

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OCTOBER 1, 1997

CHAIRMAN ELDON WEDLOCK - We are embarking on new things today, one of which is being globally transmitted. We have the technology to get ourselves there, but it may cause some inconvenience for us here, and it will take some adjustment as we go along. We hope that the glitches will work out. We have two microphones that will be passed. If you want to be recognized, wait until you get a microphone in order to speak. Otherwise nobody will be able to hear what you have to say. This may cause delays in the discussion, but if we move the microphones around with alacrity we should hopefully keep that too a minimum. We have two people who will be running the microphone from place to place. So once you finish speaking if you would relinquish the microphone quickly, it would be much appreciated.

I would like to welcome to this meeting all of the people who are watching us around the world -- not just the regional campuses -- anyone who has the code, can dial in. Once you are on the satellite -- you are on the satellite around the world, so I expect that will add to the decorum which is the usual regime here at the Faculty Senate meeting.

I. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Are there any corrections to the minutes? Any corrections or additions to the minutes? Do I hear a motion to approve the minutes? Is there a second? Would you please identify yourself by name and department so that Peggy Pickels [the secretary] can make sure for the purposes of next month's minutes that you are recognized. Any discussion? All those in favor of approving the minutes say aye. Opposed - no. Minutes are approved.

II. Reports of Officers.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - President John Palms.

PRESIDENT JOHN PALMS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My remarks will be brief. The major reason for this meeting today and for my presence is to engage with you in discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The committee has have worked very ably over a one-year period or more, and I am anxious to get your input also into the recommendations that they have made.

We are in the middle of the semester almost and a number of things that are important to us are occurring all around the campus. On Friday, our National Advisory Council is meeting on campus -- it's the advisory committee on the campaign. I'm going to tell you that the campaign continues to go very well. We are on track. A little over \$80 million has been pledged in the last two years and we are on pace for our goal, so keep your fingers crossed. We have about 51 staff people working on this campaign and over a thousand volunteers that are every day making calls and/or solicitations, cultivating or nurturing possible donors.

I want to thank those of you who have already pledged your Family Fund contributions for this year. We have asked you to do this over the entire campaign length, and I can tell you that the leading gifts have already produced in a very short time over a million dollars of pledges.

I want to tell you again that these pledges are not legally binding. You have been very generous over the years in giving to the Family Fund. It is one of the great things that I can talk about when people ask me, "Who supports you?" I can talk about the faculty and the staff contributing to the Family Fund as leadership for everybody else, and I know you will continue to be generous.

Your Provost and I met with the Senate of the Regional Campuses here last week and had a good meeting. Yesterday we honored one of our distinguished members of the Board of Trustees, Jim Bradley from Lancaster. He has been there in the community for 50 years, and he has served on the Board of Trustees for 18 years. That particular community has been very, very supportive of higher education. You know that recently they have raised a half million dollars for a new liberal arts building in the community, and it was really something to witness.

At Beaufort, the Commission on Higher Education Subcommittee has approved us beginning a campus in between Beaufort and Hilton Head where classes will be offered probably within a couple of years. That land was donated to us. There are some good things happening at that campus as well.

Those of you who participated in the Nuremberg Trial Conference -- that wonderful multi-day meeting here -- I want to thank you. We have had tremendous press. If you were in this particular auditorium listening to prosecutors who were still alive, and present here, you know why. It is something that I believe the University should have been particularly proud of. We have had a number of people that really performed beyond expectation in the time they gave to organize this conference. Professor Robert Herzstein, Peter Becker (who was not at the conference because he had a slight heart attack about the time the conference began but he is now back home), Blease Graham, and John Montgomery worked extraordinarily hard.

With that, unless there are any questions, I will wait on the discussions of Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Promotions.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Are there any questions for the President? [None asked.]
Provost Jerry Odom.

PROVOST JERRY ODOM:

Thank you, Don. There are just a couple of issues I would like to deal with. First of all I would like to personally welcome those faculty from the regional campuses who are with us on television today. One of the things that I have tried to do and am still doing is to visit each of the regional campuses. I am sure that you already know these faculty are a very dedicated and committed group. The Regional Campuses are an exciting and stimulating part of our University family. We are happy to have them involved in this experiment and we hope it works.

In terms of good news, we have already received word this year that 4 of the 5 Rotary International Scholarships that are given in our district have gone to USC students. These scholarships are worth \$22,000 each and not only do we have 4 of 5 but we have the first and second alternates. As you know, we have 20 Carolina Scholars. This year we have also invited 6 additional finalists who also came to the University to take part in our faculty mentoring program. Each Carolina Scholar is paired with a faculty mentor for the first year. We have found that this program works very well. For those of you who are faculty mentors, and I see some of you in the audience, thank you very much. We feel that that is a wonderful program and the student feedback we get from the program has been very enthusiastic.

In terms of grants that the University has recently received we are doing very well. You may have seen in the Gamecock this morning our School of Criminal Justice has just received a \$1.4 million grant. One we have just learned of is called a Water Center grant. This is from the Department of Energy for \$3 million. This is an interdisciplinary grant involving the School of Public Health, Science and Math, Engineering and others. This will set up a center for the study of water and all the facets of political study, physical study, geographical study. Water is very important to our state-both surface water and underground water. The School of the Environment has recently received a planning grant from the Kann-Rasmussen Foundation to lead a statewide effort in sustainability. If we do a good job in writing the full proposal that will be a \$5 million grant over a period of 5 years. So I think things are going very well in terms of external funding.

Performance funding is a horse of a different color. We spent about 3 hours yesterday at the CHE discussing performance funding for the coming year and going through

the performance indicator from last year and what our experiences were. This year we are just in the initial stages of performance indicators but I will keep you up-to-date as we move forward.

