

Original

UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MEETING

USC-UNION

MINUTES: 18 November 1983

General Session

I. Call to Order

II. Correction/Approval of Minutes

Correction of September 23, 1983, minutes are as follows:

- 1) Page 4: the minutes state that the minutes of the April 8, 1983, minutes were approved and they were not approved.
- 2) Page 5: under Section IV immediately under Reports from Standing Committees add, "A. Rights and Responsibilities Committee."
- 3) Page 7: add an "e" on the end of Professor Ed Caine so that his name reads "Professor Ed Caine."
- 4) Page 14: "can not" changed to "cannot"
- 5) Professor William Cordray stated that some people might interpret the minutes as stating that the manual draft would be returned to the Faculty Senate for approval. Professor Cordray stated that will not be the case.

The April 8, 1983, minutes were approved and the September 23, 1983, minutes were approved as corrected.

III. Reports from University Officers

A. Dr. John Duffy, System Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education

Dr. Duffy talked optimistically about the future of the University Campus System and credited that bright future to Dr. Holderman. Dr. Duffy went on to state, "you are as important as Columbia, you are the University."

Dr. Duffy reported on the progress of the visits by the Columbia Campus staff to the various University Campuses, stating that the visits were very positive and achieved their purposes. He also stated that the Columbia Campus visitors were very appreciative of the opportunity to visit the Campuses.

Dr. Duffy addressed the issue of the upcoming (in the next two to three years) renewal of the Higher Education Act (HEA). It was first passed in 1965, amended in 1972, and according to Dr. Duffy, "has in essence been the road map in our field, which we have followed for many years."

The new HEA is more important for what it does not do than what it will do, i.e.:

- eliminate federal subsidy for college libraries
- eliminate funds for teacher training under Title V
- eliminate funds for international education and foreign language studies
- eliminate educational cooperative programs
- eliminate graduate school opportunities for minorities and women
- no more funding of urban university grants.

The new HEA as proposed will probably not pass. As the legislation progresses on this issue, the administration will keep the faculty informed.

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter) referred to page 7 of the September 23, 1983, minutes concerning the process of Dean selection and asked if anything had been done to put the procedure in the Manual.

Dr. Duffy stated not at this time, "the procedure is basically traditional, however, I think we will work on trying to get something in there."

B. Professor John Gardner, Associate Vice President for University Campuses and Continuing Education

Commenting on the visits to the campuses by the Columbia Campus staff, Professor Gardner stated, "I believe they will have a measurable impact on the way decisions are made about our campuses."

Associate Vice President Gardner brought to the attention of the Senators the Faculty Staff Dependent Scholarship Program. This program is open to all faculty on all campuses and every qualified applicant last year was given a scholarship. To qualify, a person must be a son, daughter, or spouse of a USC faculty or staff member and either have a predicted GPR of 3.0 or be a USC student with a GPR of 3.0. From a fund of \$40,000, awards of \$800 per person a year are made and the scholarship is renewable for four years.

Concerning the budget, Professor Gardner said it was too early to tell much about it, but he was optimistic about a good budget picture. The critical factor is full formula funding which will determine how good a budget year it will be. However, with a decline in FTE in 1983 the campuses will feel the loss of those students.

Professor Gardner encouraged faculty members to go after a share of the desegregation money made available by the legislature through the Commission on Higher Education. The areas to concentrate on are the recruitment and retention of minorities.

Professor Gardner acknowledged and praised the communications program at USC-Sumter which is directed at high school students in the USC-Sumter service area. The program has been very effective in informing students in the area of higher education opportunities available to them on the Sumter Campus.

Also a meeting of student services personnel of the University Campuses was held to exchange ideas about how to work with students outside of class. Another meeting will be held in January of 1984.

With President Holderman's push to increase in statewide delivery of services by USC, Dr. Duffy and Professor Gardner will write a document explaining the Graduate Regional Studies Program and its role in the delivery system.

Referring to Carolina Plan III, Professor Gardner stated it was based on Carolina Plans I and II, and according to Dr. Holderman there is no attempt to supplant or undermine undergraduate education. The plan will go before the Board of Trustees in December for approval.

