

Faculty Senate Meeting April 30, 1997

The meeting was called to order by Professor Henry Price, Chair.

Approval of Minutes of the meeting of April 2, 1997

I. Approval of Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting of April 2, 1997 were approved as presented with the following corrections:

PROFESSOR CHARLES WEASMER (GINT) said that on the first page, the second paragraph, in reference to the Greenville newspaper the up ed piece would be more accurately described as an op ed piece.

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT (MUSC) said that on page 10, he was asking about the fine arts requirement - THSP 144.

II. Reports of Officers.

A. Mr. William Hubbard, Chair of the Board of Trustees:

Thank you, Henry. As I look out and see some of my former professors I think my comment is, the shoe is on the other foot. I couldn't leave sometimes when I wanted to leave the classroom and you're stuck today so I hope we have a productive time. I asked Henry if I could come down and walk up and down the aisle like Liddy Dole and Oprah Winfrey, but he said that I had to come up here and stand behind this large podium so that my remarks would be appropriately recorded on tape for all posterity. I didn't anticipate that they would be that important. I am flattered to be here. I appreciate the invitation. My presence here today is a result of a conversation that Henry and I had after a Board meeting not too long ago. Henry repeated a refrain of other Faculty Senate chairs that their view of the Board of Trustees is so different upon the conclusion of their term then wthey they first joined the Board. I said Henry why don't we establish better lines of communication and maybe have the Board of Trustees come to the faculty and have more direct communication so we can understand our roles more clearly.

I wanted to mention just a few things that are important to the Board of Trustees and have been important, I would say, for most of this decade. These are over arching themes that have guided our work over the past several years, and I think it is important for you to appreciate those themes, I want to thank you for your help in trying to accomplish those goals.

One over arching concern may seem so obvious that it almost seems trite, but sometimes I think we get away from it and that is a clear focus on students. Sometimes I think we as Board members and maybe even as faculty members become focused on issues that are peripherally connected to our role as teachers of students and as mentors of students, and maybe sometimes we don't focus as directly on our responsibilities to our constituents -- our students. So our guiding light in our decision making this decade has been, is this decision, is this action, in the best interest of the students of the University of South Carolina. In that regard, we have focused clearly on getting regular reports on mentoring. We have seen examples of improved mentoring on campus by faculty members to students. We think it is important that when students matriculate at the University of South Carolina that they enjoy a career here that upon their departure they feel like it is one of the highlights of their lives. What they have achieved and experienced here will go with them forever, and it will be a defining moment in their lives, so our actions have been guided by what kind of things can we promote that will make that experience more positive. To give an example is the decisions that we made in use of our capital resources. Rather than spend money on administrative buildings and that sort of thing, we try to put our capital investments in things like renovation of classrooms and in new student housing. I think you see the result of that with the renovations of some dormitories and residence halls now, as well as the virtual completion of south campus housing. We have an additional residence hall going up on part of the Booker T. Washington property. We should break ground on that in the near future. Those are some of the things that I think evidence the focus on student life.

Another thing we have been quite devoted to is the recruitment of the best students to the University of South Carolina. There was a sense on the Board five or six years ago that we were really losing ground not only to out-of-state institutions, but to some in-state institutions in

recruiting the best and the brightest students to the University of South Carolina. The Board itself has gotten actively involved in the student recruitment process. I personally wrote about 200 letters to scholarship recipients in Richland and Kershaw counties who had been offered financial aid scholarships and who are the highest ranking people in their respective classes. I also hosted a reception for those scholars not too long ago, and we had good representation from the Honors College and from the faculty. At least eight other trustees have done the same thing in their respective communities and we have established a tradition. There is a lot of peer pressure on the Board that these trustees will get out in their communities and hopefully recruit students to the University of South Carolina. We think that is paying off. We think we are seeing the results of that effort now. But I also want to implore the faculty that we believe that faculty are the best recruiters for the University of South Carolina. Some faculty members do a great job. I hear reports all the time of certain departments that are tied in very well with the Admissions Office and those faculty members do an excellent job of picking up the telephone and calling prospective students. Unfortunately, I don't think it is uniform across campus. I think some departments are doing a better job of that recruitment than others. That is something that is very important to us. We want to be the flagship university of the State of South Carolina and we are, but to maintain that status and to take this University to the next level, we have to do a better job of attracting the best students to the University of South Carolina.

