

## **Faculty Senate Meeting**

**December 3, 1997 - 3:03 p.m.**

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - I will call the meeting to order. We are very fortunate to have the Chairman of the Board of Trustees with us. It is unfortunate that we won't have the President and the Provost with us.

### **I. Correction and Approval of Minutes.**

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Are there any corrections to the minutes?

PROFESSOR GLENN HARRISON (ECON) - On page 13, I'm misquoted as asking, "what is the correct thing to do?...." I was asking for the chair's guidance on the issue of support for the private and public schools. The correct statement is, "which is the correct thing to do?"

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - On page?

PROFESSOR GLENN HARRISON - Page 13. As you see from your response, I was disagreeing with you.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - So, "which". Anything else? Approval of the minutes. All in favor say aye. Opposed. Minutes are approved as corrected.

### **II. Reports of Officers.**

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Reports of officers. We are pleased to have Chairman William C. Hubbard who will give us a brief address and take comments.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAM C. HUBBARD (USC Board of Trustees):

Don, thank you very much. I appreciate this opportunity. This is the second time I have had the privilege of appearing before the Faculty Senate and I will make some remarks today and then, I would like it, if the schedule permits, to open the discussion for questions and answers. I hope you will not hold back or be shy about asking me whatever is on your mind about the direction the University is taking.

I want to start by calling to your attention an article that I read just a week or so ago in the September/October issue of a magazine, Trusteeship. The title of it is "From the Ivory Tower". It was written by Michael Hooker, the Chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

"Universities today face a skeptical public reluctant to invest scarce tax dollars. Taxpayers rightly demand what they are getting for their money. Public universities like mine exist for one reason only - to serve the public. But how do we gauge results? A typical academic response might be to conduct a research study. I suggest the answer is much simpler. Climb down from our ivory tower and ask how are we doing and how can we serve you better.

When I returned to UNC as Chancellor in 1995, I found the University dramatically different from the one I attended nearly 30 years ago, when it basked in our citizens' respect. In recent years that image has faded. Words like "arrogant" and "aloof" crept into conversations about UNC. Those who most frequently made such claims were our own legislators, the people that we depend on for nearly a third of our budget. Those feelings, some bordering on outright hostility, were eye opening, and I spent my first year trying to change that impression. While I was successful in our state capital, I realized my outreach had to extend much further."

The article goes on to say that Chancellor Hooker then decided he should "hit the road" in the state of North Carolina, and, over the course of a year, he went into all 100 counties in North Carolina in the same fashion that UNC President Frank Porter Graham stormed the state of North Carolina fifty years before in support of public education. Another example of outreach that he described was taking 26 new professors on a week-long bus tour that provided a crash course on North Carolina and its culture. It even talked about those professors who for the first time in their lives had tasted barbecue. Chancellor Hooker said, "This past year changed my life and how I look at my University." Then he noted that although he had completed his 100 county tour, his work had just begun. Now it was time to put the lessons that he had learned to work. He said public university leaders should beware of lobbying care packages over the walls of the ivory tower without asking people what do they really need? He said, "Hearing directly from taxpayers is strong medicine. As a result of my visits around the state I am committed to translating the lessons I learned from the people of North Carolina into changes in how my university carries out its most important mission, serving the people."

I believe that there is a strong message - a strong lesson in the message of Chancellor Hooker. All of us are guilty, including myself, of often wringing our hands about the lack of public funding for our programs. But we have to move beyond that. I think we have to do two things at once to be successful at this University. We have to do more with our current resources while at the same time seeking to increase public and private support. We must also reconnect in a positive way to the public that we serve.

You all know the three missions of the University: scholarship, teaching and service. But I think that service is the component that we often forget and, if we haven't

forgotten, I am afraid that we have transformed it in a way that activities that we may consider service are really not true service in the sense of the mission of the University. I serve on all sorts of committees in all sorts of places, including my law firm and at the University, and I question sometimes whether that kind of service is the kind of service that Chancellor Hooker was talking about and the kind of service that we ought to be thinking about.