Professor Gardner acknowledged the efforts of Professors Johns and Cordray concerning the Faculty Manual and thanked them for their work. He also invited everyone to the National Conference on the Freshman Year Experience sponsored by Continuing Education and to be held in Columbia in February. There will be no registration fee for University Campuses faculty.

Addressing the proposed Provisional Year Program, Professor Gardner stated, "the debate over this issue raises serious issues for Two-Year Campus faculty and could have long-term implications for faculty on the Two-Year Campuses. The Provisional Year Program would admit 250 new freshmen next year to a one year program in which the students would be required to pass 30 hours of credit to continue. The courses would be taught by Applied Professional Sciences (CAPS) faculty members under Baccalaureate titles and numbers of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

If the program is adopted, it would provide an opportunity for 250 students who otherwise would be denied access to the Columbia Campus, admittance to USC-Columbia. Students taken into the program would have a predicted GPR of between 1.8 and 2.0. This GPR range would get them into many other colleges in the state including all of the two and four year (except Columbia) in the USC System.

If the program is not adopted, USC stands to lose 100 FTE and between 2 and 2.4 million dollars over the next four years. Also, it will hamper our efforts to recruit minority students.

The faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences are opposing this program. They have, according to Professor Gardner, "a callous regard for tenured faculty in Applied Professional Sciences." Also Professor Gardner stated, "Vice President Duffy and I are very concerned that if this proposal is not approved, it will lead to a convening in January of the so-called Committee of Nine. This is a group of nine professors who decide and

vote as to whether or not to retrench. We are concerned that that precedent be set anywhere in the University of South Carolina System. I'm sure you can follow through the long range implications of that and apply it to our own campuses."

"Now we are very respectful of the rights and prerogatives of the Senators who represent you ladies and gentlemen in the Columbia Senate to vote as you deem appropriate."

Dr. Duffy stated, "It doesn't take too much imagination to see the same logic applied to the Two-Year Campuses."

A discussion followed in which Professor Curlovic (Sumter) stated that Two-Year Campuses could lose students as a result of this program. Professor Gardner assured him and the rest of the Senate that the students would come from the Columbia area.

When questioned on the issue of faculty salaries based on statements from the Deans' retreat and the Executive Committee Retreat that faculty salaries are the number one priority, Professor Gardner stated that he and Dr. Duffy had told Dr. Holderman that faculty salaries were one of their greatest priorities. However, they, Dr. Duffy, and Professor Gardner, were waiting for the results of the Welfare Committee salary study.

Dr. Duffy stated the reason not much has been done about salaries is because not much is known about next year's budget and the administration does not want to falsely raise expectations. Right now, he said, the figures being talked about are between 5 and 9 percent.

Professor Caine (Beaufort) stated that he understood the faculty salary issue was the number one concern of the Deans and he hoped Dr. Duffy's solution to this problem would go beyond the state system for salary raises. Dr. Duffy replied, "Absolutely, that is exactly what John and I talked about to the President. We need more flexibility."

Professor Gardner stated that in their conversation with the President, he had pointed to a study in the Beaufort public schools concerning teacher salaries and how the salaries at USC-Beaufort stacked up unfavorably against them. Professor Gardner stated that the President hears and that they (Professor Gardner and Dr. Duffy) heard us last summer and they hear us again now.

Returning to the Provisional Program, Professor Tom Powers (Sumter) asked how many senior faculty members in CAPS would be saved by this program which serves 250 students and thereby not quaffed by the Committee of Nine. Professor Gardner stated that the program may be a little smaller the first year because of a late recruiting start, but if the program were successful it would have at least 250 students, and approximately 15 tenured faculty from CAPS would be used to staff the program. Dr. Duffy pointed out that three of the faculty in CAPS have received the distinguished teaching award in the last 15 years.

Professor Tom Powers asked why the CAPS faculty members could not be taken into the existing departments rather than create a department. Let the Ph.D. professors teach upper level courses rather than English 100, etc. Professor Gardner replied that there is a concern that tenured faculty will be moved into departments where they do not have a record of publications and scholarly research. Also, CAPS faculty are perceived by some faculty as being interested only in teaching and not research, and there are some perceived differences in status.

Professor Sally Johns (Lifelong Learning) stated that the Curricular and Courses Committee has reviewed the program and sees it as a unique and separate program with smaller classes, individualized instruction, etc. Professor Powers stated that this appears to be an effort to retain the College of Applied Professional Sciences and keep a junior college system, which we are not supposed to do, but are going to do anyway. Professor Gardner stated he would not have described it in that fashion.