Finally in terms of deans' searches, you may have seen in the newspaper that we had a candidate and his wife for the dean of Public Health here this weekend. He is the dean of a very well regarded School of Public Health. We are hopeful that we will be able to attract him to the University. We are finding when we are trying to deal with deans are people who we consider AAU quality is that they don't come cheap. They have high aspirations, high goals, and we need to do the best that we can to meet those goals. In Pharmacy we will interview in the next two weeks two candidates for that position--the interim dean, Dr. Farid Sadik will be one of those candidates and the other candidate will be Dr. Thomas Needam of the University of Rhode Island. The College of Science and Mathematics dean search is underway. The advertisements have been placed and the committee hopes to begin reviewing applications after November 1st. We have elected the Liberal Arts Committee. I am making some appointments. There are a couple of student appointments I need to make and that committee will be finalized. Dean David Schrock of the College of Business Administration will chair that committee. We are currently in the process of electing the committee for the dean's search for Education and will begin that search within the next few weeks. That concludes my report. I will be happy to answer any questions.
[Silence]

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - I take it there are no questions from the Provost. Moving on to Committee Reports.

III. Reports of Committees.

A. Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Professor Sarah Wise, Secretary:

No report.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Richard Clodfelter, Chair:

PROFESSOR CLODFELTER - The committee presents for your approval the changes that appear on pages 21 through 24.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - This being a committee report it doesn't require a second. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, are you ready for the question? All those in favor of the committee report signify by saying aye. Opposed - no. The ayes have it.

C. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor John Winberry, Chair:

PROFESSOR WINBERRY - The committee report can be found on pages 26 and 27 of the agenda. I would like to move acceptance of the report in its entirety. It is a short report. Roman numerals I through V.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - This being a committee report it does not require a second. Is there any discussion? Hearing none are you ready for the question? All those in favor of the report signify by saying aye. All those opposed - nay. So ordered.

PROFESSOR WINBERRY - I would like to ask the senators to remind colleagues that all the material for the May Session courses that are to be offered should be submitted to the committee on Curricula and Courses by November 3rd. I appreciate you reminding your colleagues who intend to offer a course this May. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Thank you.

D. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Caroline Strobel, Chair:

No report.

E. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Robert Wilcox, Chair:

PROFESSOR WILCOX - At the September meeting, a motion was referred to the committee regarding proposed changes in the university computing policy. We do not have a response to bring back to you at this point, but I want to update you as to where things stand. We had discussions with members of the University Academic Computing Committee, people who are familiar with the audit that sparked these proposed changes. At the moment it looks like we will have a report back to you certainly no later than the December 1st meeting -- we are hopeful the November 1st meeting. The Academic Computing Committee does not meet until very late in October. We will meet following that if we can get it all worked out between ourselves as to what language we agree on, and I will report back to you at that point.

Regarding one of the areas of substantial concern in the policy, I think you will be comfortable with the direction we are moving. The proposal raised questions whether you could ever put software on a computer if the software was not purchased University-wide. The language which we are working towards, which I think will have some agreement on, would allow any licensed software to be installed on University computers. We would also be sure to include software that was created internally for people's research purposes. The policy would really focus on the fact that it is licensed and it would also have a provision in that it would be to be used for University and University-related purposes, which is relatively broad language designed to encompass the teaching, research, and community service we do. That is

the direction that it seems to be headed to try to solve that problem. If there are comments on that, we will meet again October 23rd. I would appreciate your response if you have any to that subject.

The other elements of the policies that we have looked at -- one of them was the security issue and the requirement of passwords and that sort of thing. At the moment we have not made any changes or looked at recommending any changes. I think it is fair to say that this policy is still on the table and still being considered by the committee. There also is a policy change there dealing with the annual accounting for equipment. What we are headed toward there is to simply keep the University policies on inventory as they are currently drafted, using a business and finance policy that currently exists. The belief is that it would satisfy the auditors, and we will probably head back in that direction. I need myself to be comfortable in exactly what we are doing there, but that is my understanding of what we are agreeing to at the moment.

The other language which we have proposed to strike -- several of these policies had language in there about penalties, and some concern was raised at the last meeting that the penalty for violation includes termination. We have struck the reference to penalties. Most of the University's policies of this type do not have penalties -- especially death penalties -- included and we have recommended an agreement on that as well. We will have a final recommendation to you if we can get everything coordinated with the committees by the next meeting. There is a chance that within that one week we won't get all our work done, in which case, we will be back the next month.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Thank you.

F. Committee on Admissions, Professor James Burns, Chair

No report.

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

Lopiccolo, Chair:

PROFESSOR LOPICCOLO - We don't have a report that requires action at this time but we do have one item that we will be looking at and I wanted to invite your comment to the committee about it. We have gotten comments from a number of people requesting that we look at the grading structure or system again particularly in reference to use of minus grades as the final grades. So we will be looking at that and if any of you have ideas or ideas from your colleagues let me know either through the

Standards and Petitions Committee or through the Senate Office or directly at the College of Journalism and Communications.

H. Other Committees.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Any other committees to report? [Silence]

VI. Report of the Secretary.

None.

VII. Unfinished Business.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - One of the attachments to your agenda is a report on the May Session. Is Richard Bayer here? Would you like to comment on this please? This was in reference to question that was raised at the last Senate meeting.