I was on the search committee when Dr. Palms was selected as President of this University and one of the defining moments when we were interviewing Dr. Palms was his vision that the University of South Carolina should be the standard by which students in this state judge an institution of higher education and that if a student decided to leave the State of South Carolina for higher education, that student should be doing so for reasons other than the quality of education available at the University of South Carolina. I think that philosophy has carried over into the vision statement that has been presented by the President. I want to add something about that vision statement -- it has been endorsed by and adopted by the Board of Trustees. If you have not seen a copy of that garnet covered pamphlet that sets out the vision of the University of South Carolina, you need to get a copy of that from the President's office because

that is the policy not just of John Palms, it is the policy of the University of South Carolina as adopted by the Board of Trustees. That vision statement will guide our decisions in the coming years, and it clearly articulates a vision that the University of South Carolina will first become a Carnegie 1 research university and then hopefully in short order a member of the American Association of Universities. To do that recruitment will be important. We have to continue to recruit the best and the brightest students. Then we have to teach those students to the absolute best of our ability, and we have to mentor those students so that those students feel like they are special when they are at the University of South Carolina. In a sense, as University officials we are in a service business not dissimilar from other service businesses. Our customers, in effect, are students of the University of South Carolina. It is our obligation, our fiduciary obligation to do everything in our power to make that experience the best experience possible. We want to make the University, to use an overworked phrase, but one I think that is important, we want to make the University "user friendly." The Trustees get complaints all the time from parents saying they can't get through to people, they get into voice mail systems they can't get out of, they can't find a person to talk to who will answer their questions. We have tried to emphasize to the administration, and the administration has been very receptive, of the need to develop systems that make the University, from registration through the application process, to the advisement and counseling process, more human to the students who attend the University of South Carolina. That philosophy to bring things down to a human scale rather than an impersonal scale is also reflected in the architecture that you will see going up on the campus in the next years. The present Board and the administration believe we need to get back to construction of new buildings that are on a scale that reflects the ambiance and architecture of the Horseshoe. New construction from now on will be guided by those principles. We think that is a positive reflection of our overall philosophy.

The Board of Trustees is very grateful to the faculty for raising admission standards. It is very important to the mission of the University to take the University to the next level. Don't think for a minute that the Board of Trustees is not in favor of that. As soon as we get some new numbers and get a better sense of how raising admission standards affects our enrollment, we

should take another look at it and think about raising standards yet again. It is important that we found by raising admission standards applications are going up as many people predicted. What we are doing is replacing one segment of potential students with a higher segment of students that will ultimately help carry the University to its rightful place. So don't be reluctant to think hard about admission standards on a regular basis.

Another thing the Board is grateful to the faculty for, is the faculty's willingness to look at its own evaluation of itself in tenure and promotion and how we have attempted to raise standards and how the faculty attempted to raise standards and make uniform standards throughout campus for tenure and promotion decisions. We as a Board are in favor of anything that promotes higher quality and excellence. I wanted you to know that that's what the Board of Trustees stands for, and we appreciate the new attitude on campus that also embraces that philosophy, and we are with you as a team in that respect.

I think I have already said a little more than I intended to, and Henry indicated I would have an opportunity to answer questions which is really what I would prefer to do rather than to give a speech. So with that background I would be happy to answer any questions that you have and I will stay if Henry will let me stay before he pulls out the crook and pulls me off the podium. Any questions? This is your chance. This is like the prime minister's hour in Great Britain. You can throw a shoe if you want to. Anything is on the table. Any questions? I am not going to go back to the Board of Trustees and say I came before the Faculty Senate and everybody was perfectly happy with everything going on at the University.

PROFESSOR ROBERT WILCOX (LAW) asked Mr. Hubbard to speak about the Board's view on capital expansion, especially the Health Center contemplated and the Greek housing.

MR. HUBBARD:

One of the things that became evident from the consultants that were brought in for the development of the master plan, was the fact that our students enjoyed fewer recreational opportunities than just about any school our size in the country. We had fewer playing fields for outdoor activities and our facilities for exercise, basketball, racquet ball and those sorts of things were quite limited for a school our size. Studies have shown that about 10 years ago about 25%

of the students participated in exercise activities and that has gone up to about 75% today. So there is a real need there to develop those kinds of opportunities for our students. One way that you have to do that is to provide some facilities for those students. You don't want to make it so that students have to go to private facilities far off campus to get that kind of exercise opportunities. One thing that John Palms has emphasized throughout his tenure as President is the development of the whole student, and we think physical development is a very important part of that. Given the poor state of affairs for our current recreational opportunities we felt it important to go forward with a recreational/wellness facility. We are certainly not on the cutting edge of that at all. Other schools have done it. Georgia as you know has developed a huge new complex. Vanderbilt has built one. Mississippi State has one that has been recently been completed that would be the envy of any institution. Most of the southeastern conference schools either have such a facility or such a facility is under consideration. We think it is also an important component in the recruitment of students which, as I just described, is important to the success of our institution. It is to be competitive when it comes to providing opportunities for students.

