

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING

- MINUTES: October 3, 1979 -

Minutes . . . . . pp. 1 - 5

Attachments:

1. Faculty Salary Statistics . . . . . pp. 6 - 7
2. Summary of USC's Budget Status . . . . . p. 8
3. Faculty Senate Attendance . . . . . p. 9
4. Faculty Advisory Committee's Revised  
Resolution Exempting Faculty from  
State Grievance Procedures . . . . . p. 10 *-Approved*

Office of the Secretary  
October 3, 1979

*Peter W. Becker*  
Peter H. Becker  
Secretary

I. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the September 12th meeting were approved with a change in the attendance roster, College of Social Work should read 2 out of 2.

II. Report of President

Report of President

President Holderman announced that the Board of Trustees had approved the merging of the College of Health and Physical Education and the College of Public Health and Communicative Disorders into the College of Health.

Dr. Holderman reported that the draft form of the Commission on Higher Education's master plan is printed and will be distributed as soon as possible. The University must respond to the Commission by November 1st. A list of the pages which have direct relevance to USC was sent to all academic administrative officers.

One of our concerns is the statement in the report that the Medical School shall focus on the training of primary care physicians. At the present, the administration is trying to determine what is meant by primary care. For the moment it seems to mean that the University of South Carolina Medical School is supposed to restrict itself to the training of family practice physicians. This was not the challenge made to the University to create a medical school in the Appropriations Act of 1976-77. The second major directive on the Medical School in the document is that the USC Medical School should complement the Medical University of South Carolina. The draft report recommends that a series of studies concerning enrollment limitation, development of criteria, and suggestions for eliminating duplication of programs on the graduate and professional level be developed.

President Holderman requested departments and colleges to respond to the draft master plan no later than October 20th. He added that the master plan supports the University in its mission to improve the quality of students and programs, and to stress research, graduate education, and public service.

Referring to the two documents handed out, Dr. Holderman indicated that although Carolina and Clemson were given the same amount of money for faculty salaries, Clemson has fallen behind Carolina, even though two years ago Clemson was ahead of USC. The reason for this discrepancy is that unlike USC Clemson elected not to apply all of its money to upgrading faculty salaries. While USC is now slightly above the national average, it must be remembered that the average is calculated from all institutions, a great number of which pay considerably less and thus pull down the average. In order to remain competitive as a senior institution, USC still has to catch up and the administration is working hard toward that end. (Attachment 1, pages 6-7)

The second document is a summary of USC's budget request for 1980-81, including a 15.5% increase. Portions of this amount are needed to cover increased enrollments and library acquisitions on all campuses. President Holderman drew attention to the fact that the submitted budget contains no new positions and is merely asking for money to fund current positions. (See Attachment 2, p. 8)

III. Reports of Committees

A. Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Professor Robert L. Felix:

Nominations to Scholastic Standards & Petitions Committee On behalf of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Professor Felix presented the following nominations for the newly constituted Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee: Oscar J. Holzmann, Business Administration; Joseph Ryan, Education; Ted Simpson, Engineering; John Lopiccio, Journalism (incumbents). Foster Tait, Philosophy; and Robert Thompson, Government and International Studies (new members).

Chairman Coolidge stated that according to the Faculty Manual nominations would remain open until the end of the meeting.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor B. Theodore Cole, Chairman:

Report Approved as Amended pp. 1-5) On behalf of the Grade Change Committee, Professor Cole moved for approval of the committee's recommendations with one change on page 2, Department of Psychology, where the grade changes for Terry Johnson and Phillip Kornblut should read from B to A. (Agenda, pp. 1-5) The recommendations were approved as amended.

C. Curricula and Courses Committee, Professor Henry Price, Chairman:

Report of Committee on Curricula and Courses On behalf of the committee, Professor Price moved the adoption of Section I, College of Humanities and Social Sciences (Agenda, p. 6). Section I was approved.

Professor Price requested that the following changes be made under Section II, College of Science and Mathematics. On page 8, under "Electives" the 15-30 hours should be deleted and footnote(1) should be added. The footnote which reads "Electives may vary." should be inserted at the end of the proposed wording of the Cognate for Non-Majors on page 9. Also on page 9, line 5 should now read "mathematics, or statistics. Student or advisers". In the third paragraph on page 9, reference to Mathematics 201 should be deleted. Section II was then approved as amended.

D. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Perry Ashley, Chairman:

Revised Resolution Exempting Faculty Chairman Ashley noted that a revised resolution exempting faculty from the state grievance procedure was distributed before the meeting to replace the one on page 10 of the agenda. After pointing out the changes, Professor Ashley moved for adoption of the revised resolution which was a reflection of the faculty sentiments voiced at the open hearing held two weeks earlier. (Attachment 4, p. 10)

Chairman Coolidge moved that since this was a matter of substance the Senate agree that any definitive action on this motion be postponed until November.

Professor Richard Zienfeld, English, asked for a succinct statement of the advantages and disadvantages of exempting the USC faculty from the state grievance procedure. Professor Ashley replied that the issue essentially was one of being evaluated by one's peers rather than by people who have no knowledge of academic work. In response to a second question, Professor Ashley affirmed that the state grievance procedure seems to have a direct connection with tenure.

Professor Robert Patterson, History, observed that the grievance procedure does have a rather substantial connection with tenure. If the tenure decision followed the normal course and resulted in an unfavorable recommendation to the Board of Trustees, and that decision then became the basis for a grievance taken to the State Board composed of non-academics, a decision by the State Board to award tenure would have a very direct bearing on our tenure system.