RICHARD BAYER (University Registrar) - The report was -- you could find that on the WEB. It looks a little bit more handsome there. It is in color and your reproduction is black and white. If anyone has specific questions, I will be glad to answer them. What I presented to you was some of the changes that we implemented as the result of Standards and Petitions written request to my office. They are outlined under changes on the first page. And, then I thought I would show you a couple of different views of May Session that might be of interest. Essentially I broke May Session down by students enrolled in May Session only, Summer I only, and those enrolled in both May Session and Summer I. I also looked at the enrollment by student type-- undergraduate versus graduate student and then at the end I left a few conclusions that might be of interest. Essentially one being that we would call for courses earlier or ask for courses to be submitted much earlier this year and as Professor Winberry indicated. I think the deadline is November 3. Hopefully some faculty are out there thinking about some neat courses might be appropriate with a 3-week intense May session. But I will be glad to answer your questions that you might have.

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT (MUSC) - Is your assessment that May Session is worth all the trouble of calendar changes? Does it seem to increase enrollment?

BAYER - Yes. In one of the views I presented was a view of Summer I over the past four years and I think you can see that this past Summer I was the biggest head count enrollment that we have had in the past four years. Summer I and Summer II combined was greater than last year. Not by a whole lot but by a little bit. I think that it is still is new and I still think it may take time to catch on. Particularly if we have the courses. I think the courses will generate enrollment and the last session I thought we were a little bit surprised we didn't seem to have the courses in numbers out there that would attract a large population. But I think now with the rules being explained a

little bit clearer, with people understanding what May Session is, I think we will see continual growth in that area. I guess the other thing is that we now have taken what used to be what I call a fallow time period where not much activity was going on in the way of academic courses, we have now turned that into a 3-week period where faculty and students are given an opportunity to take courses and accelerate their degree path. So, is it working? Yes, I think so and now this will be our third time around. Computer Services has done some nice programming which has made it easier for us. We have got it down to a repetitive type of process more or less.

PROFESSOR ROY SCHWARTZMAN (THSP) - What is particularly strange and somewhat disturbing on the pie chart (my compliments on the graphics by the way) on the first pie chart that the 1997 enrollment seems disproportionately graduate students. And I wondered if you might comment on that. Did we just not seem to be proposing a lot of undergraduate courses or was it a case of there actually being much lower undergraduate enrollment as the undergraduate courses didn't make when they were proposed?

BAYER - I think both. You are right. It was extraordinary how it was flip flopped sort of reversed. First year in May Session we had a large preponderance of undergraduate students. This past May Session graduate students for the most part made up the vast majority of students. If you look at the course data and the course enrollment, we were surprised in the few number of undergraduate courses that were offered. And, we are hoping by promoting a little bit earlier and asking faculty to submit their courses earlier that we will be able to generate more courses. I know that some faculty last year weren't aware of May Session till December. I know in your department some of your courses that were excellent courses, well suited for May Session, but just didn't have enough time to promote it and get it out there. But with a more robust course offerings I think we will see a trend more toward 50/50 or 60/40. The one graduate course in particular, the Internet courses is what drove the population. That was a 700 level course.

VIII. New Business.

PROFESSOR SARAH WISE - I move on behalf of the Steering Committee that the Senate go into quasi committee of the whole to informally discuss the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion and Tenure Review.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Mr. Parliamentarian, what is a quasi committee of the whole?

PROFESSOR GREG ADAMS (LAW) - Mr. Chairman, a quasi committee of the whole is one of the three ways that Robert's Rules of Order sets out for a body to

engage in informal deliberations without the constraints of all technicalities of parliamentary rules. Robert's recommends that a quasi committee of the whole be used by a body of this size particularly where it is desirable to have the chair of the body chair the committee's deliberations. [Applause]

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Thank you. You have heard a motion. Coming from a committee it does not require a second. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye. All those opposed. We are now in a quasi committee of the whole. The President's Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Promotion, otherwise known as the Blue Ribbon Committee, has presented nine recommendations, all of which are on the WEB and in your agenda. The actual report, while fascinating reading, was too large to reproduce in such numbers. But we do have here with us Dr. Robert Patterson, our friend who was the chair of the committee, who is willing to elucidate the background of some of these recommendations. These recommendations were submitted to the President. The President has not yet fully digested them, I believe, and is awaiting some feed back from this body and other members of the University community before passing them onto the appropriate faculty committees, where necessary, in order for their deliberation and presentation to the full faculty when warranted. I think, and this is my judgment and you can of course disagree with me, that items 1, 4, 6, and 8 are the matters which are of most direct concern to the faculty. Perhaps number 5 is in that category as well. Dr. Patterson would you come up and give us a brief skinny on this for those of us who haven't done our homework?

PROFESSOR ROBERT PATTERSON (HIST):

Thank you Mr. Chairman and Colleagues. There are several things I think you should know in advance. One that is particularly relevant I suppose, because of the wide distribution of the proceedings of this meeting, is that the committee's recommendations potentially apply only to the USC-Columbia campus. They are not system-wide recommendations. Also for your perspective and perhaps to guide your comments at this time, please understand that our recommendations are only recommendations. While we were a presidential committee and our recommendations were made to the President, our proposals will ultimately be voted on by the voting faculty of the University as the Faculty Manual provides. Currently the recommendations are in the hands of the University's senior steering committee, the Faculty Advisory Committee; and doubtless you will hear what they have to say about our recommendations. So you really are only discussing a draft which is in a preliminary phase. I would like to say personally that I am very proud to have served with 16 other colleagues who went out of their way and exerted themselves in an exemplary fashion to get our work done in a calendar year. We all are very busy; but by their most conscientious behavior and personal sacrifice my colleagues got the

work done. And I don't make this comment to spread out the blame, but to spread out the praise.

