

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

SEPTEMBER 3, 1997

CHAIRMAN HENRY PRICE - Will the meeting come to order please? We have a quorum so we are going to get moving while we've got one. Lock the doors. One of the things that has been traditional is that the outgoing chair of the Faculty Senate offers some comments to the Faculty Senate on his or her views on things, and I am going to follow through on that today for a few minutes.

I. State of the Faculty Address.

PROFESSOR HENRY PRICE:

I should offer a couple of caveats, I suppose, about this. I realize that I am preaching to the choir. If you weren't interested in faculty governance you wouldn't be here right now. Nonetheless I hope perhaps you'll take some of the comments that I make, if you find them worthy, back to your colleagues who are somewhat less active in the faculty governance process than you.

Second, some of my comments may seem familiar to you. If you were at the Board of Trustees several weeks ago or if you saw materials in USC Times, you will indeed recognize some of the comments that I will make. Nevertheless even with all of that and those caveats I offer you a few observations that grow out of my two years as Chair of the Faculty Senate.

First there are a few people on the faculty, often the same ones year after year, who willingly give repeatedly of their precious time and considerable talent to carry on the business of the faculty. There are a whole lot of people who more than willingly let them do so. I am deeply grateful for the participation and the interest of the few over the past two years because they have kept things running. I deeply regret the lack of participation and interest of the many in the faculty governance process because these are times when the University needs all of its members of its family putting forth maximum effort to advance its cause -- a cause whose needs cannot be met solely in the classroom or the laboratory.

Speaking of the University family which is generally construed to be the faculty, staff, administration, trustees, and the students, I told the Board of Trustees several weeks ago at their meeting that I think even the most optimistic observer would have to

classify our family as essentially dysfunctional. Each family member seems to view the other family members as "them." Some months ago at the Board of Trustees retreat in Greenville I asked several of the trustees who were there when was the last time they had been in a classroom at the University to hear what was going on, to interact with the faculty and the students. A couple of them said that they were in the classroom on a fairly regular basis. Most, however, admitted that the last time they were in a classroom was the last time they took a class. The Chairman of the Board, William Hubbard, has agreed to spend a day on campus this fall accompanying a student to his or her classes -- a day in which I am certain he will be listening, contributing, and learning. I hope others on the Board will do the same thing. I think Mr. Hubbard would agree that if you have to sell the University, as the Board and all of us must in these times, you can do your best job if you know what is going on in the classroom, if you know that this is a really good faculty, if you know what a really bright and energetic student body we have. If you want to really know what the University is all about, personal contact beats cold statistics every time.

Now, lest we as faculty feel too smug in this process, I don't think we have made an effort to reach out to the Board to inform its members about what we do and what we think about the issues they have to consider. I doubt that many of us here could name more than one or two, perhaps three of the members of the Board of Trustees right now. I have learned how hard the trustees work for the University and how dedicated they are to it. I know that they give great amounts of their time to the affairs of the University -- time that has come out of their jobs and their personal lives. Most of us, however, know only what we read in the newspapers or see on television about the trustees and what they do for USC. That's too bad. We desperately need increased interaction between the trustees and the faculty. Familiarity might breed contempt, but in this case I think it might breed mutual respect -- respect that is often lacking now.

You should know this as well. Mr. Hubbard has asked me to provide him with ideas on how to improve the faculty-trustee relationship and I will be responding to that request shortly. If any of you have ideas that you would like to pass on to me, ideas on what we can do, please do so. You can snail-mail me at the College of Journalism and Mass Communications, or you can send e-mail to me at: price-henryt@sc.edu.

The third thing that I have learned while Chair of the Senate is confirmation of something that I saw happening for several years before I became Chair. This faculty, for whatever reason, is by and large apathetic about its role in faculty governance and about its responsibilities. This was painfully obvious when we had to adjourn the Faculty Senate meeting of July 1 because of lack of a quorum. In order for it to be an official meeting, we must have 69 members present. With fewer than 40 in July, we weren't even close, and we ought to be able to turn out at least half of our members in the summertime. In fact, we lacked a quorum at our April 30 meeting, and you will be

asked today to pass a resolution that will ratify the actions taken then. And, if you need further evidence, there were only about 80 people at yesterday's General Faculty meeting. Of that number 22 were new faculty members who were being introduced to the faculty. An additional 10 were deans who were doing the introductions and there were about a half a dozen people from Osborne who were there -- so roughly 35 to 40 faculty members at a General Faculty meeting.

This is not, as I have said, a new problem. When Marcia Welsh was Chair of the Senate, she worked hard to reinvigorate the faculty in the process of faculty governance. I think she would tell you that it wasn't a very successful endeavor. I know that my efforts to improve attendance at Senate meetings fell far short, as attendance at the April and July meetings show. You might remember, too, that General Faculty was presented in the Spring of 1995 with proposed changes to the Faculty Manual concerning the tenure and promotion process -- some of which would essentially have done away with service as a consideration. Some people were delighted that there were about 400 faculty members at that General Faculty meeting. I was appalled that less than one-third of the faculty would turn out to decide on changes that would have a great effect on their future at this University. I hope that the General Faculty meeting that will be called to consider the recommendations of the President's Special Committee on Tenure and Promotion has to be held in the Coliseum. Wouldn't it really be something to see 1,400 of us at that meeting, knowledgeable and ready to discuss the issues! I would love to see it happen. It has happened before, maybe it will happen again.