The guest speaker, Professor Richard Mims, Director of the BAIS program in CAPS, addressed the Senate on plans to expand the role of the BAIS in the University System. After providing the Senate with many facts and figures concerning the program, Professor Mims opened the floor to questions.

Professor Bob Group (Salkehatchie) asked if a new course was designed on one of the Two-Year Campuses, how would it transfer in the System, and specifically how would it be received in the BAIS program? Professor Mims replied that efforts at all levels are being made to give each campus more autonomy in administering the BAIS program. Dr. Duffy announced a BAIS workshop to be held in Columbia on January 27, 1984.

Professor Group asked if an interdisciplinary course designed at the Salkehatchie Campus would transfer into the BAIS program. Professor Mims replied that it would. Professor Mims also stated he believed that if a student was admitted to the BAIS program after 30 hours, it would be a good idea if that student also worked toward an A.A. degree while working toward the BAIS.

Dr. David Bowden, Dean for Telecommunications Instruction and Correspondence Study, pointed out the options available in his department to students on Two-Year Campuses seeking a BAIS degree.

IV. Reports of Standing Committees

A. Rights and Responsibilities

Professor Rick Boulware, chairman, citing the difficulty in trying to define computer literacy and identifying computer needs of individual faculty members, stated the committee would like to address the issue in terms of option. The Rights and Responsibilities Committee recommended that individual faculty members voluntarily pursue the development of computer literacy skills according to individually perceived needs. The committee feels that development of these skills should be an option rather than a requirement. Also, Dr. Duffy's Office should make informa-

tion available to the faculty concerning computer services and that the University should periodically survey the computer needs of the faculty. Finally, local computer faculty should design a program for local faculty concerning computers and coordinate efforts in that area.

There are presently two resources already available to the faculty:

1. Network--a publication from the Computer Services Center in Columbia.
2. Academic Support Group; staff members in the Computer Science Program whose job is to accommodate the computer needs of faculty.

Dr. Duffy stated that it has always been the intention of his Office and of the Deans that computer literacy be an option and not a requirement. It will not become a new hurdle on the way to promotion, according to Dr. Duffy.

B. Faculty Welfare

Professor Lila Meeks (Beaufort) stated the committee had no motions to present at this time, but they do have a report on the progress of the salary study. Greg Labyak (Salkehatchie) obtained a report from Columbia concerning salaries on all the Campuses in the system broken down by rank, sex, discipline, etc. The report, however, is incomplete because the University will not issue, at least in this report, information in categories where there are less than four people. In addition to this information, the committee has information on public school salaries in counties where the Two-Year Campuses are located. The committee will issue its final report in Lancaster in February and if the salary picture warrants it, make a case for higher salaries.

The chair requested that if possible the committee meet before the next Executive Committee meeting so that a report and any subsequent motion could be put on the agenda. Professor Meeks stated that the chairperson of the committee would be in contact with Chairman Nunnery on that matter.

Professor Caine (Beaufort) asked why there has been so much trouble getting specific information on salaries when that information is part of the public domain? Dr. Duffy replied that the personnel office has an internal policy that it will generally not release information when it identifies individuals. Of course there is the Freedom of Information Act, he went on state.

Professor Robert Group (Salkehatchie) suggested the committee look at the 1975 and 1980 CHE reports on percentage increase in salaries to see how each campus has fared.

Professor Gardner stated he was glad to see the effort made by the Welfare Committee because it gives him and Dr. Duffy more credibility and firepower when talking to the President and Budget Committee when they can provide a faculty perspective on issues backed by concrete evidence.

Professor Meeks concluded the report and then thanked Professors Cordray and Johns for their work on the Manual.

C. Intra-University Services and Communications

Professor Robert Costello (Sumter) presented a motion from the committee concerning a name change of the Two-Year Campuses. After much discussion and additions to the motion, the final version of the motion presented to the Senate was as follows:

The Committee moves that:

Individual Campuses retain their current names (i.e., USC-Beaufort, USC-Lancaster, etc.). The name "Two-Year" be eliminated. The Senate convey to the administration and Board of Trustees the following suggested names to replace the term "Two-Year" in the names for Dr. Duffy's office and this Senate, plus any others which may be added by members of the Senate prior to voting on this motion during the November 18 General Session.