In terms of Greek housing, there is a sense by a majority of the Board that we have neglected that element of our student body for some period of time. The McBryde Quadrangle facilities are pretty inadequate and they have been inadequate for over 30 years. We have been trying to figure out a way to provide opportunities for Greeks at the least possible cost to the University and the current plan under which the University will provide the land but the Greeks themselves will build the houses is a way that we can accommodate more students in better housing at far less cost to the University. I can't recall the figures off the top of my head but it will allow us to provide first-class housing for students at about 25% of the cost if we had to build those same facilities ourselves. So we are going to be providing an opportunity for a large segment of our students to have new and upgraded facilities yet the cost to the University will be far far less than if we had to build these facilities like we are having to do with the new residence halls. So the economics of it is also the guiding force behind the Greek housing. Any other questions?

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT (MUSC) asked if the Board of Trustees were reviewing the status of Faculty House.

MR. HUBBARD said he hadn't seen anything come before the Board on that in about 10 months. I don't have any new information on that. John, do you want to answer it.

PRESIDENT PALMS said we have appointed a faculty committee. I have received a report last month and I think I am meeting with that committee to hear additions to what has been printed and then we are going to take that to the Board. The Board is waiting on that report. I appreciate the time the committee has spent on it.

MR. HUBBARD asked if there were any other questions.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (CSCI) asked if he could comment on the old stuff--the issues of deferred maintenance and renovations? Some of our buildings are falling down. There is at least one item on the agenda for this meeting. I think there is some concern that there is overemphasis on new construction, which everyone knows is more fun than renovations.

MR. HUBBARD:

The Board doesn't look at it that way. We have been frustrated by the issue of deferred maintenance for sometime and I am pleased to report and that if we keep our fingers crossed that we will get the bond bill through the legislature this year. The majority of the money that we have requested in the bond bill is for renovation of the Gibbes Green properties. It is about \$15 million which is for retrofitting of those facilities but that money is largely the result of our inability to do what we need to do on deferred maintenance. There are some Board members who at every meeting ask about the status of deferred maintenance. It is not something that we push off to the side. It's a money question. It's a very valid point. You have to achieve a balance of maintaining existing properties as well as providing new opportunities and new properties as priorities change. But I appreciate your point. We have about \$100 million in deferred maintenance needs at this University. The \$15 million will certainly not solve the problem, but it will help us get a good start.

PROFESSOR DAVID HILL (SPANISH) said you are certainly aware that there are vast discrepancies in the salary ranges from department to department and the reason given for that is

usually market forces. Is the University the marketplace or is a philosophy professor worth as much as an engineering professor and if so why is he or she not paid as much?

MR. HUBBARD:

Well in my judgement, a Philosophy professor is worth as much as an Engineering professor with all due respect to Dean Rogers whom I saw a minute ago. All professors are important. They each serve a particular need. All disciplines are vital or we wouldn't have them on campus. I am sure that there are some professions that the market does have some influence on the salary structure because the opportunities for placement in the private sector are there, and the salaries have to be competitive to keep those people on the faculty of the University.

I would be in favor of raising everyone's salary as much as we could possibly raise salaries. It is just a question of resources. One of the highest priorities in the legislature this year is to get the pay raises funded by the State so we don't have to take those monies out of other operating sources of the University. We want new money for faculty pay raises. I have my own philosophy about pay scales. I would like to see more merit driven compensation. I am in a law firm that for a long time had lock step compensation and only recently have we evolved in a way that the true producers are better compensated and those who choose to go a different way don't get as much any more. It used to be the standard in law firms and other professional groups that you would be compensated according to how long you were around. Some of that has value, but there also has to be a balance so those who are very productive faculty members are also rewarded for the extra effort that they put in. I am personally in favor of anything that we can do to more greatly reward those people who are willing to go the extra mile. I would like to see it a little more market driven, actually.

CHARLES DENNY (USC - SUMTER) asked what Mr. Hubbard's feelings were about what is going on at Francis Marion University and what type of precedent does he think that sets with the Legislature for even this University.

MR. HUBBARD:

I think you are talking about a conflict between the administration and the faculty. That is about all I know about it. There is not a very high comfort level between the administration

and the faculty there. I've just heard that in general terms, and I don't know any thing specific. I do know the legislature is suspicious of higher education. It always has been. I get very frustrated with that. I write letters to people all the time, and I call up legislators, and I have buttonholed them whenever I can to talk about the value of higher education. The fact of the matter is we have not made the case that we need to make. We haven't succeeded in getting the grass roots support for higher education funding in South Carolina that we need to. The Board is guilty of this, and I think the faculty is guilty of it. We spend too much time talking among ourselves about why aren't we loved, and we don't spend enough time talking to citizens who can talk to legislators or talking to legislators directly. There is an anecdotal story that if a legislator gets five telephone calls on a subject, he thinks there is a consensus. We ought to do a much better job when we have to get something through the legislature of getting alumni, students, and faculty calling on particular points and trying to convince that legislator that there is a consensus out there. They respond to immediate stimulus, and we don't do a very good job providing that kind of stimulation. We will go over with all our charts and graphs, and I frankly think they glaze over with some of the presentations that we make. When it comes to funding, I try to think of one or two things that we can emphasize. The one that John Palms has heard me repeat so many times is we are funded in South Carolina \$1,400 less per student per year than the southeastern average. And the response to that from the legislature might be, "Yes, but you are still very inefficient. You have a lot of people over there not doing anything." And then you point to the Southern Region Education Study that says "we are the most efficient public institution in the southeast." Usually with those two facts that is as far as you are going to get in depth any way. With those two facts you can go a long way. It knocks some of the premises out of the water, and I think those are effective statistics to cite, and the simpler we can make our story the better off we will be. But we need to make our story and we need to start speaking externally. Yet sometimes, I think, when professors have written op ed pieces it hasn't worked as well as it should because the professor will talk in terms of how it affects his livelihood or her livelihood instead of speaking in terms of not being able to keep the best faculty for the students or not having the resources to teach as well as the professor is capable of teaching if they had