Why this apathy? Why this seeming disinterest in exercising the prerogatives the faculty has? Perhaps it is a feeling among faculty that in reality it matters little what it thinks or does and that involvement is meaningless. Perhaps it is because we were told that increasing faculty salaries to the Southeastern average was an administrative priority, and we find that our increases on average do not measure up to inflation, much less gain ground on our colleagues at other institutions. Perhaps we do not take faculty governance seriously because we think it is not taken seriously or respected as part of the tenure and promotion process by those who must pass judgment on us from time to time and who determine the distribution of such merit raise money as might be available. Frankly, I do not know what the basic problem is. But I do know that if we choose not to exercise our prerogatives in faculty governance, they will be exercised for us by others. I also know that the situation is thought to be sufficiently serious to warrant the attention of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and the Provost, who have met recently to discuss it. I know as well that initiative is seldom handed to you on a silver platter; you have got to seize it. And as a faculty we are not very good at that. I wish I could claim these next two sentences as my words; they are not. It is one of those things that I wish I had said. Marcia Welsh gave me these two sentences, and

she said, "We must remember that faculty governance is a privilege and not a right. If we don't think we can lose it overnight, we might want to talk with our colleagues at Francis Marion."

I don't think that there is a great deal of respect in the University family for the faculty as a whole or for the process of faculty governance in general. I believe that recent administration changes might improve the situation a bit.

This University has a top-notch Provost, and the faculty would do well to bestir itself to help him as he works to reach the goals set in the President's vision statement. I sincerely believe the Provost wants the faculty with him on this trip, but I also believe that he can't wait forever for us to make up our minds. And, you know, we got this Provost despite a lack of faculty participation in the search process. I was on the first search committee, and I was greatly disappointed with the poor turnout of the faculty to talk to the candidates when they visited the campus. The turnout was even worse during the second search. It is hard to have an impact, folks, when your presence is little more than faint shadow in the background.

Another thing I have learned in my 28-plus years as a faculty member here is that we have a lot of highly intelligent people on this faculty -- people with enormous common sense and marvelous insights into the problems of the University and of the state. But I have to tell you it is one of the best-kept secrets of this century. Because we interact so little with the other members of the University family and with the various audiences that observe the University, few know what a tremendously valuable resource this faculty is. I hope that in the years ahead the faculty will seize the initiative and through its activities get the message of its quality out. A small beginning in this process would be for all committees to reread their charge as presented in the Faculty Manual and actively seek out ways to meet the requirements of that charge. Be active, not reactive. Don't wait for others to point out your issues; find them for yourselves.

The final thing that I have learned over the past two years is how to value good advice. A number of people have offered me advice, both solicited and unsolicited, and it has almost invariably been good. I must acknowledge special appreciation to two people who unselfishly gave of their time to advise me and who more than once saved me from myself. To Marcia Welsh and Sandra Wertz, my deepest thanks. I also wish to express my great appreciation for the unflagging effort and exceptional work of Peggy Pickels and Jeanna Luker in the Faculty Senate Office. As most of you who have been committee chairs know, without the efforts of these two not a lot would get done around here. I would like to thank my Dean Judy VanSlyke Turk, who is a staunch supporter of faculty governance and who made it possible for me to have the time to do the Chair's job. And, finally a deep a very special thanks to you, my

colleagues, who have been the regulars at the Senate meetings and on committees the past two years. Whatever has been accomplished has happened because you have given unselfishly of yourselves.

As I step down from this position that has occupied a large part of the past two years for me, three years actually, I take comfort from the knowledge that I am leaving the Faculty Senate in more capable hands than mine. Ladies and gentlemen, the new Chair of your Faculty Senate, Professor Don Wedlock.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - As my first act I am proud to present Henry Price with this certificate of appreciation on behalf of Faculty Senate, the entire faculty, and the University of South Carolina. You are a hard act to follow.

II. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

The minutes of September 3, 1997 were approved.

PROFESSOR SARAH WISE - SECRETARY - I would like to move the resolution on page 78 ratifying the actions by the Faculty Senate on April 30th.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - Being moved by a committee it doesn't require a second. Discussion of the resolution? All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed - no. So ordered.

III. REPORTS OF OFFICERS.

PRESIDENT PALMS:

Thank you. Henry, I appreciate your words to the faculty. The Trustees, as you know, are also very much concerned with the activities of the faculty. We often joke with them that the faculty are doing everything that they are supposed to do--teaching and research and committee work, advising, etc., and that this is not a comfortable place to work. You're really being held accountable. They understand that. I hope that you will take the opportunity to look and see how we are governed. If you feel like we have too many committees, or if our committees are too large, for example. I know that your principal responsibilities are teaching, research and service here. So if you want to reorganize or think of a way that you can be more effective and efficient, please discuss that. Our Board, by the way, including all of its committees, meets 42 times a year. I know no other board that is supposed to be setting policy that meets that frequently, but they give up their time to do it. You know what some of the lawyers charge per hour. This is time the Board gives up. It is important for them to see that we are also actively participating in governance.