There is no doubt in this room and among your colleagues are the best and brightest citizens in the state of South Carolina. So the question in my mind is, are we, as the best and the brightest, doing everything that we can to make progress in the state of South Carolina, to advance the state every single day? Are you among those faculty who go into the public schools and share your special talents and expertise with school children who aren't exposed on a daily basis (because of lack of funds or for whatever reason or demographics) with cutting edge ideas and technology? Are you among those on the faculty who provide consistently balanced and useful information to the policy-makers of this State? Do you go out and speak to service clubs and civic organizations about the importance of what you do in your speciality as well as the importance of higher education in general? Do you on the Medical School and Nursing School faculties do what you can to help with indigent care in South Carolina? And, do those of you on the faculty of the Law School do what you can do to promote pro bono services to the poor? These are questions that I think we need always to ask ourselves. Another component of that -- it goes back to the internal part of it -- are we doing the best that we can by our students every day -- the people that we serve? Do you care deeply about whether the students' lives are ennobled? Do you think about whether or not the spark in every student is lit? Do you welcome and encourage questions after class or do you send signals that you are in a hurry or that your schedule is tight and you don't have time to respond to that particular question?

I think that we need to find a way to find the time to make a difference. We work so hard at this enterprise because we are trying to make a difference. I think we all -- as trustees, administrators, and faculty members -- all need to work to do a better job. I think that this time in the life of the University presents a unique opportunity for us to take the whole institution to another level. We are very fortunate that we have a Provost and a President who have vision, who work hard and, importantly, have integrity. I know from my very private and candid conversations with both the President and the Provost that they believe in you and all of your colleagues, and they believe in the concept of faculty governance. They believe in the contributions that you can make to your students and to society.

I believe that we have a Board of Trustees that better understands its role as a policy-making body. It is more responsive to the academic needs of this institution than in the past. We have made a lot of progress on the Board in the last decade, and I think

we are fulfilling our role as we should. We, as a board of trustees, and administration, and I am grateful to say, as a faculty, now all embrace and accept the idea that we have to have higher standards across the board. I am very grateful to the faculty for raising admission standards three times in the last

five years. I am very grateful for the work of the Blue Ribbon Task Force that looked at tenure and promotion standards in an effort to make sure that those standards are rewarding those faculty whose efforts justified promotion and to come up with standards that treat faculty in different departments across the institution in a fairer ways.

The Board and the administration are supporting very strong efforts to gain more public and private support. I cannot tell you the number of hours that are devoted not just to trying to get a few more dollars from the legislature, but the efforts that are being made as we speak to gain a substantial increase in our endowment through private support. Many people are working extremely hard to provide you with the resources that you need in order that you can be the best that you can be. But it takes all of us working together. What I am asking today is that we all work together and just do a little bit more even in such simple tasks as being a little bit more prepared for class, thinking more about mentoring and advising of students, trying to change a life because it may be your only opportunity to make a difference in that person's life. Perhaps that student comes from an environment that has not been conducive to exposing that student to a new cutting edge idea or technology or something in the arts or music. You can open the world to that student.

I want to encourage you to talk to your neighbors. We have to do more to build grass roots support for higher education. It is a team effort. It takes all of us making that contribution. We have to quit talking just among ourselves if we are going to get the kind of support that we need. And I think that if we work harder, and if we try to work smarter, we can make a difference not only in this institution but in the lives of our students and in the state as a whole. I think we can make a difference, and I think we can have fun doing it if we approach it with the right attitude and we work harder at this enterprise. I think you're all leaders. You wouldn't be here if you weren't leaders.

I want to close with a quote from the Europeanist, Jean Monet, who declared, "I regard every defeat as an opportunity." I think that is something you have to look at. We have to change the way we look at obstacles and not look at every bump in the road as something that justifies our not trying to go to the next level. I think we have to change our whole approach to the way we look at problems that we face as an institution and look for the opportunities in those problems. I think when you go to a dean with a new idea that you think is going to be the greatest program that can be developed and it can help your students, you should not just take "Well, we've never

done that before" as a response. Ask why we can't do it, why we can't be more responsive, and why we can't change. I think we have to change. We can't accept the status quo and get where we need to be.

I invite all of you to work with the administration and the Board in an effort to take this University to a higher level of excellence. I appreciate all that you do. I know that you all could be doing different things with your lives, but I think this is a noble effort. I commend you. I will be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Do you want me to intercede, or can you handle it yourself?