more money to operate laboratories and classrooms. It is the spin you want to put on the message. I think sometimes people outside the University think that we are all just inner directed and we are not thinking about serving our constituents, the students, as well as we should. That is the perception, and, I think, we miss a great opportunity because in this room and throughout this campus are among the brightest people in Columbia. With all this brain power we ought to come up with a mechanism that harnesses that brain power, focuses that brain power in a way that effects legislative change. That is a dream. I have dreamed it for a long time but I haven't given up on it. I think there are ways that we can do it. Anything the faculty can come up with as a strategy for how we can better get our message across to the legislature is going to be well received by the Board but it also involves getting some grass roots support. It takes getting citizens calling legislators to say that higher education is important. If the only people they ever hear from are the people directly involved in higher education for a livelihood, it is not as effective as people saying, "My child is in your college at the University of South Carolina and they need the resources to do a better job." Any other questions?

PROFESSOR FRED MYHRER (PHYSICS) said I hear you talking about teaching and serving the students, but what about grant funded resources. What I don't hear from the legislators or from the Board in relation to the public and to the Legislature is that we are bringing in here high tech equipment. We are exposing students to the latest in technology. That you cannot teach in a classroom, they have to go in and work with it themselves and it takes an awful lot of time to do this. Is this conveyed to the politicians?

MR. HUBBARD:

It is very important to the Board. If I haven't focused on that today it is only because I have a limited amount of time. Getting back to the vision statement that Dr. Palms drafted and has been adopted by the Board as policy of the University, the first objective in that is to be a Carnegie 1 research university. That implies a lot greater funding for research. We get regular reports on the amount of research dollars coming into the institution. I am proud of the progress we have made but we all acknowledge there is a way to go yet before we get to our goal in research funding. I don't think that we have made the point with the public as well as we should.

I know Marcia Torr wrote a great op ed piece one time talking about the connection between research, economic development and the progress of the State of South Carolina. I wrote her a note. I remember it well. It was a real fine piece making that connection in a way that I think the public could understand. We need more of that. We need to get that message out into the public debate better than we do now. It is a very important and vital part of the progress of the State. We can never teach the way we want to and we can never achieve our goals unless we provide new research and new scholarship. The Board is aware of that but we obviously want to achieve the right balance between teaching and research. Obviously one goes with the other -- they are not mutually exclusive. I didn't mean to imply that if I did. Any other questions?

PROFESSOR ALAN BAUERSCHMIDT (BADM) asked if he could speak on the issue of tenure and promotion from the Board's perspective.

MR. HUBBARD:

I think the Board's philosophy is we want to raise standards everywhere and we want our administration to produce to higher levels. We want the Board to produce at a higher level. We want our faculty to produce at a higher level. So philosophically we're supportive of tenure and promotion policies that focus on achieving the goals of the University, that focus on our ability to become a Research One university and then an AAU university. We think it is important to the State of South Carolina to have a great university and to the extent that the tenure and promotion policies support that effort that's what we're looking for. We are not looking for tenure and promotion policies that don't help us achieve that goal. That is as simply as I can put it. We don't intend to or like to get involved in departmental units developing those criteria. But we certainly hope as the units look at their criteria continuously evaluating those criteria that they will be consistent with our overarching goals for quality. Thank you.

PROFESSOR HENRY PRICE thanked Mr. Hubbard for taking the time to meet with the Senate. He emphasized the importance of the faculty, the trustees, and the administration to all play on the same page as much as possible to seek the advancement of the University.

B. Report of President John M. Palms:

Thank you, Henry. I think that you would agree with me, I certainly don't know of many, that there aren't major public institutions where the chairman of the board is willing to come before the faculty, first of all in these times, and then to so ably and articulately express thought-out opinions about where this university is going. I want to compliment through our chairman of the board for his and the board's willingness to work together with the administration and the faculty in a tremendous learning process about what are the distinctive differences in colleges and universities today and what defines really a true university not just by name, but by its endeavors, and by its character. I think all of us - administration and faculty and trustees - have come a long way together to develop an appreciation of how this is really worthy of our energies.