Also, as one who has been associated with the tenure and promotion system of the University and with faculty governance for many years in a variety of capacities, I want to say how proud I am to have been associated with this process which was initiated by a university and administration, including the Trustees, which are not in the mode of questioning the existence of tenure, but which are striving to make the system of tenure stronger. Many of you know from national publications how tenure as an institution is being questioned here and there; but we are not in that mode. I think that our situation is one of which we can be very proud. Our role must be to demonstrate once again that although we enjoy an enormous privilege by receiving tenure and promotion at various ranks, we are not complacent. Personally, collectively, and institutionally we are involved in rethinking the means and standards by which tenure and promotions are awarded. That is what this is all about.

After a great deal of work, we finished our business in May and presented our recommendations to the President, and as I said, they are now in the hands of the Faculty Advisory Committee. Rather than read the provisions of our recommendations, let me distill them a little. Then if you have any questions, I will be glad to answer them in so far as I am able.

I guess that our prime recommendation or the kernel of our report has been to introduce a principle which reflects our highest institutional ambition: to be among the very best universities in our country -- to be included in, you might say, the best academic pecking order of the world. With that in mind, in principle number one we felt that with respect to rethinking and reevaluating criteria that we should have a process of reaccreditation for all tenure granting units. They would have to demonstrate empirically how their criteria, based upon their individual fields, compare with Research One and AAU institutional standards. Units' standards will vary from discipline to discipline, but each tenure granting unit's criteria will have to be measure up to those of comparable Research One and AAU units. One thing, by the way, which reveals the draft status of our recommendations is that they target Fall 1997 for the beginning of the reaccreditation process. I would be surprised if that happens! In any case, supporting information will be provided by units and submitted to the UCTP for approval. Duties on the UCTP, as those of you who have served on it know, "eat you alive." Roughly between January and the end of March people's times are taken up reading files. So the only time the 24 can realistically consider revised criteria and so on is in the Fall. How then could we go through all of the units in the University? The best thing would be to put the process of units' reaccreditations on a rotating basis. We took the figure, roughly speaking, of one fifth of the units to go through the process each year for a period of five years. With some units it may be a very simple

process; with others it may not be. We didn't actually take this factor into consideration, but we thought it was a very necessary procedure. I suppose there is a subtext here that units' academics have standards, but they are not solely responsible for establishing them. In other words there should be a system of checks and balances. The checks and balance we have maintained above the units still is the UCTP, a principle which is stated in the Faculty Manual.

We have kept the tenure and promotion system in our recommendations basically as it has been since its 1973 codification. You should have been at the faculty meeting which adopted the system; it was quite a meeting.

Now if you will skip to number 4. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to follow your directional map here -- not that 2 and 3 are not interesting. Anyway, the next important issue for us was to clear up an ambiguity about the role of the UCTP, the 24, in applying criteria to cases. You may remember that one of the things this Blue Ribbon Committee did was to solicit your opinion by means of a poll sent to all tenure track faculty in the University. While we found a very, very strong strain of support for the present system, we did find that among some there was a feeling that on occasion the UCTP might have substituted its judgement in cases in place of that of individual units. Whether this was true or not, we felt that it was important that any ambiguity about the UCTP's powers described in the Faculty Manual be cleared up. There were certain applications for promotion when I chaired the UCTP which the committee denied. We called them "gold watch" cases, strongly supported files which did not meet established criteria from faculty who had served loyally and long in a particular rank and who were nearing retirement. In our recommendation we felt that in circumstances in which units votes go against their criteria, the UCTP should say so when it acts contrary to these votes and certify that in doing so it has applied the units' criteria. This should clear up any misunderstanding about how the UCTP is behaving. It is an effort to further enhance the reputation of the UCTP in the faculty's minds and to instill in faculty members greater confidence about how their cases are being handled. Criteria the UCTP will apply are still going to be the approved criteria of local units -- bottom line.

In number 5 we wanted to be sure that in a grievance the Grievance Committee would be fully informed, both by the petitioner and by the administration, about the grounds for denial of tenure and/or promotion. That is why we put in the principle that the President or the President's designees must be present. The text of this recommendation has been slightly altered to clear up any misunderstanding that the Grievance Committee's recommendations might not go back to the unit as the Faculty Manual requires but to the President and to the Board. Procedure will be as the Faculty Manual dictates; so there will be no circumvention of the local unit. But just as there has been a perception that at times the UCTP may have acted beyond its

explicitly mandated role, some believe that on occasion the Faculty Grievance Committee has gotten into the business of tenure and promotion decisions. In other words, rather than looking at issues such as due process, violation of contract, etc., etc., the committee has considered the merit of cases -- which, of course, according to the Faculty Manual it does not have a right to do. So we have restated the principle of the committee's functional role.

Number 6 in part restates the principle of number 1 by recommending that wording should be added to the Faculty Manual that general criteria for faculty members should adhere to those of Research I and AAU institutions. Also while we recognized that research and teaching are the two most important faculty functions, we also stressed the secondary importance of service. We felt that of the two major activities the more difficult to assess is teaching. Student opinion polls or student evaluations as they are sometimes called are commonly used in tenure and promotion cases, sometimes mandated. We felt that the most appropriate people to comment on the pedagogical expertise of faculty members is their colleagues, in a manner to be determined by each unit. So we inserted this principle that the determination of the quality of teaching should be based upon peer and student evaluations.

You might be amused, if you haven't already read it, to know that we recommended that deans should be brought up to date on the tenure and promotion system in case they are not well informed. We thought that they should know as much about the system as the faculty they are evaluating. You should like that one.

Number 8. As you know, a grievance now goes to a subcommittee of the Board; but there is a feeling we perceived from the Board itself and from elsewhere in the University that this is somewhat of an awkward situation. In effect it forces a subcommittee of the Board to take sides in a potential dispute between faculty and administration. I was chairman of the faculty committee which sat with the subcommittee of the board and on one occasion the Board's subcommittee actually sided with the faculty in a case. Anyway, it is an awkward situation. So taking this into account we recommended, obviously subject to the Board's approval, that with the approval of the Trustees the President should be the final authority within the University to whom a grievance concerning tenure and promotion may be submitted.