Dean Waugh, Engineering, asked for a procedural interpretation on whether a substantive matter could be dealt with if previously circulated to the meeting. Dr. Coolidge answered that it could be voted on now but that he had asked the indulgence of the Senate before he made such a ruling. He added the reason for the postponement was the changes that were made. Dean Waugh inquired if timing was of any importance in the matter. Dr. Ashley responded that there did not appear to be any critical problem with postponing a decision until November.

Professor Donald L. Jones, Religious Studies, and Chairman of the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions, stated that his committee had not met since the original resolution was circulated, but that he talked with several members of the committee who endorse the resolution. He thought it would be advantageous to vote on it immediately, as the committee would have to deal with mid-year decisions on tenure and promotion without the benefit of this amendment. He added that he did not want the work of the committee in the spring to be placed in continual limbo in light of the Attorney General's August 1979 Opinion that tenure and promotion regulations as practiced by USC and as stated in the Faculty Manual do not take precedence over the state appraisal policy in the State Policy Manual. This could rule the work of the committee invalid. He asked for assurance that the University Tenure and Promotions Committee's spring decisions would not be rendered invalid if approval of this resolution was postponed.

Provost Borkowski stated that he could not give any assurance to the committee that its work would not be rendered invalid if the issue were to be delayed past the time of the beginning of the legislative session in January. It was his understanding from conversations with Senator Miles that the Education Committee of the Senate contemplated holding open public hearings at the end of the month. He added that his office had not received anything in writing from the Education Committee. Senator Miles also said there would probably be an amendment sent forward in January to the Legislature to encompass specific employment exemptions from the state grievance procedure. The grievance procedures of all the state colleges and universities would have to meet with the approval of the State Personnel Board. Dean Waugh asked the Provost if action on this resolution today would be desirable. Provost Borkowski answered he would prefer to let that decision be made by the Faculty Senate.

Professor Eldon Wedlock, Law, stated that the interaction of tenure as granted by the University and the application of state grievance procedures to unclassified employees is a complex issue. He did not think it was safe to assume, as he has heard some people say, that there is automatic tenure after six months but it does inhibit the non-renewal of individuals. He added that it should be deliberated in some way before action was taken.

Resolution Post-  
Poned November. Dr. Coolidge then stated that the resolution was postponed until November.

E. Admissions Committee, Professor Susie VanHuss, Chairman:  
Motion to Approve Admission Policy Statement On behalf of the Admissions Committee, Professor VanHuss moved the adoption of the Admission Policy Statement. (Agenda, pp. 11-16)  
Several questions were answered regarding the large standard of error (0.7) margin in the formula.

Professor Nancy Lange, Foreign Languages, asked whether the Admissions Office has the right to refuse admission to any student. Professor VanHuss answered that any applicant who is denied admission has the right to appeal to the Committee which has the final decision in the matter. She added that the document has a provision for a "floating grade point average" with the specification that this is under the Committee's jurisdiction. Under no conditions can this standard go below a 1.75. This allows some faculty judgment and also gives the committee an opportunity to obtain better students. The average student has SAT scores over 900 although we do accept 350-350. Professor Lane then asked what exceptions are made to the policy. Dr. VanHuss stated that they are included in the document, for example a person over 25 years of age does not have to take the SAT. There are also special students who come under the rule for discretionary admissions. The Committee has always gone to the individual college of department for a recommendation on an applicant if there was any particular doubt.

Professor Lane asked who would be admitted under provision "V. Discretionary Admissions." Professor VanHuss replied that this section has been University policy for approximately 10-12 years and was not changed. The bulk of discretionary admissions are students in the Opportunity Scholars Program. The Committee has monitored the number of discretionary admissions and found no abuse. It is the practice of the President in exercising his prerogative to consult the Admissions staff or the Committee.

Professor John Spurrier, Mathematics, Computer Science and Statistics, asked if the committee plans to update the equation since the grade point average and the prediction will change over the years and Professor VanHuss assured him that the matter will be reviewed annually.

Professor Edward Mercer, Chemistry, stated that it sounded as if the Admissions Staff would only make recommendations to the committee and that all exceptions would be made by the committee, but that according to paragraph 3 on page 21 that was not so. His reading was that the Admissions Staff may make exceptions.

John Bolin, Director of Admissions, stated that the Admissions Office processes 20,000 applications a year and could not ask the Committee at every point what to do. It is employing a general set of guidelines and when problems arise in following those guidelines the Admissions Committee is asked for advice. Professor VanHuss added that this is not a policy change.

Professor Robert Rood, Government and International Studies, wanted to know what effect the new procedure would have had this fall if it had been applied to the entering class.

John Bolin answered that 180 students would not have been admitted.

Professor Richard Mandell, History, suggested that the faculty ought to consider the effect on this institution if the number were raised from 180 to, for example, 2500. He thought that much of the atmosphere at USC was determined by students who should not be here at all and that their number was much higher than 180. Harvard is essentially a great institution not because of its faculty or its library, but because of its admissions policy. The tenor of USC would unquestionably be raised if more unqualified students were rejected.

Professor VanHuss pointed out that the grade point average which is permitted to float upward but not downward could result in the admission of better students, that the committee will continue to study the matter, and that the faculty could discuss the question of minimum scores. We would like to be a Harvard, but it must not be forgotten that we do not serve the same constituency.

Professor William Lamprecht, Salkehatchie, asked if this policy included the two year campuses. Professor VanHuss responded that it applies to the Columbia Campus only.

Chairman Coolidge then asked the Senate to vote on whether it was ready to proceed with the motion. The Senate voted in favor of voting on the motion.

Motion  
Carries

The chair then presented the motion to adopt the Admissions Policy Statement. Motion carried.

IV. Report of Secretary - none

V. Old Business - None

VI. New Business - None

VII. Good of the Order - None

There being no further business, a motion was made to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 5:20.