Speaking about some of those issues, Jerry and I are going to have lunch with the entire Senate. The Senate has been more generous than the House has been in funding for higher education. They propose additional sums of money going to higher ed. They have been very strong in maintaining that 2 1/2% salary increase totally funded. The bond bill is secure. As late as last night they finished work on that. They have been very strong in protecting our interest in the departmental fellows program. You may have been reading about some of the controversy about the process and the application mechanism by which high school seniors could apply for those Palmettos. There is a tremendous interest on the part of the private colleges to get more of that money, and although they have changed the process for applications and the chronology of that process, they have maintained the percentage of money that could go to the private versus the public. The money for the privates runs out and somebody continues to apply and say where do I want to go? Those strong seniors you can go to the honors college. For the public institutions, we are not going to change that percentage of funding. It is very very important for us. We have a lot of friends in the Senate and the turn-around that we are experiencing, although slight, is still there. We also have very strong support in the Senate for coming up now with these new performance funding benchmarks and parameters that will help achieve this Carnegie One and AAU status for us, and we are working with the key members of the Senate to do that and that is very important as well.

I will remind you also that our former chair of the Board of Trustees is now a member of the Commission on Higher Education, Dr. Eddie Floyd. He takes a tremendous amount of time and he still serves on the Board of Trustees and is still a full-time surgeon in Florence. His presence on the commission is also important as far as our liaison with the House and the Senate. So we will be leaving in just a moment.

I already expressed to the faculty at the awards meeting - the General Faculty meeting the other day - where we are in the campaign. Tomorrow on this campus there will be over 400 volunteers that will be working with the various colleges with their development officers. Tomorrow night there is going to be a dinner of 700 people in the Coliseum. This is not the formal kick-off of the campaign. We are still in the quiet phase. These are just the volunteers helping us in all the colleges to come and make the bicentennial campaign a success.

Steve Forbes of Forbes magazine is going to be the speaker at tomorrow's luncheon, speaking about philanthropy, and I'll have a chance to speak to 700 attendees tomorrow evening about what it means to leave a legacy in a way that makes your life really worthwhile.

I hope you picked a copy of the Annual Report of the President on the way in. Many of you were at the General Faculty meeting when we also handed it out. I just wanted to tell you how much I appreciate the 28 or so faculty who allowed us to profile their work and their research in this annual report as representative of I think the best of what goes on this campus as far as research is concerned, how it involves our students, graduate students as well as undergraduate students, how important that is for the life of the University, and I am proud to represent you in this annual report. It will go to hundreds of supporters of the University, and I think it is a wonderful reflection about the important things that really go on here.

I have no other points of interest to discuss with you. Is there any questions, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank the chairman again for being here.

C. Report of Provost Jerome Odom:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of brief comments. First of all, I would like to thank William Hubbard for coming and talking to us today. One of the things that I found

when I was a dean and working with the Board is that the Board of Trustees members have a deep feeling for the University. I don't know whether you know that William was an undergraduate here as a Carolina Scholar. He has a deep affection for this University and what he would like for it to be. The Board in general has that kind of feeling, and they work very hard to see that we achieve our goals. I do hope that William's law firm takes into account in salary raises the amount of time that he has to spend at the University. I see him here and in many functions all over this state representing the University of South Carolina. Thus, my thank you to William.

Dean Carol Garrison of the Graduate School and Associate Provost is going to leave the University on May 30th. I'm very sorry that she is not here right now, but I will tell you what she is doing. She is working on performance funding with respect to the Legislature. When she told me she was going to go to the University of Louisville as provost, I was very happy for her, and I was very unhappy for me because it means that we are going to lose a very valuable member of the provost's office. I said, "Carol we need to sit down and have some talks about your responsibilities," and at the next meeting she came to, she gave me a sheet of paper that was totally filled. We have had some more conversations and every time she comes she says "I forgot to put this on the list". After several long discussions with Carol, I have decided at this time to keep that position as one person. However, I am going to take much of the responsibility for interacting with the Commission on Higher Education for the time being. I am going to continue to examine the functions of the Dean of the Graduate School and the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies and see what we are doing and how things are working. Last week I established a search committee for that position. Mary Ann Parsons, Dean of Nursing, will chair the committee. The other members are Bob Markland, Business Administration; Carol Flake, Education; Jim Radziminski, Engineering; Susan Cutter, Geography; Sally Woodin, Biological Sciences; Jim Miller, African American Studies; Donna Richter, School of Public Health; Judy Prince from USC-Spartanburg; and Carolyn West from USC-Sumter. Richard Bayer and Richard Lawhon will serve as ex officio members of the committee representing the Registrar's Office and the Graduate School respectively. I have formulated what will be the duties and

responsibilities for this individual. I will meet with the search committee at their initial meeting, and we will talk about this and ask them if they would like to change anything with the guidelines I would like to establish for that individual. But my purpose today is to tell you how valuable Carol has been, and again I am sorry she is not here so that I could thank her publicly. She will be leaving at the end of this month, and she has made a tremendous contribution to the University.