Number 9. A practice which grew up in response to the 1973 tenure and promotion system was the Provost's reporting to the Faculty Senate once a year the percentages of agreement between the various votes of units with those of the UCTP, the Provost, and the President. That gave people a sense of how the UCTP, the Provost, and the President were reacting in relation to the votes of local units. This created a high level of confidence in the way the system was operating; and the information it provided could alert faculty to a possible need to amend the system. So we thought that it was

very, very important for this practice to be restored. And irrespective of the fate of our recommendations, by agreement with the Provost we know that the practice will be restored.

This in sum represents the main points of our recommendation in adequate clarity I hope. If you would like to comment or ask any questions, I would be happy to respond.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Thank you Rob for that overview of this document. I am going to open the floor up for discussion. Does anybody have any comments or questions? Or is it all perfectly clear? [Laughter]

PROFESSOR BARBARA AINSWORTH (HEALTH) - I have heard that we should be expected to present research on the same level as the AAU or the Research I schools yet is the infrastructure or our resources of a similar level to be commensurate in having that level of support to get that out?

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - That is a good question I do not have the answer to, but does anyone want to comment or respond to that? What the question seems to be is if we are going to be expected to perform at AAU standards, we ought to be provided with AAU level resources.

PROFESSOR JOHN SAFKO (PHYS) - I think the cover there would probably be the comment of equivalent like units and so we would not have to compare our particular units say with the best unit that meets in those criteria but units that have the same kind of support that we might have. That would be one way that it could be interpreted by UCTP.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - That is that unless the peer unit was an AAU unit then you would be held to a unit of the same caliber but how do we go about determining those?

PROFESSOR SAFKO - That brings up a question I have, which is the statement that these go to the UCTP. If they are unacceptable and no agreement seems to be worked out what happens then? I am asking this as a member of Faculty Advisory that is going to have to try propose some wording for the Faculty Manual. So my question is, "What happens if they can't work out an agreement between the unit and the UCTP as to what meets the standards that are being requested here?"

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - This is in relation to number 1. Is that correct?

PROFESSOR SAFKO - Yes, number 1 particularly.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Which reads in part, "Supporting evidence should be submitted with the procedures and criteria which shows how the units' procedures and criteria compare with those of like units in Research I and AAU institutions...." What if the units says they are, and the UCTP says they are not, and the unit says they are, etc. Does anybody have any comment on how that might be resolved. That does seem to be a question. There needs to be some kind of tie breaker here.

PROVOST ODOM - John, I think from what I know about what has happened in the past, there has always been some exchange, and in the end a compromise has been reached in one way or another. Certainly I would hope that the UCTP and the unit would continue to try to work on that. I know that Daniel Feldman (BADM) [1996-1997 UCTP Chair] last year for example worked with a number of units back and forth to make sure that everyone was satisfied at some point. So I think it is just a matter of trying to reach a compromise if that is necessary. There are other chairs of UCTP here who have done that before.

PROFESSOR SAFKO - In other words if we put in the kind of statement that an agreement will be reached between the unit and the UCTP -- just leave it like that. That would be sufficient?

PROFESSOR RICK STEPHENS (JOUR) - I would just reinforce the point. This has always been an issue. There has been this process where the individual units work with the UCTP. Traditionally, I think, the Provost's Office has left it at the level of the UCTP and the units to try to resolve these questions because it is clear in the Faculty Manual and in the "Goldenrod Book" that reviewing unit guidelines is something the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion has always been responsible for. That is something that has been consistent.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - I think that is pretty clear. What we are suggesting here is that this is like a peace process rather than having a determinater.

PROFESSOR TOM BORG (MEDC) - The sense of the Ad Hoc Committee, or at least the sense of one member of the Ad Hoc Committee, was that the Provost Office was going to become more active in this process. When departments blatantly said "No, we are not going to change this." Then the Provost's Office was also going to be brought into the process. Am I wrong on that Jerry?

PROVOST ODOM - No, I think the Provost Office would be happy to be involved.

PROFESSOR BORG - Because otherwise what has happened in the past is the units have just said "Oh, to hell with you." And never resubmitted the criteria back for review.

PROVOST ODOM - I don't want to get into a big discussion here, but when somebody tells me that, I control their budget, I can answer that remark.

PROFESSOR BORG - Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - No, it is hell to you [the unit].

PROFESSOR PATTERSON - I was going to say that the question in a sense is oversimplified in that it over looks what we might call the subtleties of the academic process.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Then it is a process. Thank you very much. Are there any other questions or comments on this subject? Does anyone want to comment on 4? Yes, could we get a microphone to this gentlemen?

PROFESSOR BRUCE MEGLINO (BADM) - I just want to echo a comment that was made earlier. I think about what might go on in the recruiting process. We would be hiring people who would be expected to conform to criteria based on AAU institutions. With the salary structure that we have right now -- I think of Jerry's comment earlier that AAU quality deans don't come cheap -- I think AAU quality faculty might not come cheap either. So we may be in a contest that we can't win in terms of recruiting new faculty.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - I think that is an echo of the resource question.

PROFESSOR JOHN SPURRIER (STAT) - I have a question on the meaning of number 6 and number 1. I see in number 6 the wording regarding appointment. Does this include the notion of promotion to that rank or is this strictly for hiring in at a particular rank? And, on number 1, in my reading, the UCTP has the option of approving criteria below those of Research I and AAU universities if they feel it is in the best interest of the University. Is that the intent of these statement? On number 6, I see the wording for appointment at various ranks. Does that include for promotion to those ranks or is that only for hiring one in at a particular rank?

