Dietzel to give up coaching

BY JAMES P. HERSHEY
Asst. Sports Editor

Paul Dietzel's turbulent career as Carolina's football coach will end after this season.

The unexpected announcement was made by Dietzel at his post-game press conference after USC lost its second game of the season Saturday night, 20-14 to Duke.

As Dietzel left the field after the game—but before his announcement—he was jeered by numerous Carolina fans, who have grown impatient waiting for him to build a nationally-ranked team, as he promised to do when he came to USC nine years ago.

The scene has recurred after nearly every Carolina loss at Williams-Brice Stadium in the past few years.

Dietzel did not tell his team of his decision until after the game. The players, normally quiet after a loss anyway, moved around the locker room in gloomy silence after the announcement.

The resignation is of a contract, which would have expired in 1982, as both athletic director and coach. However, Dietzel said he hopes to be hired as athletic director.

The University, meanwhile, remains noncommittal about its plans.

USC President Dr. William H. Patterson said a decision about Dietzel's future as athletic director is "of course left up to the board of trustees and myself, too. Right now we don't have any plans."

However, Patterson said he thinks Dietzel has done an "amazingly good job" in his nine years as athletic director. "The choice to hire Coach Dietzel has never been regretted," Patterson said.

Meanwhile, T. Eaton Marchant, USC Board of Trustees' chairman, said "there very definitely has been no decision and no commitments made" about Dietzel's future at the University.

Marchant said he was told of Dietzel's decision to resign after this year on Friday, but was not aware the announcement would be made after the Duke game until Saturday afternoon.

According to Marchant, Dietzel gave no indication as to why he wanted to make his decision public when he did.

In a prepared statement, Dietzel said he decided this summer to resign as coach, but told his plans only to his wife, Anne, and Patterson. Dietzel said he originally planned to make his retirement public near the end of the season. Dietzel's health seemed to be the major factor in his decision to resign. Last year he missed two games because of an operation for
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Optional fee payment plan
Given approval by Board

From Staff Reports

The USC Board of Trustees unanimously approved a plan allowing part-time students the option of paying the student activities fees.

The resolution, which became effective today, states that the payment of the activities fees by part-time students, those carrying less than 12 hours, be "permissible but not mandatory." The board had taken this option away from students earlier in the year.

The part-time fee question was just one of many topics discussed by the board at their bi-annual meeting Saturday and at a full day of committee meetings Friday.

The committee meetings were open to the public and the press for the first time, as a direct result of a July ruling by state's attorney General Daniel McCleod.

McCleod said the board's longstanding practice of holding closed-door committee meetings was in direct conflict with the South Carolina Freedom of Information Act.

The part-time fee question was presented to the board's Student Trustee Liaison Committee Friday by Student Government President Leigh Leventis, who said he considered the problem a "top priority" item.

The fee, which totals up to $32.50 in the sum of three separate fees, student health, $27; student activities, $13.50, and intercollegiate athletics, $12.

Several advantages and disadvantages were pointed out by the USC administration for enacting the optional fee plan for part-time students.

Presidents William H. Patterson, who presented the plan to the board's executive committee for its study and to USC officials who said the system would be fair to those students who are part-time only because they need a few courses to complete a certain degree program.
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Tenure decision divides USC Law Center faculty

BY "MORY" SALAHUDDIN
Gamecock Staff Writer

First of two parts

"If people could have kept their cool we might have been able to approach the tenured faculty in a more effective way and possibly some concessions might have been made before a 'noisy' approach was taken."

-USC Law Professor

On July 2, 1974, USC Law Professors Charles Sullivan and Michael Zimmer were asked to leave at the end of the current academic year. This decision was made by a majority of the Law Center's tenure committee.

On Aug. 15, 1974, a majority of the same committee asked Sullivan and Zimmer to stay on.

I think the press release covers the whole story," said Law Center dean Robert W. Foster. The Sept. 11 press release, put out by University Information Services, quotes Foster as saying "new information not in existence during the discussions earlier this year was on the basis on which the majority of it was made and law faculty changed their decisions."

"The new information on the two assistant professors," said Foster, "included publication of articles in law review journals and substantially higher scores on more recent student critiques of classroom performance."

In earlier meetings, the tenure committee, apart from retaining Sullivan and Zimmer, had also approved the dismissal of Professors William Barwick and William of.

These were unpopular decisions. There was strong student and faculty protest. According to Jay Bender, a third year law student, students organized to discuss these decisions. There were some meetings with Foster. Members of the Law Review, said Bender, went to see USC President William H. Patterson and communicated their concerns therein.

Apparently, Patterson was impressed and formed an ad hoc committee, composed of senior University professors to look further into the tenure decisions.

The ad hoc committee, in its report to President Patterson, questioned whether the tenure committee, in approving dismissal of four professors, had all available evidence before it.

The ad hoc committee also raised doubts which, in dismissing these four professors, the tenure committee had been led exclusively by merit considerations. It therefore requested the tenure committee to reconvene and reconsider its decision.

The tenure committee met again on Aug. 15. Each of the four faculty professors involved, Barwick, Zimmer, Sullivan and Toal were invited to appear before the committee and submit further proof of their qualifications.

Barwick refused the offer and resigned immediately. The other three professors presented additional information regarding their professional activities.

The tenure committee, after evaluating the new information, decided to retain Zimmer and Sullivan and Professor Toal, however, was again asked to leave at the end of the academic year.

Zimmer said there was enough
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