Also, I would like to mention just briefly that I would like to seek your help. We had a General Faculty meeting in this room this week. It was two days ago, and we had rather poor attendance at a meeting where we actually celebrated the accomplishments of some of our faculty. So what I would like to ask you to do is give me your input concerning general faculty meetings. I just think somebody needs to look at these in terms of where they are. It was here. Should there be a more central location? It was held on the last day of classes. I believe it should have been on Reading Day. But I would seek your input so we can truly celebrate as a faculty in this University the accomplishments of our colleagues. I would like to hear from you. I will be happy to answer any questions.

PROFESSOR JOHN SPURRIER (STAT) asked where are we in terms of the search committee for the dean of Science and Mathematics?

PROVOST ODOM said that he asked Professor Roger Sawyer, Interim Dean of the College, to call a general meeting of the college, and he thought that would occur within the next week. Our policies and procedures call for nominations from the college members and we will move from there. Since Carol is leaving on May 30th, I am very hopeful we can fill her position by the 1st of July. This will be an internal search and I hope that it will move very quickly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

III. Reports of Committees.

- A. Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Professor Wise:
No report.
- B. Grade Change Committee, Professor McNeill:
The committee report was approved as presented.
- C. Curricula and Courses Committee, Professor Lane:

PROFESSOR LANE - On page 19 of the report, the first item of business is with the College of Business Administration. We passed a portion of the curriculum change in the College of Business Administration that we probably should not have and so they want to move restoration of the minimum grade point average requirement of 2.5 for students enrolled in other colleges on the Columbia campus. The wording is the same as is in the Undergraduate Bulletin, page 87.

I have some editorial changes that need to be made if you will bear with me. In the Marketing section, page 20, MKGT 459 should be changed to MKTG 459. Also in the course title MARKETING CHANNELS AND DISTRIBUTION. (3) (Prereq: MKTG 350) Marketing functions and channel flows used to develop distribution strategies. We are adding "that provide effective, efficient and reliable delivery of products and services to end-user markets." This restores the description that Marketing originally requested. It was left off and they requested that we put it back.

In the middle of the page, an editorial change where it states "TO: MKTG 455," the prerequisite should read "MKTG 350." Under "TO: MKTG 461" in the course description, take the first word out. It should read "Retail institutions, relationships with other channel members, factors....." and the next line it should read "adapting to change". Also MKTG 461 the course title should read RETAILING MANAGEMENT with an "E" after the G.

On page 21, MKTG 454, eliminate the first word in the description so that it begins with the word "Marketing."

MKTG 465, the title should read "MARKETING STRATEGY AND PLANNING." Eliminate the comma after "tools".

Under the change in curriculum, the proposed change where it says "Marketing" under Majors eliminate "Option 1: Basic and the parentheses around that. It now reads (12 hours). This is to bring it in line with the other changes that were made. On the next line, MKTG 351, 352, 459 (9 hours) should read MKTG 351, 352, 465 (9 hours). Under the terms "any one of the following courses: eliminate "450, strike 453, strike 456 and after 458, add 459, 460, 461.

On page 22, the words "Option 2: expanded" should be eliminated as well as the parentheses. In place of the word "expanded", it should be "Intensive Major (15-24 hours)".

Then we have the same changes to make as far as numbering is concerned 465 should replace 459 and on the "Two to five of the following courses: MKTG strike 450, 453, 456, and again add 459, 460, 461 after 458. I think that is all of the changes.

PROFESSOR STAN FRYER (BADM) said after the heading "Marketing" delete Option 1: (Basic" and leave (12 hours). Delete "Option 2: (Expanded 15-24 hours)". It now reads "Intensive Major (15-24 hours)".

The motion for approval of materials contained on pages 19, 20, 21, and 22 under Part I, College of Business Administration was passed.

PROFESSOR LANE moved the approval of Part II, College of Education with the withdrawal of EDCE 610. The motion was passed.

PROFESSOR LANE moved the approval of Part III. College of Journalism and Mass Communications. The motion was passed.

PROFESSOR LANE -- Under point IV. College of Liberal Arts, I have a couple of editorial changes. Under ANTH 569 The cross-listed course was put in twice. So strike [GEOG 569]. Under the Department of Art, ARTS 570, I have a slight editorial change in the course description. It should read "Advanced visual arts computing techniques using software such as Photoshop, Studio Pro, and Netscape.

PROFESSOR DAVID HILL (SPAN) asked if it was appropriate to plug these software?