We have a lot of good things going at this institution. We have initiated a lot of new programs with new objectives and new goals. We have made progress but it has taken a lot of time for them to come together and to endorse the proposals that you have put forth.

We have a lot of construction going on our campus. The Buildings and Grounds Committee meets regularly to study how we finance this construction and to work with the legislature. The Board spends a lot of time lobbying. Last year was a successful year. We couldn't have gotten that bond bill through to get \$15,000,000 for deferred maintenance on this campus and to get money for our science building on this campus without the Trustees helping and working, from the time the legislature went into session--even before--to the time that they finally adjourned in June. And even now in the early stages of September, the Governor is putting together his budget, and we are actively working, so let's show them that we are also doing our share.

We did have a very good year last year. Some of the things that are noteworthy you know about. Some of the newer faculty may not have heard. For instance, 22 students received more than \$650,000 in national fellowships and scholarships in competitive competitions with 3 NSF grants, 2 Fulbrights, and 3 Goldwaters. 3 Goldwater winners--there are no other institutions in the state that had any Goldwater winners. That puts us in the league of institutions that also had 3: MIT, Notre Dame, Princeton, and Stanford. This is again a reflection of what we have been doing with our Carolina Scholars and with our Honors College. The great competitive research grant that we received from the Department of Defense--\$9.3 million--completed a pledge that we made with the Legislature that we would try to get this money from the Defense Department if the state would come up with \$10,000,000 for the science building. This item became very, very important in the latter half of the legislative session, when we were debating who was going to get which funds in for the capital needs of the campus.

With the August commencement, this academic year we awarded a total for the year of 248 doctoral degrees. We often point out how much work this takes and want to express appreciation for your serving on these dissertation committees or chairing the dissertation committees. 2,200 master's degrees--that is also a considerable number of master's projects and dissertations. 4,000 baccalaureate degrees, 71 medical degrees, and 225 law degrees. A good year as far as that is concerned.

The campaign. We just finished the second year of the campaign and next April is a key time for us, when we will publicly announce the campaign with a public goal in mind. Now we are in the quiet phase. There are over 700 volunteers helping all of our colleges and the central administration in trying to raise this money. Our goal is to

raise \$45,000,000 this last year and we raised \$49,000,000. Our goal is to raise \$65,000,000 between now and April. Now this is not cash in hand. I wish it were, but this is money that is pledged to us. It's bequests. It's in people's charitable remaining trusts. It's in property. It's in gifts-in-kind. It's in equipment.

Some of this money will come in over the next 10 or 20 year period, but those volunteers and

the development staff are all working. We have a very, very substantial committee now that is heading the campaign in this state, and we have worked over a year and a half to try to get leadership in this state to commit themselves. That's not easy to do when, you ask someone to head the campaign, because you know they know they have to make a major lead gift. But finally we got Charlie Way from the Beach Company who owns Kiawah Island to head the campaign with 3 vice chairs. That is how they agreed to do this. One of the vice chairs is Hootie Johnson, who is the secretary of the Executive Committee of Nations Bank. You may have read that it just bought Barnett Bank in Florida. You've got Governor McNair, and you got Robert Royall, who is the Secretary of Commerce and works for a dollar a year. But they are willing to do this, and they've got all the connections and solicitations lined up for me to go make with them. We would like to announce that we are going to have a \$250,000,000 campaign, but we have got to raise \$65,000,000 this year. To give you an idea of where the money is going so far, some of these gifts you've heard about-- those million dollar gifts, but about \$20.2 million is

going to scholarships and fellowships, \$5 million to faculty development and chairs, \$9.7 into research is going and equipment, and \$33 million to program enhancement.

Outside of the state, we were fortunate enough, as I said before, to uncover a number of

prominent USC graduates who hold key positions. Over 500 CEO's we uncovered that we did not know about. The owner of the horse that won the Preakness, Bob McNair, the Bob McNair who is from Texas, is one of our graduates. The President of Texaco Global Business, Glenn Tilton, has agreed to chair the out-of-state part of the campaign. You know we have 80,000 alumni living out-of-state. It is very, very important. You read about some other gifts from some key people.

The focus this year between now and April is on gifts of more than \$100,000. Now one of the things that has really impressed our potential donors who we are trying to cultivate and nurture and inform and have them buy into what our goals are to be members of the AAU, is confidence and commitment the people in South Carolina and our faculty and staff have made to this institution. One of the things that always

raises eyebrows in almost disbelief is how generous the faculty and staff have been through the Family Fund to the University of South Carolina. You have given on the average \$600,000 a year to the Family Fund, and what we are trying to do in this campaign for the next 5 years is to indicate to our potential donors that we have made a 5-year pledge not just a one-year pledge. Now this is not a legally binding pledge. You can get out from under this, but just think what you have been giving and extend it over 5 years. So we are trying to increase that \$600,000 to a number that says we are going to commit \$3,000,000 to this campaign. It sounds like a lot, but you have been doing this already. It means a great deal, and people just don't believe this institution has done that. It is very, very important for us.