PROFESSOR PATTERSON - It is for both. Actually while we were doing our business we were thinking about the promotion process.

PROFESSOR SPURRIER - I think that needs to be clarified. Also on number 1, is my understanding correct that UCTP is not required to make the criteria equal to Research I and AAU universities? But, if they think it is in the University's best interest, they can approve those of a lesser quality?

PROFESSOR PATTERSON - There is no mandate for that because if there were, we would be right back where we are now. There is a clear addition here, an institutional addition. Some of our colleagues are actively giving voice to a very important aspect of this the budgetary one. We will need resources and that may require some budgetary rethinking here.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Any other comments?

PROFESSOR MARGARET GREDLER (Ed. PSYC) - Reflecting on my four years on the UCTP, the gold watch decisions that Dr. Patterson referred to were straight forward decisions in that had the individual candidate met the criteria for promotion the file would have come through much earlier in the person's career. Mention was also made here today of units being concerned that UCTP applied its own criteria rather than unit criteria. However, criteria are always subject to some interpretation. Unless department criteria under the reaccreditation process come through in a sort of bean counter fashion, such as an individual will have published x articles in referred journals in one year. This provision in 4 then leads to the question, "What criteria will be used by UCTP to determine that the unit did not apply its own criteria?"

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - If I got that correctly, how does the UCTP decide whether or not the unit has dropped the ball before it goes on to apply the units criteria itself?

PROFESSOR PATTERSON - Whatever is there. It goes with the file, as we know.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - It is in with the file.

PROFESSOR GREDLER - But they are typically subject to interpretation. So my question is, how will UCTP decide that the unit did in fact apply its own criteria or not?

PROFESSOR PATTERSON - It will do so by comparing the evidence contained in files with units' votes. That is the function assigned by the Faculty Manual to the UCTP.

PROFESSOR GLENN HARRISON (BADM) - I have an operational question? Can you say how it [UCTP] does make that determination? I think the answer is "no."

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - I think a lot of people have different ideas on that which they bring to the process. I know when I was on that committee there were lengthy discussions about that process. I am not sure it is one that has been resolved.

PROFESSOR ROBERT FELIX (LAW) - I was a member of the committee, and I would like to offer at least one clarification from my perspective. Talk about the criteria of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee is misleading. They have no criteria. They are there to apply the University criteria and those are established in the Faculty Manual. While there maybe a significant gap between the quality of unit criteria offered for approval and the committee's perception of how those conform to the University criteria as set out in the Faculty Manual, that is a matter of interpretation and a matter of give and take as the Provost has suggested. The University Committee was not at the outset and I do not understand the report to say that it was ever given the authority to substitute its view of what a unit's criteria ought to be other than as measuring it against the criteria set out in the Faculty Manual. UCTP is not, from my point of view, there as super unit to jack up the criteria except by "give and play" and the authority it has to ask for further refinement and clarification, and the instructive function that it has to inform a unit it is not really playing at a very high level. Now what has been put into this report -- I stress aspiration and I ask you to look carefully at the language which says how the criteria of the unit comport with AAU criteria. This to me is not a mandate that you can only have AAU criteria. It is clearly an encouragement to aspire to higher criteria, whether you want to identify those as AAU or something better than you have been doing. I see these two points in the report, and I hope that they will be kept in mind, even if you disagree with them.

PROFESSOR DON JORDAN (PRSC) - The Board of Trustees has the final say on tenure. Why are we changing the final say on grievance?

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Do you want to restate that question? I think you are voicing a dissatisfaction with the idea of taking the Board of Trustees out of the loop or are you just asking a question about it? I think Professor Patterson said that the Board of Trustees doesn't feel comfortable doing this and that other people don't feel comfortable putting what might be considered academic judgments, that are really faculty judgments, in the hands of an oversight board like this.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE STROBEL (BADM) - I along with Don are among the faculty on this Board of Trustees committee, and I think the trustees are very uncomfortable with the whole process. I also would have to say that the grievance that we are trying to remove is the tenure and promotion grievance not other types of grievances. I think they are very uncomfortable with it. Secondly, they are really not prepared to judge an academic file. Another thing that I think is difficult is that they are really not seeing what everybody else is seeing: what the local T&P has seen; what the department chair; the dean; and the 24 person committee (UCTP); the Provost; and the President have seen. What they get is a case that has been put together by an attorney with a grievant. In no way do they really have any idea what

the unit criteria actually were. What is presented is just an incomplete picture. So any sort of judgment that you are getting from the trustees, as has been noted before, I feel is pitting the grievant against the administration more or less. And, that is not really the way it should be, but that is the way it is right now.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - I would second that. That is a problem. The record that is before the Board of Trustees is more of an advocacy record so it is a "who do you believe" kind of contest. That is the way it is structured now.

PROFESSOR WOODY CARLSON (SOCY) - There seems to be kind of a mystery about what these substituted UCTP-criteria-in-lieu-of-department-criteria might have been. To try and clear up the mystery about what some people objected to in the UCTP proceeding, I offer the following: Several times in the last decade our department has been raided by AAU departments and we have lost faculty. In an effort to prevent that kind of thing, we have tried on occasion to offer early tenure to people who clearly qualified for tenure even at that early date. Those recommendations by our department were turned down higher up in the administration, and I think there was at that time nothing in the Faculty Manual against granting early tenure to people who qualified for it. But it was turned down at some level above us. I think that is the kind of thing that departments are wary of in this situation.