PROFESSOR LANE said this was brought up in committee and we decided that it was not as much a plug as an explanation. But certainly these are copyrighted names of products. It is the opinion of the committee that this was necessary to describe the course.

The Committee withdrew under Department of Theatre, Speech and Dance - THSP 577. It will be considered at a later time.

The motion for the approval of materials listed under Part IV. College of Liberal Arts was passed.

PROFESSOR LANE moved the adoption of Part IV. College of Science and Mathematics. The motion passed.

PROFESSOR LANE drew attention to the May Session course for the Senate's information

FILM 566M and also an experimental course; MKTG 452X. The Senate should have received an addendum to the faculty agenda that consisted of the guidelines for May Session course proposals and a change in the guidelines that was brought about by suggestions from the provost at the last meeting. The Steering Committee decided that since this was an internal document it wasn't necessary for the Senate vote on it. However, I wanted to have these guidelines available to the senators. I've already gotten some very germane and excellent editorial comments. So please read this before we put it in the guidelines. We will certainly welcome any input that you have.

I would also like to introduce the new chairman of the committee, Professor John Winberry of the Department of Geography. Professor Winberry will assume his duties after the summer meeting.

PROFESSOR STAN FRYER (BADM) -- asked if earlier guidelines for Maymester proposals were being replaced by Item I Guidelines for May Session proposals.

PROFESSOR LANE replied affirmatively. He said that these guidelines were the recommendations of the Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee presented by Professor Thorne Compton. Yes, these are intended to be the guidelines under which May Session courses will be passed. In other words, after the guidelines are adopted if the course is adopted as a May Session course it will no longer be put forward every year as a proposal.

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT (MUSC) asked if this was a watering down of the standards?

PROFESSOR LANE -- No. I try to use the word amalgamation. It is shorter, but we felt like that it more accurately described what faculty seems to want. We had about a year and a half to look at this. If this doesn't reflect what you want, by all means get in touch with me, and we will try to work some things out. This seems to be the general direction that the courses that we have gotten and the courses that we have been asked to approve have taken.

PROFESSOR PRICE said that there was no report from Faculty Advisory Committee, Faculty Welfare Committee, Committee on Admissions and Scholastic Standards and Petitions.

E. Faculty Committee on Libraries, Professor Allen Bushong:

PROFESSOR BUSHONG said that the Faculty Committee on Libraries asked for the Senate's

approval of a resolution, a copy of which is included in the agenda.

PROFESSOR FRED MYHRER (PHYS) -- said there is only so much money for renovation/maintenance. Where does the extra money come from for renovations? We (the Faculty Senate) do not have enough information about the other renovation and maintenance projects to endorse the (South Caroliniana Library) resolution.

PROFESSOR KIRK FIELDER (BADM) -- I feel uncomfortable dictating resource allocations as my colleague suggested. We are not privy to the entire process. So I assume that the Board of Trustees and the administration has more insight into the allocation of resources and I have to trust their judgment. I can see a resolution suggesting that they should be made aware of this, but I don't feel comfortable dictating resource allocations.

PROFESSOR BUSHONG -- Well, I certainly am not privy to the entire picture either, and I don't think anyone else is. But speaking very personally, I think it is worth making a statement

of our concern here. I might say that President Palms himself has toured the South Caroliniana facility and is very concerned about the present physical state of the building as are all members of the committee who have also toured this facility. Granted there are many needs for retrofitting various buildings and that is a question that very definitely has to be resolved at the place where the purse strings lie. But I think we ought to make a statement for this very special facility.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (CSCI) -- I think a very strong case can be made for us as a faculty to make a statement that this a very high priority, probably the highest priority for renovation and restoration. As the resolution points out, this is a library that houses a major part of our history, our records as an institution and as a state. If the building is not renovated, some of this can be lost, which means it is gone forever. This is part of our heritage in a way that the contents of most other buildings are not, and I say that as someone who has worked here in two of the older buildings that are most in need of renovations -- LeConte and Sumwalt. Sumwalt is unfortunately under going further renovation while people are trying to work in there. But I don't think the conditions in the other buildings and the contents of the other buildings are in any way comparable to this priceless collection.

PROFESSOR CHARLES MACK (ART) -- I would like to add my support. Even though I worked for 26 years in one of the worst buildings on campus, I would push this as a first priority. It seems solid and well thought out.

STAN FRYER (BADM) -- said I am strongly in favor of the core of the resolution that is being presented, that is, the renovation of South Caroliniana Library. However, I am concerned with the part of the resolution that calls for immediately appropriating the funds needed for the renovation. The resolution doesn't restrict the funds that might be appropriated to renovation funds; it doesn't even preclude extreme actions such as firing non-tenured assistant professors in order to obtain the funds necessary to renovate the South Caroliniana Library. Making capital budgeting decisions in the dark without a full list of projects that are competing for funds and without a full list of projects that are competing for funds and without knowing where the money is coming from is very dangerous. I wish there was some way that the urgency of the need for renovations and the support of the faculty could be expressed without requesting that the board take an action which might not be appropriate.