We report to you that the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the blue ribbon committee, has given their report to me. I have met with that committee. I shared that with the Provost and the Provost shared that document with all of the deans at an all-day retreat session, and we have gotten some feedback from them. We will share this with the Faculty Advisory Committee, Jerry, and give you an opportunity to make your comments before we make our final recommendations to the Board of Trustees. There are not major changes recommended, but enough to fine tune it and to make some meaningful improvements into what you have already been dealing with for the last 20 years. Also, I have a report from the special committee that I appointed for the Faculty House and have recommendations from them. We shared that with the Faculty House Board and they in return have sent a document last week countering some of those recommendations again. I would like to share those with the faculty before we make recommendations to the Board in that regard.

Jerry is going to talk to you about the success of our incoming class. It really is an extraordinary class, it really is tremendously challenging when we see the quality of the students who are now coming to this institution. It also puts a tremendous burden of credibility on us that we will deliver what we promised to deliver as we recruited these students.

You have been reading in the national press about the tremendous opposition there is and anxiety there is about how people are going to educate their young people in the future with the cost of private education going up as much as it has. The public education has also gone up but not nearly as much as private education. You are seeing a shift as public higher education improves and the public major universities improve, a shift from people that used to go to private and to public institutions. But it also puts the burden of responsibility on us that we can deliver in reality the same quality that the private institutions claim that they are providing.

Now we all still hear horror stories about people that graduate from this institution that have inadequate skills. When I hear from some of the people I know who teach

seniors, say in the Department of English, who have not yet been to the library in the 3 years they have been here and cannot write a decent paper. We have a long way to go to even teach them the basic skills. On the upper side of that I think we are doing very well--our Carolina Scholars, our Honors College kids, the kids that are well-prepared to come here but we also have a responsibility to teach that other half of our student body and that is a challenge. It takes more of your time. We are getting an awful lot of advice about what to teach these days from industries, from commercial enterprises, about what kind of skills we should be focusing on. But we are sticking to our commitment, trying to teach the whole person. That means we ought to teach the whole person with all of the skills they need to live in this changing and very, very challenging environment that is truly world-wide. So I ask you to pay particular attention to the total education of our students.

This is a wonderful class. We have recruited almost 3,000 students, one of the largest classes we've ever had. I would hate to think that in the junior year, 40% of those students are no longer here. Then we have wasted our efforts in recruiting, and they have transferred, have failed, or have not realized the kind of support and advising or counseling available, or there

is some other reason why they could not find the life of the mind here at the institution that they sought. So I think working together we can assure ourselves of success. That is the way we are going to be measured, that kind of reputation of overall commitment. So far we are on a roll. There is no question about it. We had over 10,000 applications for this incoming class - up 7,000 four or five years ago. That is really a phenomenon. We are also putting about \$3,000,000 in scholarships because good students are recruited financially as well as intellectually. I want to thank you for that help in getting that class here and wish you a good year. I look forward to working with you and hope we have a quorum every time.

I will be glad, Mr. Chairman, to answer any questions and appreciate your leadership.

WEDLOCK - Any questions for the President?

PROFESSOR CHARLES MACK - ART - There has been a fair amount of discussion in various quarters about the post-tenure review. I think a number of us, myself included are not exactly sure what that is going to entail. In other words, where is the carrot and where is the stick?

PRESIDENT PALMS - The Provost has taken a major leadership role in that, working with the Council of Deans. Let him go ahead and answer, and if you still have questions for me that is fine. Again, it is a matter of what the rest of society is experiencing. I think that is the cultural pressure on us with companies right sizing,

with longevity no longer being a factor in many industries and questions about whether you have employment security, including among the unions. We are the last surviving industry that has a special privilege, and I think we are reacting partially to that pressure that we are going to be held accountable for life. We have tenure for life. But we are not afraid of being held accountable. We want to make this as less burdensome as possible. But we say that we teach and do research and provide service, and we ought to be able to document those achievements. I think that's basically what we are talking about. We certainly don't want another cumbersome process that is going to take more of your time away from your principle core responsibilities. I am going to let Jerry go ahead and give you the progress of where we are on that effort.

PROVOST ODOM - Thank you, John. I would like to say that everything that I say today everybody heard yesterday but I don't remember seeing all of you at the General Faculty meeting yesterday. In fact I wondered about Henry when he said there were 80 faculty including deans and new faculty and then there were 6 people from Osborne as well. A former provost actually did tell me "when you have come from the faculty, you have got 6 months and then you are not one of the faculty any more you are one of "them" and that means I have 2 more weeks before I become one of "them".

Very seriously though, as I told you in March I have come from the faculty and I consider myself a faculty member and always will and I think that is why I would echo many of Henry's concerns when I say that I am perplexed by a lack of participation in faculty governance. I'm deeply desirous of having you govern yourself and having you participate in all of the decisions that we make as a University family. To that end I want to tell you that I will meet with Don Wedlock. We will have lunch together every Wednesday before the Faculty Senate and I am even going to buy his lunch. I will meet with the Steering Committee and I plan on meeting with the Faculty Advisory Committee. I want to participate and know what the faculty are thinking. I want you to know what I am thinking and we can do that together as long as we are all on the same page and working for the same goals.