MR.HUBBARD - I can handle it. Yes, sir..

PROFESSOR CHARLES MACK (ART) - I was at UNC about 30 years ago and it was generally despised about the state -- it was called "Commie Hill" as Jessie Helms used to put it.

Aside from that are you serious about discussion here? Do you really want to open discussion?

MR. HUBBARD - Yes, that is why I am here.

PROFESSOR MACK - I guess I can sum everything up by "mixed signals." The sort of service

you describe is the service which is talked about but is not highly regarded in the general process of promotion and tenure here. You talk about service to the state. I agree with you that is very important for a state institution, and we are funded by the state. But I think most of us are encouraged to think about contribution to the profession, a contribution to the greater international university than to what we can be doing locally to raise local South Carolina standards. This is "mixed signals". This sort of going out and talking to citizens' groups, going into the schools, that is the sort of thing that doesn't appear on a vitae and it is not going to be looked at in the tenure decisions. What is going to be counted is professional service to one's discipline. The sort of thing such as professional talks at various professional societies; not going around and raising the standards of the state. I think that is unfortunate, but the signals are certainly mixed. Our administrators may talk a lot about the kind of service that you describe but I don't think we are encouraged to do it. In fact, it is just the opposite. Service has been discussed. Administrators have said we are to make sure that it is professionally related. It is not going out to public schools. It's a dichotomy.

MR. HUBBARD - I don't think they are mutually exclusive.

PROFESSOR MACK - I agree with you but we are told essentially that we are wasting our time.

I am speaking very frankly -- wasting our time when we should be devoting ourselves to professionally elevating the institution into the ethereal realm of the AAU and that type of thing.

MR. HUBBARD - Well, I think we have both responsibilities and I don't think they are mutually exclusive. I am sorry that those signals are there and if you are discouraged from raising the state while at the same time contributing to the scholarship in your speciality - I think that's wrong and we need to get a better balance.

PROFESSOR MACK - I am not discouraged but I am not concerned about tenure and promotion. I think younger faculty members are getting a very different message.

MR. HUBBARD - Well, I appreciate your alerting me.

PROFESSOR JAMES FRASER (CRJU) - I don't have a question. I would just like to associate myself with Charles's question, if only to keep from leaving him all alone. I think it is fascinating what you just said, in contradiction to what we have been hearing at this University for years.

MR. HUBBARD - Well, this is fascinating to me that you have been told that public service is not worthwhile. That is very instructive.

PROFESSOR GLENN HARRIS (ECON) - I disagree that we have mixed signals. However, perhaps there is a point of clarification needed here. When you talk about service, you seem to restrict it to the state of South Carolina. I think that is the sense in which it may be misunderstood. In Business Administration we undertake considerable service, but it is very broadly defined geographically and it doesn't only include professional service per se.

MR. HUBBARD - There are a number of things that we can all do tomorrow. Things that we could go out and start trying to accomplish in a very small way. But, when you multiply those small steps by the number of faculty that we have, it can make a difference. None of what I said was meant to imply that we should not be doing what we need to do to make this University visible on a national and international basis. That's obviously where we are trying to go with this institution. I am just saying that

we need to give some consideration to getting the kind of public support that we need and deserve. I think we are going to have to do more on the grass roots level as well. We just can't do the kinds of things that you are doing in the Business School on an international level to the exclusion of trying to develop the grass roots support that we need for higher education. I don't think we can get where we want to be internationally if the people back home don't understand what we are trying to accomplish and why we are trying to do it. We know and we understand that our citizens are not going to be able to compete unless we have international standards and international class programs. We have to get there but we have to make that connection as well. We have to communicate better and show that what you are doing in the Business School is going to provide opportunities for the students and the people in South Carolina. We have to reestablish those connections.