PROFESSOR BUSHONG -- the reason we put it this way was that we wanted very much to make the point that it is in need of immediate implementation.

PROFESSOR PRICE -- if I may observe, I think the word "request" in the "therefore" segment is an entirely appropriate word for this - it is a request to the Board that they do so. It is, of course, their decision to make whether they accept our view of the importance of this.

PROFESSOR STAN FRYER (BADM) -- My position is that I am unable to support the immediate expenditure of funds for this project irrespective of whatever other urgency might exist on campus. I don't feel that I have the information to make that decision, and, at the same time I hate to vote against the resolution because I support 95 percent of its content.

PROFESSOR CHARLES MACK (ART) -- stated I don't read this that way. It says "requests the Board of Trustees of the University of South Carolina to appropriate for immediate implementation of the necessary funds". It doesn't say "put aside any appropriated". It says "appropriate for immediate implementation the necessary funds". It doesn't say fire untenured professors or any of us. So I don't see how one could dispute this.

PROFESSOR JAMES RITTER (CHEM ENGR) -- I am not familiar with the process of money for renovations. Is there a pool of money readily available for renovations? Why not just insert the word renovation?

PROFESSOR BUSHONG asked if he meant for all projects in the University.

PROFESSOR RITTER (CHEM ENGR) asked if there was a separate pool for deferred maintenance? If there is money needed for renovations, will there be a separate pool or does a separate pool exist now? Renovations are needed all the time. You can see it all the time.

PROFESSOR BUSHONG said that's true as far as this project, the South Caroliniana project is concerned. \$250,000 has been budgeted in our account for the project, but that is still a ways from the estimated \$1 million needed.

PROFESSOR PRICE commented that you don't use assistant professors' money to redo buildings.

PROFESSOR CHARLES MACK (ART) -- I think this is throwing a fear that is not necessary at all. Perhaps this ranks a little bit more than some of the other ongoing construction projects that maybe could be shelved for a moment that do not have valuable library resources in danger of destruction. So I would forget getting into faculty members' tenure or anything like that.

PROFESSOR GEORGE McNULTY (MATH) said he wondered where this resolution stands in relation to the bond bill that is going before the Legislature. Do you have your eye on some of that money?

PROFESSOR BUSHONG said he couldn't answer that question, but perhaps George Terry can.

DR. GEORGE TERRY (VICE PROVOST AND DEAN FOR LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SERVICES) -- All that I am aware of is that the Board of Trustees, when the problem was presented to them by chairman of the Faculty Senate, said they wanted to begin the renovations. It is my understanding that \$250,000 is more than enough to get the project underway. The project, because of the nature of the facility, has to be done in increments. I think the Faculty Library Committee wants to go on record that they felt very strongly that the Caroliniana Library was in need of repairs. That is reason they are presenting the resolution.

PROFESSOR McNULTY (MATH) -- Let me phrase my question again. How does it connect with the current bond bill? Do you have any idea about how the bond bill goes through allocating funds to certain projects?

DR. GEORGE TERRY -- For the most part those funds are going to the Gibbes portion of campus.

PROFESSOR DAVID HILL (SPAN) called the question.

PROFESSOR BUSHONG said the question has been called. The resolution, which you have before you, I move the approval of that resolution, which will be transmitted to Mr. Hubbard as chair of the Board of Trustees. The resolution was approved.

After much discussion the resolution as offered by the committee was passed.

IV. Report of the Secretary.
No report.

V. Unfinished Business.
None.

VI. New Business.
None.

VII. Good of the Order.

PROFESSOR ROBERT FELIX (LAW), confident that he was speaking in a representative capacity, expressed his thanks to Professor Charles B. Weasmer for his long-time service to and participation in faculty governance--notably as Chair of the Faculty Senate and of the Faculty Advisory Committee and memorably as proponent of the good interest of the faculty, of countless parliamentary discussions concerning the well-being of the University.

The Senate followed Professor Felix's remarks with a standing ovation.

PROFESSOR CHARLES WEASMER (GINT) -- It probably needs to go into the minutes that I am at a loss for words. My tendency is to shuffle feet, turn red or do a variety of silly things in the face of words which are so kind and the response by the faculty. All I can say is thank you very much. I've enjoyed it. Unless anyone thinks that I am going quietly into the darkness let me use this opportunity to raise a question. In one of our earlier meetings, we abolished the

faculty Committee on Student Affairs with the promise that a similar committee would be constituted with appropriate description of functions and the like. Thus I shall leave with the question "is anything being done along this line, or where are we" and I will let the Steering Committee steer the question in the proper direction. Again my thanks to Professor Felix and to the instigators and to all of you.

VIII. Announcements.
None.

The meeting adjourned at 1:27 p.m.