Let me first turn to the news that the President discussed very briefly and that is our freshmen class. I am very pleased with the makeup of this year's freshmen class and much of that is due to the faculty's role in helping us recruit quality students. This class as of yesterday had 2,968 students including 258 in the Honors College and 345 in the Provisional Year. Of this class 54% are female, 76% are from South Carolina, and 18% are African American. Not only is the Fall of 1997 class 287 students larger than last year but it also presents a stronger academic profile. The SAT average for this year's class is right at 1,100 which is 13 points higher than last year's class. The high school core GPA of 3.27 is also higher than the Fall 1996 average. The Honors

College freshmen class has 45 more students this year than last year. Right after I became Provost, Don Greiner, Dennis Pruitt, Peter Sederberg and I got together and talked about increasing the enrollment of the Honors College. At that time Don and Dennis argued for 250. Peter and I said we really need to try to hold it at 230 because we are not sure we are ready to have such a large influx. Well ready or not we had such a high yield rate, acceptance rate on offers, that we have 258 students in the Honors College this year. They have an SAT average of 1,358 which is 17 points higher than last year and their average high school core GPA is 4.3 on a 4 point scale. We enrolled a significantly larger number of scholarship recipients this year. We have increases in the number of Carolina Scholars finalists, University Scholars finalists, National Merit finalists and National Achievement finalists. The total number of students in this class who received either a general university scholarship or National Merit or Achievement award is 869 which is 210 more than last year. Dennis Pruitt wanted me to point out the figures are preliminary but they are not going to change in terms of their makeup in numbers. Again, I would thank you for what you have done and I would ask you to continue to help us recruit students. One of the things that will be new this year is a National Carolina Scholars Program. We are going to try to take on Carolina Scholars Program from the State of South Carolina and recruit about 5 National Carolina Scholars. We are very anxious to see how this program works in terms of the kind of students that we can attract and also if this will have something of a coat tail effect in helping us bring in better students from out of state.

In other topics that I wanted to discuss very briefly, this summer I was very pleased to be able to appoint Marcia Welsh as Associate Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies and Bruce Coull as Dean of the School of the Environment. We have several deans searches which are on-'going as you know. We are currently working very hard on Public Health and Pharmacy. We have recently constituted the Science and Mathematics Search Committee. Craig Rogers will chair that committee. We are currently electing the members of the College of Liberal Arts' Search Committee. Once they are elected I will make 2 or 3 appointments, appoint a chair and we will have both of those search committees off and running. I need to meet with the College of Education to constitute their search committee and I am hopeful that we will fill a number of those positions this year. In fact I would like to fill all of those positions this year.

Some of you may have read a little bit in the newspaper about performance funding which as you know is a legislatively mandated program that is being conceived and will be

administered by the Commission on Higher Education. In the first round of scoring all campuses of the University did well. The number 1 campus in terms of its score was the University of South Carolina at Lancaster. The University in Columbia received a

score of 67 out of 70 possible points that gave us a 96 average after the Commission decided to scale all scores by a scaling factor we ended up with an 87. Most scores were very close. Clemson was I think 85 and MUSC was 88 so there is not a lot of difference. The University will receive something over a million dollars of new money which we had already budgeted -- put in the budget this year. This year was financially not as important as it will become in the next two years. This year the Legislature made available \$4.6 million of new money and spread that throughout all of higher education so it did not amount to much money for any particular institution. Next year it will be more and at the end of 3 years all of higher education's budget of \$600,000,000 will be appropriated or allocated based on performance funding. I have spent a lot of time with that this summer and plan to continue to be involved from the University's point of view.

The President did mention the Blue Ribbon Report on Tenure and Promotion's recommendations and I would urge you to read that report. It is listed on the Provost's homepage which you can access by going simply to the University homepage. The President solicits your comments. We will pass that on to Don Wedlock as soon as we can. We would like to act quickly and Don, of course, then will move it through the various channels of the Faculty Senate for your comments and concurrence and concerns.

The issues that I plan to deal with this year in particular from the Provost's Office have to do with faculty workload. A good examination of faculty teaching loads, faculty research accomplishments and faculty service will all be done in conjunction somewhat with post-tenure review. Let me tell you where we are on that right now. This is something that will if we don't do will be mandated through performance funding. What the deans have done is simply try to come up with a skeleton process or mechanism by which we might do this and this will then go back to units. There will be a lot of unit discretion in a post-tenure review situation. We talked about different ways of looking at this. First of all, it depends upon a very strong annual review process. If for example, two consecutive annual reviews result in an evaluation of unsatisfactory and that unsatisfactory threshold will be defined at the unit level, this could trigger a post-tenure review. We are not really sure. That does not really seem to be the what the state will accept. They are talking about a review of all faculty members and so we are perhaps looking at a post-tenure review on a rotating basis of all faculty members over a 6 or 7 year period, again with some kind of a threshold in terms of a satisfactory/unsatisfactory. If it is unsatisfactory, our plan would be for the unit head to sit down with the faculty member and come up with a plan of how this evaluation can be rectified, what can be done to receive a satisfactory evaluation, and set some kind of a timetable for this. We feel that if that is done, and done correctly, that is where the process would stop. However, there would be some kind of a process

if an unsatisfactory evaluation continued then there would be something in the way of tenure revocation proceedings that could be implemented. I would like to make sure you understand this is a very preliminary stage, needs a lot of discussion, but this is the kind of mechanism that we are thinking about. At the same time, it is the feeling of the deans, and I share that feeling, that if we do a post-tenure review on a faculty member and we have a very high rating then there needs to be a reward system for that as well. So this process is not only for the evaluation for people who evaluate unsatisfactory but for people who evaluate at the excellent or superior range.