Suggested names:

1. Carolina Campuses
2. Regional Campuses
3. Carolina Colleges
4. University Campuses at (Beaufort, Sumter, etc.)
5. System Campuses

The motion passed by voice vote.

Professor Dockery asked that the record note that for the first time since he has been a part of this system that he is in total agreement with Dean Anderson on renaming the campuses Regional Campuses.

V. Executive Committee Report

Professor Johns (Lifelong Learning). The Executive Committee met in Columbia on Friday, 28 October 1983. Items discussed include the following:

- expansion of the BAIS degree
- sabbatical policy
- tenure and promotion procedures in the Two-Year Campus System
- the need for a more accurate name for the Two-Year Campus System
- an update of progress on the Faculty Manual
- progress of standing committees on various projects
- agenda for the November 18 Senate Meeting
- dates for spring Senate meetings:
 - February 17 Lancaster (Executive Committee February 3)
 - April 13 Beaufort (Executive Committee March 30)

During the morning session the Committee prepared a motion that will be presented following the report from the Academic Forward Planning Committee.

VI. Reports from Special Committees

A. University Library Committee—Professor Milton Harden (Salkehatchie) reporting for Sherre H. Dryden (Salkehatchie).

The University Library Committee met Monday, November 31, 1983, to consider the allocation of the library book budget for the Columbia Campus. Kenneth Toombs, Director of Libraries at USC Columbia reported that disciplines would be able to commit up to 5% of the unencumbered balance of their departmental allocation for new periodical subscriptions. This move ends a three year freeze on the addition of new periodicals to the Columbia Campus libraries, and will yield up to \$7,000 for new subscriptions.

Mr. Toombs reported the probable closing of the Thomas Cooper Library during the week between Christmas Day and New Year's Day, stating that the cost of operating the Library is \$1,000 per day.

Mr. Toombs also reported to the Committee on the South Carolina Newspaper Project that is to be headed by Dr. John Hammond Moore. A grant has been awarded to fund the Project, which will result in a bibliography of all newspapers published in South Carolina and holding locations in and out of the state.

B. Curricula and Courses Committee—Professor Sally Johns (Lifelong Learning)

Since the last Senate meeting, the Curricula and Courses Committee has met three times: October 17, November 7, and November 14.

The following new courses have been approved by the Committee and forwarded to the Columbia Faculty Senate:

ANTH 310, Peoples and Cultures of Islam
ANTH 358, Gender, Culture, and Behavior
ANTH 370, Computer Applications in Social Anthropology
ARTH 503, History of American Antiques and Decorative Arts
ARTH 334, History of Modern Art
SPAN 311, Intensive Advanced Spanish
THSP 379, Intermediate Jazz Dance
BIOL 536 (MSCI 536), Ichthyology

Changes in prerequisites, title, description, and/or hours were approved for several courses numbered 500 or above in Engineering, History, and Biology; thus these changes are not pertinent to our campuses. (However, a full listing will be included in the Columbia Faculty Senate minutes, and information will be provided upon request.)

Several changes in the Journalism curriculum were approved. Because of a schedule conflict Professor Johns was not present when this proposal was acted upon, but will forward approved proposal copies to all of the Deans in our System when received.

The Committee also discussed and acted upon a Provisional Year Proposal from the College of Applied Professional Sciences. After extensive discussion of the proposal, the Committee concluded:

1. That the concept is worthwhile and in keeping with the goals of the University.
2. That the proposal as currently written has problems, several of which are sufficient to warrant changes; therefore, the Committee recommended:
 - a. inclusion in the curriculum of one course to develop and test analytical skills, to come from the area of math, science, or logic;
 - b. some continuing mechanism on paper to handle coordination between faculty and the departments whose courses they would teach;
 - c. written commitment from all concerned parties before the proposal is presented to the Columbia Faculty Senate.

C. Welfare Committee—Professor Jerry Dockery (Lifelong Learning)

The Faculty Welfare Committee met on September 26, 1983. Senior Vice President Denton met with the Committee to discuss and explain the 10% administrative charge on E funds. (This charge does not apply to the Two-Year Campuses budgets.)