RICHARD HUDSON (MATH) - I would like to echo the sentiments of those two gentlemen. Just looking back at my career: When I came here I felt the pressure to get tenure so I published and tried to teach well all the various things. At some point I felt like there was some point in my life that I needed to do something for society, and I really got involved in the Boy Scouts. It got up to 40 hours a week service and I won the Silver Beaver and all those other things. A scholarship was presented in my name. The scholarship which is at the University. Four young men have matriculated from it. I got to carry the Olympic Torch because of that. When I went to talk to the people in my department about it -- they said "Well, that's nice but it doesn't really count. It is not professional service." It's something. It's there. It's nice. It makes no difference as far as salary is concerned. Now I find myself back to doing a lot of research, and every time I meet somebody from Scouts who says to me, "Gee, what are you doing in scouting?" I have to tell them "No, I am back to doing professional things. I'm not involved in scouting anymore. Didn't leave it for that reason, but I really miss it because I felt like what I did there was more meaningful, at least as meaningful, as anything I have done professionally.

MR. HUBBARD - My remarks today were devoted to one component of the University's missions -- the service. I am not trying to imply that the other missions of the University are not important. I am just saying that the service mission has been neglected, and I am disappointed to hear that those parts of service element that would allow us to get broader based support for the mission of higher education are not appreciated.

PROFESSOR HUDSON - Michael Mungo, is he still on the Board?

MR. HUBBARD - He is.

PROFESSOR HUDSON - I saw an article in the paper about some of the things he has done. He gives money to people. There was a neighbor he helped that was a paraplegic. That kind of thing helps the University change the image. Plus as you said before we need to make life more noble and not just think about promotions and so forth, but how to make things better. When your 52 it might not matter so much, but when you're younger it sure makes a difference.

JOHN SPURRIER (STAT) - Two weeks ago Representative Stille wrote an editorial in the State newspaper portraying us as people who don't work very hard and are over paid. I don't know who he was talking about because the faculty that I know work very hard and compared to Research I universities are underpaid. Does the Board or the administration plan to respond to Representative Stille's editorial?

MR. HUBBARD - I think we do respond. We counter a lot of those allegations directly with members of the General Assembly on a daily basis. We do not need to start engaging in some sort of verbal warfare that is still not going to get us where we need to be. To often, I think, the University bears the brunt for all of higher education in South Carolina because we stand up and fight on a lot of these issues. You are certainly free to respond. I am not saying the University won't respond to that particular piece but we have been responding to a lot of those allegations for a long time by providing lots of information -- reams of information -- both to the General Assembly, Representative Stille, his committees, and the Commission on Higher Education. It does not go unanswered. We try to be selective about the forum in which we respond and the manner in which we respond.

RICHARD CONANT (MUSC) - Actually I think we did strengthen the component of service in

the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines that we just passed a couple of years ago. Indeed in the Music School we are in the process of doing that now -- strengthening the service component. Frankly, I always thought that service was appreciated.

MR. HUBBARD - Any other questions?

PROFESSOR SHIRLEY KUIPER (BADM) - It just strikes me that perhaps we need another reporting mechanism because we typically report research and we typically report service to the profession and things of that nature. I think if we had a different reporting mechanism you would probably find that the faculty has in fact contributed substantially to the community in community service projects of one sort or another. I think the work that I do for my church but is related to my expertise is a community service. But that kind of thing is not ever reported anywhere. Perhaps the Board should ask for a comprehensive report of that nature and I think you might be



surprised to know how much is being done and that should also be made public to the community.

MR. HUBBARD - That's a good idea. Good point.

BARBARA AINSWORTH (PUBH) - I just wanted to say that I really appreciate your remarks.

Sometimes it is frustrating to hear your remarks because we feel really pulled to be a Research I University, so we are told we are not doing enough to make sure we are there, and then we are pulled to be better teachers. We are told that we are not doing enough to be good teachers. It is just really hard to try to live up to the best standards of all of that.

MR. HUBBARD - I appreciate that and I didn't come to this lightly. I thought about what should be the message today. I get frustrated when I see people in the community and policy-makers that truly don't understand the role of higher education and how hard faculty members work and the contributions that they make. I am seeking to stimulate some discussion and get some dialogue going on that issue. We need to look at our tenure and promotion requirements with that in mind then. If we need better reporting on what is actually done in the University, the administration needs to do a better job of publicizing those good works and then we need to look at that. But I don't want to leave the impression that I think that somehow we need to relegate our scholarship efforts and our teaching efforts to the service component. The message I am trying to convey is that we can all do more. I know that is not necessarily the message you want to hear because the typical response is I am willing to do more -- pay me to do more. That is the typical response in my law firm and it is around most people that I know. People always need to be rewarded for their efforts and if they perceive that their efforts are somehow related to their vocations or to their professional lives, then there ought to be compensation for that. I believe in rewards and compensation but I just think that we all need to just look at ourselves, including me. Am I doing everything that I can to help make progress in this state and am I doing everything I can make a student a better student. I think we can all do a better job.