Let me just mention one other thing and that is space utilization. I would like to take a look, with the help of Richard Baker, the Registrar, and some new software that he has obtained and using the data base that Charlie Jeffcoat maintains in Facilities, at space on this campus, the size of the space, how much of the day it is utilized, and the size of the student body utilizing that space at that time and see if we can't do a better job of increasing the efficiency in the way that we use space.

I think I will stop and will go right back to you, Randy, if you have any further questions.

PROFESSOR MACK - I thank you for the clearest discussion on post-tenure review and revocation that I've heard. Most of us then have a question of egos to keep ourselves motivated and that as it were is peer pressure. But am I hearing that if a faculty member said "I don't care. I've got tenure so what." There is a "so what" built into this.

ODOM - Yes.

PROFESSOR MACK - And how does this deal with the whole additional notion of tenure and all sorts of things. I haven't thought this out because I just hear the "so what". Is this being proposed or will the whole faculty have a chance to examine this whole procedure.

PROVOST ODOM - Absolutely. I think the faculty will have to examine it and will have to talk about it. The thing that I would say up front is that I think it is imperative that we as a faculty devise our own system of post tenure review before some external party does it for us. I think if we don't do it, it will be done for us.

PROFESSOR GLENN HARRISON - ECONOMICS - I have a question, following up on the issue of post-tenure review, which interacts with the issue of salary compression. If you would, please give us your guidance on how we should interpret the issue of salary compression. Specifically, if you have 2 members in the same department who have the same performance in terms of traditional criteria (research,

teaching, and service) but they have different vintages would we give the person with the longer vintage a bigger salary?

PROVOST ODOM - Do you mean by longer vintage -- they have greater longevity?

PROFESSOR GLENN HARRISON - Yes.

PROVOST ODOM - Glenn, salary compression is an issue that we have to face. In fact we talked about this and perhaps the Faculty Welfare Committee chair would like to say a few words when he gives his report about this. Their report, in fact, states that gender and race issues have been dealt with by a salary equity task force. Salary compression has not really been dealt with. When you are dealing with an average raise of 2-1/2% it is very hard to take into consideration matters of compression and not matters of merit. It is just very difficult. But speaking now as a former dean I know that I was instructed to try to use a portion of the raise money to deal with salary compression issues. .

GLENN HARRISON - So you would give different salaries to two people with the same teaching and service, I admit that is a hypothetical issue, when in reality we are dealing with apples and oranges. Are you saying that some faculty should get a higher salary?

PROVOST ODOM - Yes, I would. With the same performance I would. The thing that concerns me most is beginning salaries. We bring young people in and I know in several cases to attract the best young people you are looking at their starting salaries either bumping up against or exceeding the starting salaries of other assistant professors. So what you are doing there is you are compressing immediately. Immediately you are starting a salary compression that is going to be very difficult to ever get out of.

RICHARD CONANT - MUSC - Is this a good time to suggest that we go back to have

general faculty meeting right before the faculty senate meeting? I believe that it would I believe that it would improve the attendance...as opposed to having it on an 'ad hoc' basis like we have been.

ODOM - I think it is wonderful. I asked Don why we had one meeting yesterday and one today and I don't think either of us knew the answer and so I think we should look at having both meetings on the same day. Thank you.

IV. Report of Committees.

A. Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Professor Sarah Wise:

PROFESSOR WISE - I would just like to say that Dave Berube of Theatre and Speech has been appointed to fill a one-year appointment on Faculty Welfare for Ed Madden who is on leave.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Richard Clodfelter:

The committee report was approved as presented.

C.. Curricula and Courses, Professor John Winberry:

PROFESSOR WINBERRY - The committee report sections I, II, and III were approved with the withdrawal of EDCE 510 by the College of Education.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - You have heard the motion of the committee are there any questions? Amendments? Hearing none I put the question. All those in favor signify by saying aye. All those opposed. So done.

PROFESSOR WINBERRY - On pages 40 through 45, section IV, the College of Liberal Arts was approved.

PROFESSOR WINBERRY - On page 46, is a copy of a letter which the committee has put together to be submitted to department chairs and program directors regarding the May session. It is basically the idea that all courses to be submitted for the May Session will have to come through the Curricula and Courses Committee. We do have separate policies dealing with those courses that have been offered already for the May Session versus new courses. The deadline for all proposals (either courses that are already have been offered or courses that are being considered new) is November 3rd to the Curricula and Courses Committee so that we can make sure that all the procedures are satisfied in time for the publication of the course guide.

D. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Caroline Strobel:

PROFESSOR STROBEL - I would like to announce that at the next faculty meeting in October we are going to try something a little bit different. Advisory Committee will be considering the recommendations of the President's committee for promotion and tenure. We've decided that it would be a good idea to have some general discussion and so as a part of new business next time we will be discussing the recommendations of that report. We will have the recommendation included as part of the agenda and not the full report. It is available on the WEB page under the Provost's

Office. If you want to read the full report before the debate, please look for it on the WEB page. Please urge colleagues to attend this meeting. Other faculty who are not senators can come if they have strong feelings about the recommendations. Hopefully we can fill this auditorium for that discussion at the October meeting.

E. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Rob Wilcox:

PROFESSOR WILCOX - The Welfare Committee has recently reorganized for the year, so

there is no action to bring before you but I want to report on a couple of issues. Our annual report is in the minutes and enclosed in it are several matters from last year, one of which is the salary compression issue and which has been raised today. We raised that with you the end of last year, but the school year ended without taking any serious look at how to address it. We have put it before ourselves this year and one of the issues that we have to deal with is exactly what is salary compression. I think to work on defining what we are talking about, looking at what process is in place, and how we monitor it needs to be addressed. We will be working this Fall gathering ideas and information as to how to proceed along those lines. We will report back in due course to the Senate on our recommendations.

A second issue to point out to you at the end of last year you may recall we had some discussion of the proposed changes to the sexual harassment procedures. Over the summer representing the committee, I met with the Provost, Bobby Gist from the Office of Equal Employment, and with the University Counsel. This matter was in front of the Welfare Committee actually on referral from the Advisory Committee. We are prepared at this point to report back to Advisory that we have entered into a compromise agreement with the administration on these policies. The two major areas that we had raised questions about:

1. Proposed changes in the timetable of investigations. The current regulations require that investigations be completed normally within 15 working days at the most 30 working days which in essence gives them a 30-day working period to complete the investigation. The request had been made based in part on the realities that they have experienced and the time it takes to do investigations to increase that timetable to 60 working days. We had expressed some concern on one hand that we didn't think that solved the problems they were contemplating and it delayed resolution of this process which we thought was unsatisfactory to both the complainant and the

person accused of the harassment. We essentially compromised by cutting it in half and saying we will extend it to 45 working days and see if that resolves the problems

that the investigators had in completing their investigations on time. We felt that was at least 3 weeks sooner than originally had been proposed.

2. Of greater concern was what happened with the investigation materials at the end of the investigation. The current policy in essence provides that the parties have access to the investigation file as well as appropriate university officials. A proposal had been made to

remove the parties from that process. A part of the modification also concerned that the investigation should not be a point at which there is cross-examination of the witnesses by the various concerned interests. After we had discussed this and worked it out we reached an agreement that the parties should have the opportunity to review the files so that the investigation materials would under the current compromise continue to be made available both to university officials who have a need to know and to the parties - the complainant and the accused. We did think it was reasonable that the investigation is not the point for cross-examination. You don't need at that point to have people and their counsel cross-examining witnesses and so that seemed to really be the concern that University Counsel had and so we agreed on some compromised language that makes that clear but also allows the parties to have access to the file. Our sense after the investigation or discussion of this was that information was going to be made available any way and at least orally if not in writing. By the time we worked it all out we felt that this was a reasonable compromise. We will forward that on to the Advisory Committee. If you have further concerns about it that would be the committee that will sign off on it. They technically sign off on the proposed changes to the Provost Office. So that is how the process works. We think that it is fairly well resolved at this point.

A couple of other things are on the workload as you heard the Provost say and I talked with him briefly yesterday about it. He mentions faculty workloads being on the agenda for consideration this year. I have mentioned to the Provost and I think he has agreed to be sure to involve the Welfare Committee in that discussion. Certainly that goes to important faculty concerns so we will keep close contact with the Provost Office on that discussion as it progresses and we will report to you.

One other thing on the sexual harassment policy, we are not totally done with it.

In looking at these changes, the committee has raised some concerns about what appears to be the absence of any hearing in this process of a sexual harassment complaint. As we read the rules, once sexual harassment complaint is made a report is filed, the accused has an opportunity to respond to the report and then a decision is rendered. One of the things that we are interested in looking at is whether there should be a hearing at some point in that process because one of the sanctions obviously, if

you are untenured, would be dismissal from the University. If there is a tenure revocation then there would be a hearing of the tenure revocation process. But we will be looking further into some of these other issues of the sexual harassment policy as we go on this year. So we have signed off on the current proposed changes, but we will be further

studying them. We have some subcommittees formed with people who have knowledge of

these issues.

F. Committee on Admissions, Professor James Burns:

No report.

G. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Professor John Lopiccolo:

No report.

H. Other Committees.

No report.

V. Report of the Secretary.

PROFESSOR WISE reminded everyone that the dates for the Fall Senate meeting are on the top of the third page of your agenda. Please place these dates on your calendar.

VI. Unfinished Business.

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT (MUSIC) - Since the July meeting was adjourned we didn't get a report on Summer School or May Session and how all that came out.

RICHARD BAKER (REGISTRAR) - I will be glad to put something together but off the top of my head I do not have any numbers. The last time we looked the enrollment was up for Summer I and that would include May Session. I would be glad to put something together.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - If you would do that, I would appreciate it for the next meeting.

VII. New Business.

CAROLINE EASTMAN (CSCI) - I am distributing copies of proposed policies relating to computer and information systems.