PROVOST ODOM - We are all subject to raiding at all times. I was not a part of what happened and can not say too much about it -- except that if you clearly have someone who is up for early tenure and/or promotion, I think the case has to be made very clearly. Now if you have somebody who is going to be hired by Harvard or Princeton or Yale, that is a pretty good case as far as I'm concerned. And, I would certainly be willing to listen to something like that.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (CSCI) - I have a couple of comments and one question. The first comment is that in items 1 and 6 there is reference for wording to refer to Research I and AAU institutions. I would prefer not to see wording specifically referring to Research I and AAU institutions in public documents such as the Faculty Manual; this seems a little bit tacky and the kind of thing that a Research I or AAU institutions probably wouldn't do, the second comment is from a colleague of mine, who unlike me, has been on the UCTP; he said that he saw no way unless people gave up their day jobs, that they could review as many unit criteria in a year as are proposed in number 1.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - How many units are there? Anybody know? Sixty-seven -- 5 into 70, say, is 14.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - So that might be possible. The question is actually about number 2 (that you thought no one might have any questions about) which concerns annual reviews based on unit tenure and promotion criteria. My question is would this preclude practices such as are currently established in the College of Science and Mathematics, and possibly other colleges, of using a set of college criteria which are perhaps somewhat loosely related to the unit criteria?

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Did that occur to the committee?

PROFESSOR PATTERSON - I can't say that it really did, but it certainly wouldn't exclude that in the way it was worded. As you know the present system requires that these objective criteria be applied at the local unit and in making up the annual evaluations.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - My reading of it is that it is ambiguous on that point. I know that my department has had some concern that our criteria were somewhat at variance (not completely, obviously) with the college criteria.

PROVOST ODOM - Having had some experience with the College of Science and Mathematics evaluation form, let me just say, Caroline, that my expectation as a dean was that using the evaluation, that was a college wide instrument, it wasn't really very hard for a chair and a peer review committee or a tenure and promotion committee to use that evaluation and tie it directly to how a person was performing with respect to tenure and/or promotion. I think that could have been done fairly easily. I think most departments were able to do that.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - So, basically, the response is that there doesn't seem to be a whole lot of friction between the language of the unit criteria and any college.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - I did not mean to imply that there was a lot of friction. I certainly did not perceive any. Certainly the two sets of criteria were fairly close. So I did not mean to imply that but we did have faculty get one sort of peer evaluation referring to the unit criteria and then the annual review referring to a different set.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - I do not think that anybody inferred that you implied that. [Laughter] I was speaking conceptually.

PROFESSOR JUDY RINK (PEDU) - I guess one of the questions I have is relative to the CHE criteria that they are using now, and whether the administration is prepared to reconcile the differences between what the CHE may want of this University and this faculty in terms some things, teaching load, etc. and the AAU criteria?

PROVOST ODOM - Judy, first of all as you know the CHE has classified us as a research institution. One of three in the state. In that sector the CHE has been willing in the performance indicator funding to let us be different from the other sectors. That is that we can compare ourselves to what we call peer or aspirant institutions. I think some very good questions have been asked today about infrastructure and so forth. We are going to be comparing ourselves to really 9 AAU institutions in terms of our performance. How we perform relative to them. It is going to be clear pretty quickly that we need to increase our faculty salaries if we are going to compare to those institutions. It is going to be clear very quickly that institutional support for research at the University of South Carolina does not meet the standards of our aspirant institutions and so we are working very hard to get the State to understand what we are trying to do and let us be judged versus the institutions we want to be like.

PROFESSOR RINK - That is the issue. I just finished this morning a review of a colleague at the University of Maryland, which would qualify as an AAU institution. This particular individual in the past three years has taught one class with 5 individuals and that particular class also was a class related to her research and this was for associate professor. A major problem here is that we can't give our faculty those kind of resources at the present time.

PROVOST ODOM - Right.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Maybe if we get AAU status we can.

PROFESSOR GLENN HARRISON (BADM) - I have a question for the Provost again, following up on the previous issue and also following up on the issue of salary compression. One of the problems that arises if we hire somebody at the margin from a top notch school (let's assume we've been given the salary line to do that) is that some deadwood faculty in a given unit would complain and say this person is being hired at \$10,000/\$20,000 a year ahead of their salary or has equipment ahead of their position. Pursuant to your answer to my question in the last Senate meeting, the older faculty that has no extra abilities in terms of performance would have a claim to the same salary line. That's where the question of salary compression interacts very dramatically with the stated goal of raising standards. Because what you are doing there is not just raising the marginal budget; you are raising the entire budget given that we have these overarching goals. Could you speak to that, since you do control the budget?

PROVOST ODOM - Glenn, I need to know exactly what kind of question you are asking. You asked me last time about two faculty having the same vintage but one having performed better than the other and who got the better raise. And, I think I was pretty clear about that.

PROFESSOR HARRISON - No, I asked last time if you had two faculty who had identical metrics in terms of research, teaching, and service (as they are traditionally defined in the Faculty Manual) but one was older: Should the person who was older have the same or a higher salary?

PROVOST ODOM - Performing exactly the same and I said the person with longer service should have a higher salary. What you are asking me now is if you hire someone who is clearly a better faculty member than one who is here who is not performing?

PROFESSOR HARRISON - Right. Then you'll be happy with us paying that person a higher salary than existing faculty?

PROVOST ODOM - I think that happens. Yes.

PROFESSOR HARRISON - So that would not be a case of salary compression?

PROVOST ODOM - That can lead to salary compression and it can lead certainly to unhappiness. In fact last year, as a dean, I brought in an associate professor from MIT. He had an excellent record. I was very surprised we were able to get him and he was interested not only in a position but he was interested in quality of life. That is where we won. We had to pay him a very high salary but I was happy to do that. So he is the highest paid associate professor in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and is making more than some of the full professors. That is what we had to do to get him.