BARBARA AINSWORTH (PUBH) - I am speaking for myself, and I think I can speak for many of my colleagues. I think our reward is being able to teach and do research and service at the University of South Carolina.

MR. HUBBARD - That is noble.

PROFESSOR CHARLES MACK (ART) - I would like to echo that. I don't think the monetary rewards are a consideration, or I don't think many of us would be doing what we are doing. Despite the representative's comments about the high salaries, my department is obviously out of whack with his figures. My concern originally was that I am afraid there is an issue not of reward but of penalty. I am afraid in many ways, that doing the kind of service that you're describing has penalized us. And I do think actually the revisions in the tenure and promotion--the strengthening of the tenure and promotion--although it has included service obviously it is not in any first place or second place or third place. It is well down the list. So I think it is more penalty that I am concerned about. I think most of us work an extraordinary amount of time. I calculated it several years ago and my wife was horrified when she found I was correct. I think we put in the time and we do the work so that is not the issue. The issue is penalty.

MR. HUBBARD - Any questions? Any comments or questions? Are we where we should be with technology?

ALL - No.

MR. HUBBARD - I saw George Terry over there and I just left a faculty meeting and had an earful about technology and the need to coordinate the efforts to upgrade our technology.

So, George, I just wanted you to know I have been to a committee meeting and have gotten an earful on that.

PROFESSOR KARL HEIDER (ANTH) - We have at this moment two visions of the future floating in front of us -- one is the AAU vision which President Palms has spoken of so often and so eloquently. Another vision that we see bearing down on us is the performance criteria and which we don't really know what that involves. Do you have a sense that these going to be complementary to each other or are they going to tear us yet in different directions?

MR. HUBBARD - I think performance funding is complementary to AAU status. It gives us an opportunity as a major research university to get the kinds of funding, to get the dollars, that we need to take us to the next level. Obviously there are going to be political battles over what the criteria are and how you weigh those criteria, but I think we are on top of it. I see it as the best chance in the last decade or two to get a higher percentage of public dollars. So in that sense I think it is going to be an opportunity for us instead of something that is going to keep us from getting to AAU status. The whole focus of it is to reward performance. I do think this institution performs better than many of our counter parts in the state. We must continue to raise

our standards across the board. Those are the kinds of things that are going to be rewarded under performance funding.

PROFESSOR KARL HEIDER (ANTH) - Very specifically this is in fact what we were talking about. AAU doesn't want a university that is spending 40 hours a week doing service.

MR. HUBBARD - Well it's all a question, Karl, called balance and it is question of trying to do more -- maybe we can do more than one thing at a time. Maybe we can take on more than one task in a day. Maybe we can do some research and occasionally go to the Kiwanis Club and talk about anthropology. I don't think it is mutually exclusive. I think we can do more. I think I can do more. I think the Board of Trustees can do more and do better and the administration can do more and do better. And, I think, these faculty members can do more and do better. I think it is going to take a team effort to get us to the next level. I don't think we can count on somebody to come in here with a dump truck of dollars unload it and say "Go for it!" It does not work that way. Our systems are going to have to be better. We are going to have to have new technology. We can work more efficiently and effectively. We are going to have to go the extra mile. That is the point that I am trying to make.

PROFESSOR SHERYL RUSSELL (NURS) - I am 2 1/2 years into my tenure track -- attempted tenure track -- and it has been made painstakingly clear that my ability to achieve tenure rests almost exclusively on funding. That the teaching is the expectation, and that we need to put in between 60 to 80 hours a week to be able to get that funding initiated and launched. That leaves little time for much else let alone community service. That's what new faculty are hearing.

MR. HUBBARD - I've heard it a lot today. Are there any questions about any other subjects?