WEDLOCK - This has to do with a proposed policy that has been issued with regard to the use of personal materials on your computers. Personal software that may be licensed to you but isn't registered with the University. It also has to do with a number of other details that might impede your work.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - This is a resolution dealing with policies that some of you may not have seen. At this point I do not have copies of them for everyone. I have 10 pages that were sent to all of the deans. Some of whom sent them to the department chairs, at least one of them sent them to all of the department faculty (namely my department). We have in my department been discussing a number of concerns we have both as faculty and computer scientists and feel that it would be premature for these policies to be implemented at this point. I would like to read a few sentences from them, obviously not the entire thing. "University Data Security. All University data, whether in electronic, written or other media forms must be protected. This required protection extends to written/printed copies of data as well as visible data left showing on unattended screens. Protection also includes not down-loading programs to the USC data system from non-approved, non-university sites." This has to do with one of the items in the resolution that is apparently establishing a single level of security where perhaps multiple levels are appropriate. Security for, say, student grades, disciplinary hearings, and so forth is critically important, but you just do not need the same level of security for someone's draft paper or a course homework assignment.

Let me read a couple of sentences from the policy on "Software Licensing. "It is the policy of the University of South Carolina that all software utilized on University owned equipment must be properly licensed to, or by, the University and that all conditions of the licensing agreement be observed." "Personal use software, purchased or developed with non USC funding, even if properly licensed to an individual, may not be loaded or run on University equipment." Strictly speaking this means you cannot buy your own software and put it on the PC in your office. You cannot get something from a research colleague in another institution and put it on the PC in your office. I won't ask how many people have this kind of software on their PC's since I note that violation of this policy, not yet adopted, may result in discipline or termination.

The final comment from a policy dealing with inventory control, "It is the responsibility of vice presidents, deans and department heads, depending on their division or area of responsibility to devise a method to account for communications and data processing equipment whose value is greater than \$500 but less than \$5,000."

which is the cut off for the University inventory equipment so this proposal would establish a whole bunch of small inventory control systems. Just an awful lot of paper work. I think everyone can see what some of the implications are. Hopefully, everyone has a copy of this motion. I have one final comment on electronic information compared to traditional information. For years everyone kept grades in a grade book. A lot of them are on computer spread sheets now. Basically we were trusted to take care of the grade books to keep the information secure. We were not told that we had to use pass words or locks or pit bulls, or whatever for security, or pit vipers. (I am told we have some of those in Sumwalt.) Although I have not gone to ask the biologist where they are. I trust that the pit vipers are under appropriate security. Saying that you cannot put your own software on a computer system is like saying you cannot put your own book on your bookshelf. Here I have a book of my own copy, not even a University book. This one is called "Who Owns Information"; I can put that on my bookshelf. So anyway I would like to present this motion for consideration by the Senate.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - The motion has been presented. I think this is a matter of substance so I am going to refer this to the Welfare Committee for consideration. Randy, you were talking about things imposed rather than just things that are selected. This thing could be imposed because this comes, I understand, from the Office of Internal Audit who reports to no one but the Board of Trustees. We need some input on this, and we probably could use some heavy input on this particular policy because it would completely change the way we go about being professors.

KIRK FIEDLER - BADM - I believe this subject relates to something I brought up sometime ago which was the policy that did not allow the projection of Internet images over our long distance education system or its related television systems. At that time I followed up my statements at the Faculty Senate with communication to the Welfare committee to review this policy. The important fact of our to recognize is that as we move into the next century telecommunication and computer technology will become increasingly critical to every aspect of our University's operations. Now is the time for us to admit that a heavy handed management approach that is blind to the unique characteristics of these technologies could cripple the University.

WEDLOCK - I think the Welfare Committee will be in liaison with the Computer Committee.

WILCOX - The first thing we will do is contact the University Committee on Computers and work with them so we are not all doing separate things. I think our first concern is to respond immediately to this proposal to be sure that nothing goes through a process that would put brakes on the proposal so that you can discuss it and then we will be happy to take it up or at least monitor it to be sure that that committee

takes up these issues. I don't want the Welfare Committee duplicating what the Computer Committee is doing.

PROFESSOR GLENN HARRISON - Caroline before we get all flustered, can you give us a sense of who proposed what precisely and to whom because these proposals seem either silly or irrelevant.

WEDLOCK - The Division of Libraries and Information Systems proposes the attached

proposes the attached four new University policies in order to comply with the recommendations of the Office of Internal Audit. So don't blame the Division of Libraries and Information Systems. These are those kinds of things that you do because somebody else tells you you had to. Then it says please circulate the comments you have to Dr. George Terry, Vice Provost. This is from the Office of Internal Audit which was again--my understanding, I stand to be corrected if anyone knows any more than I do--was a group that was established after the Jim Holderman years to report directly to the Board of Trustees on what was going on in the University. It goes around the administration. It is not an unusual thing to have but it is independent.

PROVOST ODOM - I am not going to defend it but it has to go out in my name. I don't do anything but send it out to the deans and other people and ask for their input into that. I have seen a lot of input and I appreciate that input.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - Caroline has some extra copies of this if you want to take a look at the details. Any other questions or comments? Jerry is just a conduit to get the proposal out on the floor. Any other questions?

VIII. Remarks for Good of the Order.

None.

IX. Announcements.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - I am announcing that the next month or next meeting we are going to have a discussion on tenure and promotion recommendations. That is really important and we ought to have good turn out on that I hope. So see you then.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.