The members of the Committee were not satisfied with some of the answers to their inquiries and a letter was drafted by the Chair, N. K. Heveny, to Executive Vice President Vlahoplus.

Another meeting would be scheduled as soon as the Chair received a response from Executive Vice President Vlahoplus.

D. Academic Forward Planning Committee—Professor Ed Caine (Beaufort)

The Academic Forward Planning Committee met on October 14 and November 3. The College of Pharmacy requested that the AFPC reconsider their Pharm. D. program. Upon reconsideration, the Pharm. D. program was recommended.

The AFPC considered the Provisional Year Plan from the College of Applied Professional Sciences. This program, which is similar to a branch program on the Columbia Campus, was approved in concept.

We also considered Carolina Plan III, which is a 5-year plan proposed by President Holderman. The AFPC made no recommendations on Carolina Plan III, and passed the written comments that I made, to the Provost. (A copy of Professor Caine's written comments to the Provost are attached as Appendix A.)

Addressing the Senate in response to Professor Caine's position on Carolina Plan III, Dr. Duffy stated that Carolina Plan III is not a final document and that it has been submitted to the Deans, Chancellors, Vice Presidents and other administrative personnel. All of these people were asked to respond to the document. He restated President Holderman's remarks made at Sumter that Carolina Plan III is just that and it does not supersede Carolina Plans I and II. Carolina Plans I and II support undergraduate and continuing education.

Dr. Duffy went on to explain the salary formula and how salaries are arrived at in the Two-Year System, stating that the highest Two-Year Campus is part of the formula and CAPS has been the benchmark in that area.

Professor Lila Meeks stated that she had never seen Carolina Plan III and was unfamiliar with it until now. She asked if the priorities, buildings, etc., were just additions to the priorities in the previous two Carolina Plans.

Dr. Duffy responded by saying that in the case of Beaufort, getting the elementary school has always been a priority, however, Carolina Plan III sparse on buildings. This is just an operational document for CHE and it probably should include the more detailed building plans of Dave Rinker. Again, this is a discussion document.

Professor Meeks asked for more information concerning salaries.

Dr. Duffy replied that CHE treats Clemson and USC-Columbia the same as the four-year schools and the two-year schools. They plug into the formula the highest salaries in each category. CAPS has the highest salaries in the System. Historically the Two-Year System is a spin-off of General Studies (now CAPS). Dr. Duffy stated that because the college is older and that some years ago Dean Varney used some innovative techniques, which Dr. Duffy is unfamiliar with and Dean Varney has not yet shared with him, the base salary of CAPS is higher.

Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter) asked who "they" are and what "they" do with this "benchmark"?

Dr. Duffy replied that the way the formula works there are 12 steps that take into consideration--buildings, the age of those buildings, square footage, etc., and the highest paid faculty in a category. The problem is the formula has never been fully funded. We spend more money on salaries than the formula generates. We take from maintenance and underfund the administration by 25% of what the formula says it should be.

Professor Johns (Lifelong Learning) presented the following motion from the Executive Committee:

The Executive Committee moves that the Two-Year Campus Faculty Senate go on record as endorsing the position taken by its representative to the Academic Forwarding Planning Committee on Carolina Plan III.

The following discussion occurred:

Professor Harold Sears (Union), "Dr. Caine's remarks are interesting, but most of us have not seen Carolina Plan III and although Dr. Caine's remarks may be accurate since we haven't seen the plan we could not verify Dr. Caine's remarks."

Professor Dockery stated he had read all three of the Carolina Plans and the first was released step by step. Professor Dockery stated that he believed that Carolina Plan III read as though it came straight from Dr. Borkowski's office.

Professor Don Curlovic (Sumter) stated he believes that our role (the Senate) is to convey to Dr. Duffy our concerns toward undergraduate education. Given the remarks of Dr. Borkowski at the first Senate meeting in Columbia about Carolina becoming like Michigan in terms of emphasis on graduate education and the tone of Carolina Plan III, Professor Curlovic is concerned about the future of undergraduate education at USC.

Professor Cordray shared Professor Curlovic's concerns and stated he wants to see the Senate work with the administration in assuring that the mission of the Two-Year Campuses is not forgotten. This is not an anti-administration effort, but an effort to make our feelings known.