PROFESSOR GREG ADAMS (LAW) - You talked about us working harder but you also just a minute ago mentioned working efficiently more effectively. I was thinking about the relationship of this faculty to the University administration and trying to remember how many times I have had someone in the University or the Law School administration say to me, "What can we do to help you do your job more efficiently?" "What kind of support can we provide you?" "What kind of assistance?" I wonder if one of the fundamental problems of this University is the conceptualization of the relationship between the administration and the faculty and whether we shouldn't be focusing on how do we get to the point of working smarter rather than working harder in order to be able to accomplish more.

MR. HUBBARD - My challenge to you is to ask your students what's beneficial about this course, what are you getting out of it, what works and what doesn't so that you can be a better teacher. Chancellor Hooker went around and asked how can the university serve the public better? The job of the dean is to find out how that dean can serve the faculty better: how that dean can find the resources to allow you to be the best law professor you can be. That's the dean's job.

PROFESSOR GREG ADAMS (LAW) - I think it has got to go higher in the administration. That attitude has got to be pervasive throughout the University.

MR. HUBBARD - I think that attitude is essential if we are going to succeed. I think it has to be bottom up. I think the communication needs to flow in both directions and there has to be a lot of discussion and a lot of collaboration if we are going to achieve the goals that we have set for this institution. We are going to have to improve communication. It is difficult for me to imagine a successful enterprise if we don't have the bottom up type of communication that is essential. So you are on the front line -- you are the teacher who is in the classroom with the students and you know what is working and what is not working and what tools you need. That has to be communicated consistently to the administration. Now there are channels obviously. You couldn't every time, Greg, that you come up with a new idea, call us and say put this on your to do list. There are ways to accomplish that so that everybody can work through these channels and work in an effective way; but that opportunity ought to be there to present itself in this University.

PROFESSOR GREG ADAMS (LAW) It is encouraging to have you here today. We really appreciate it.

MR. HUBBARD - I have learned a lot being here. Any other questions or comments?

PROFESSOR MIGUEL GONI (GEOL) - I have also been here two years on my tenure track. Two years I have been here I have never heard any one asking "how can I make your life easier?" Never, never.

MR. HUBBARD - Well that is the staff's job to make your life easier. And you make students' lives better.

PROFESSOR MIGUEL GONI (GEOL) - The challenge is that as we get the sort of rewards that we ask for, we are also able to support our staff. I see myself as trying to be AAU or whatever that is by doubling my research. Who is going to be able to administer the extra proposals unless you have somebody who really believes that this is a job worth pursuing and that they are getting rewards from it. It seems to me that just asking ourselves to become AAU members is only going to create friction and

frustration that at least several of our faculty members I talked with have experienced -- we want to do better but we can't do it alone. There is no support of the administration people who are working in the offices of the various departments. They have to be also brought aboard in the same sort of exciting picture of the future that I think we all hear. I don't know if the people back in the departments are hearing that.

MR. HUBBARD - Well, that's a good point. We need to work on that. Because you cannot succeed unless all the people that are in the enterprise understand the role. You can take it down to the mail room. If the people in the mail room don't understand that the University is trying to get AAU status and that we are all trying to redouble our efforts, then there has not been effective communication. It has to be all the way down. And, it has to come up as I was responding to Greg.

PROFESSOR BRUCE DUNLAP (CHEMISTRY and BIOCHEMISTRY) - You are fully aware of the travails that this institution has gone through in the last 10 years. I wonder if you might comment on what your view of the public's perception is for this institution?

MR. HUBBARD - I think the public's perception is a much more positive perception than it was, obviously, 10 years ago. I am gratified by what I believe to be exponential improvement in the public's perception. I think we put some of those bad times behind us more rapidly than I ever thought we would be able to. I am very encouraged by our ability to move past some of those travails. One thing I've often expressed to my friends is my hope to see us go 10 years, a decade, as an institution without any real stumbles. I am not sure we will be able to do that but I think we handle our problems in a better way now. I think we handle those problems with integrity, with dispatch, and with firmness. I think we all learned a lot about how not to bleed to death drop by drop. If you have a problem, you get to the source of the problem, you resolve the problem and go on to something else. That keeps you from getting bogged down in these quagmires of public relations problems that truly set the University back. If you are in a damage control mode, then you are not moving forward. It is a distraction. It is a drain on your human talents and resources. That's why I support getting in there and solving the problems so that you can keep your eye on the goal, the AAU status -- the raising of the University to the next level. Thank you very much.