PROFESSOR HARRISON - That is an excellent answer, but notice that it puts in relief the answer to salary compression last time and that is what I wanted.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - When we start talking about individual cases, we have to realize that we are going global we are world-wide here. By the way, although your question was apropos, it did start to slide off the point of the tenure and promotion standards. Maybe this is a topic for another discourse?

PROFESSOR HARRISON - No it is not, because Professor Patterson stated clearly that the over arching goal was to raise standards.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - I understand, but we started talking about salary. I understand the relevance of it but it....

PROFESSOR HARRISON - No, I don't think you do.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Well, I don't need to.

CHAIRMAN JOHN SPURRIER (STAT) - Some of my colleagues are concerned that one of the problems of our promotion and tenure system is the long span of time between when the candidate is told yes by the department and when they hear no ultimately from the end of the process. They feel that the process would be improved if the candidate knew the decision each step along the way so it wouldn't be a huge surprise in May when the candidates finds out no. It is my understanding that these colleagues made this recommendation to the blue ribbon panel and they are interested in finding out if it was discussed and if so why it was not included in the recommendations.

PROFESSOR PATTERSON - Could I please reassure you that this was an issue which was discussed extensively in the committee. It had to do with the general topic of confidentiality. There are pros and cons to both sides. The problem which you give voice to is that according to existing practice the file goes forward in the fall and the applicant finds out in the late spring. And, since the ultimate decision is up to the Board of Trustees, technically it may be actually into summer. I suppose where we finally came down was on the importance of preserving the integrity of the process by not potentially politicizing it. By that I mean we saw the potential at a variety of levels for people you might say marshaling support in a political sense rather than a qualitative sense. The file should have everything in it that is relevant qualitatively speaking to the merits of the case. But we didn't want to see extraneous issues which sometimes have entered as a by product of the system that you talk about. I can tell you that our final recommendation was the result of a very long and extensive examination of this issue, not once but over several of our meetings. So we took it very seriously; but there is no question that there are two sides to the issue.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - I know the committee surveyed other institutions. Did we ever do any investigation on the time line of other institutions? Do you remember?

PROFESSOR PATTERSON - I don't remember.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - I don't either, but then I left it in mid-stream.

PROFESSOR PATTERSON - I would say anybody who served on that committee knows that members are hard pressed to complete the process within an academic year. That is what makes their life so miserable for the late winter and early spring.

PROFESSOR MARGIT RESCH (GERM) - I have a question to my colleagues here, I wonder who has ever compared their criteria with an AAU or Research I institution. Anyone? Well, we have and we found that ours were by far superior to the ones we

compared with. So maybe our fears can be mollified a bit by this comment. Then I have a question and that regards the Grievance Committee. It appears that it may consider appeals on the basis of violations of the employment contract. The employment contract, I presume, would also be the letter of employment that is issued by the dean. We were asked by the UCTP committee to not consider this and not put it into our tenure and promotion criteria because it would make it too difficult for the committee to determine the case. So there seems to be a contradiction here. The grievance process will allow these contracts but the tenure and promotion process will not.

PROFESSOR PATTERSON - I see an apparent, not a real problem there. If our recommendations are adopted, that prohibition would no longer be effective.

PROFESSOR RESCH - So it could now be included in the criteria.

PROFESSOR PATTERSON - I see no reason why not.

PROFESSOR BRUCE MEGLINO (BADM) - I assume that this is a minor point. The last two sentences of point number 6 give the impression that teaching quality should be based exclusively on peer and student evaluations. I don't think that is what the committee intended. Maybe the committee should reconsider rewording that.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - What else would you suggest?

PROFESSOR MEGLINO - I mean that some departments have additional criteria. For example the development of instructional material, etc.

PROFESSOR PATTERSON - We didn't mean to be exclusive in that case.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Ok, so that might need some work. It says "should be based on" that doesn't mean exclusively based on. Other questions, comments? No more questions or comments? We are completely satisfied with the final product? As Professor Patterson said this is still a work in progress and we welcome the discussion and some good points were obviously made. We conducted ourselves fairly well. It was a great wonderful experiment. I am now going to declare we rise from the quasi committee of the whole.

IX. Good of the Order.

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT (MUSIC) - This microphone business is awfully distracting. Don't we have like a boom mike that could be pointed at people?

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - It certainly is. The problem, I'm told, with a boom mike is that with the PA system on you get feedback and no one hears anything.

PROFESSOR ROY SCHWARTZMAN (THSP) - I would suggest that is things like this that cause us some trepidation in direct comparisons with Research I institutions.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - This was the first try there are other technologies that are out there. We might try some of those in the future. Any other remarks for the good of the order?

X. Announcements.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - I have a couple of announcements. Johnny Gregory will be here at the next meeting. He is the University lobbyist and he will be talking about the University's legislative agenda -- something I know that our administration will be working on. In particular a problem with the way in which the legislature changed the Palmetto Scholarship criteria has arisen. They may need some lobbying on that. Also there will be some discussion in the legislature about how to carve up any money in scholarships between private and public institutions. The private institutions are attempting to get more of that particular pie. So I urge you to come here and participate in the regular business and also in a give and take with Mr. Gregory.

In the December meeting, the Chairman of the Board, William Hubbard has tentatively agreed to appear, his schedule permitting. And, I have every reason to believe that he will honor that commitment if at all possible. So we should have an opportunity for a lively discussion then. That, by the way, is something that doesn't happen very often. I don't know any AAU institutions or Research I institutions where the Chairman of the Board comes to take tomatoes from the faculty. So its a unique opportunity and I think we can learn a lot form it.

No other business before this assembly? I declare this meeting adjourned.