Dr. Duffy, "What you are referring to as Carolina Plan III is a discussion document and not Carolina Plan III. It would be premature to take a stand now before all the input is in. Wait and see what Carolina Plan III looks like."

Professor Tom Powers (Sumter) stated that if Carolina Plan III is not yet complete, then this is the best time to discuss and come up with a position before the document is finalized. It is better to do this than to come up with a rebuttal after the Plan is set. Professor Powers questioned why the Senate was not asked to review the document but since this was done by the Academic Forward Planning Committee we should support him. He (Caine) represents us on that Committee and we should back him as credible.

Professor Powers continued to say that if the Carolina Plan III is to move the emphasis from the first two plans concerning undergraduate and continuing education, then there is a cause for concern. Let's not move on to something new if we are not a stage we want to be at in the other plans.

Professor Johns reminded the Senate that the motion does not address Carolina Plan III directly, but supports our representative's position as stated in the Academic Forward Planning Committee.

Professor Rick Boulware (Beaufort) called the question:

22-Yes

3-No

The motion passed by voice vote.

E. Academic Affairs/Faculty Liason-Professor Harold Sears (Union)

"No report."

F. Research and Productive Scholarship-J. T. Myers (Sumter)

The various subcommittees (Humanities, Social Sciences, and the Science Committees) have met recently to assess this semester's proposals. Decisions on funding should be out by the second week of December.

Six proposals were received from the Two-Year Campuses. Three went to the Science Committee, three to the Humanities Committee, none to the Social Science subcommittee.

A new call for proposals will be out in January. If you or colleagues on your campuses have any questions which aren't answered in this report, contact J. T. Myers.

G. System Committee-Professor Cordray announced the Committee had not met since the previous Senate meeting.

VII. Unfinished Business

Professor Cordray reported the Manual is almost ready to go to the Board of Trustees. The section in the Manual on Facilities and Services will be eliminated and moved to the Resource Manual.

Dr. Duffy asked rhetorically, "Do you realize this committee has written the Two-Year Campuses Manual as well as the Columbia Campus Manual?"

VIII. New Business

None.

IX. Announcements

Dean Arnold invited everyone to arrive at Lancaster early to make use of the facilities there, especially the sports complex.

X. Adjournment

11/83

CAROLINA PLAN III

— Coming from a unit that is denied teaching of graduate level courses by the CHE, I have reservations concerning Carolina Plan III. The argument that the reputation of a University is built around the graduate and international programs cannot be denied. However, the bread-and-butter of the University is the undergraduate program. Some mention of the role of the other eight campuses within the system should be a part of a systems wide plan.

From reading Carolina Plan III, it seems that the systems actions, as outlined on page 4, are already underway, i.e., the one time 16 million dollars for computers (objective 2) and RECON (objective 4). The remainder of the 5-year plan primarily is geared for the College of Education (GRS) and the graduate school in Columbia. I feel obligated to emphasize that 10% of the F.T.E.'s at U.S.C. are generated by the Two-Year campuses. Logic should dictate that we get 10% of the pie. We do not.

On page 8 the Summit Fund is touted as a " ... system-wide major capital funds campaign ..." Efforts on the Beaufort campus alone have resulted in contributions in excess of five million dollars through the donation of Pritchard's Island, and yet we cannot get adequate teaching facilities.

On page 9 under Physical Plant Objectives, the Carolina Plan III states that funds will be sought for " ... priority projects for each campus as listed in the objectives below." The objectives on page 10 are for an engineering center on the Columbia campus, and for seeking private housing at Coastal Carolina. Either a page is missing from my copy of Carolina Plan III, or the other seven campuses have no physical plant priorities.

On a different note, the third objective on page 4 indicates the formation of a systems-wide graduate faculty. I assume that the criteria for appointment to the graduate faculty will be the same throughout the system. If such is the case, then it seems that compensation should be uniform throughout the system for the graduate faculty within a discipline.

Overall, I believe that Carolina Plan III addresses important issues for our University, but I believe that the scope of the plan is myopic. If we are a system then we must function as a system, rather than merely to play lip-service to a concept. The Two-Year system was asked to share-the-pain when the budget was tight, even though our FTEs fell only slightly. I view a systems approach as sharing-the-wealth as the economy improves.