APPLAUSE.

CHARLES MACK (ART) - Thank you for being here and for your comments.

MR. HUBBARD - If you will invite me back, I'll come again.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Thank you very much. I might say I don't think that any of us are unwilling to out to the schools and do these things. What I hear the faculty saying is they don't feel secure in their ability to do that and spend that time and not have it somehow come back against them if they are not doing something else. It is not an unwillingness. It's a lack of opportunity to do that or recognition that that is part of what they should be doing.

#### **IV. Reports of Committees.**

A. Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Professor Sarah Wise:

No report.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Richard Clodfelter:

I present for your approval the grade changes presented on pages 24 and 25.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Are there any comments or questions about any of these changes? The committee report does not require a second. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. It carries.

C. Curricula and Courses Committee, Professor John Winberry:

PROFESSOR WINBERRY - The report of the committee can be found on pages 26 through 38 and I would like to request the approval of the Faculty Senate. I would like to divide the report into two parts. The first part, pages 26 through 32. That is Roman numerals I through V.

One clarification, on the bottom of page 26, the word "Delete" should be next to the section on Cognates which are underscored. The College of Journalism is seeking to remove any cognates and replace it with Minors.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Any questions or comments? All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. Motion carries.

PROFESSOR WINBERRY - On pages 33 through 38 which really technically does not require any Faculty Senate action but we would like the approval of it. It is a series of courses related to May Session. On the bottom of page 37, there is one change from the Mathematics Department, change MATH 500 to MATH 400M, a May Session course.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - But there is not for approval is that right? This doesn't require Senate approval.

PROFESSOR WINBERRY - I don't know, to be honest with you.

PROFESSOR CARL EVANS (RELG) - On pages 36 and carrying over on 37 is a May Session course, RELG 503M. In the committee's work to fashion a description out of a syllabus unfortunately some phrases were put together that result in some historical distortions. So I would respectfully request the deletion of the phrase on the top of page 37 which reads "the era during which the biblical events unfolded." If we delete that phrase, the rest of it will make historical sense.

PROFESSOR WINBERRY - I am in Geography so I know where to go but I'm sorry I don't know much more. With regard to the descriptions these are what will appear in the course schedule and with the Registrar's approval I am sure that these can be modified considerably. So there should be no problem about that. I will take care of it.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (CSCI) - I would like to raise a concern with MART 490M, Web Site Development.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Which page are you on?

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN - Page 34, about three-fourths of the way down. I am not raising concerns about the content of the course, but I am concerned about the title and description. They are much too general from what I can understand will be done in this course.

I could easily identify a dozen units on this campus who could legitimately offer rather different courses titled "Web Site Development," and I think any such course should reflect its discipline specific nature. I don't think this one does, and I don't think that is a good precedent. I understand this is a Maymester course and it is not going into the Bulletin, but it does go into the Schedule of Courses. I think it would be appropriate if the title and description were changed. I am prepared to make a motion. I would propose that the title and description be changed to reflect what I presume to be the media arts nature of the course, for example, to Media Arts in Web Site Development.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Do we have the proponent of this course?

PROFESSOR MALDEN MILLCEVIC (ART) - I agree. I really see no problem with anything that is stated here but can I have some time to think about a more appropriate title that would satisfy you. I cannot come up with a title on the spot.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - What is the title?

PROFESSOR MALDEN MILLCEVIC - I don't see what is the core of the problem. Do you think that that belongs to a certain domain or discipline?

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN - No, I do not. I do not have any problem with the content of the course which my department chair had the opportunity to look over. What I am saying is I don't think it would be useful to the University to have possibly a dozen courses all with the same name doing rather different things. I think this gives the wrong impression outside the University and to its students. But what I think you do in the Media Arts is going to be different than what we would do in Computer Science in terms of web sites.

PROFESSOR MALDEN MILLCEVIC - But that describes through the content of the class.

For example, what do you think of computer music being offered in the Music Department?

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN - They offer it.

PROFESSOR MALDEN MILLCEVIC - But do you know what they do, they do some heavy problems in C++ which is the domain of your department. You don't object it because it is applied to music. You have nothing to do with it.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Excuse me I don't think the objection is to the course, it is simply a description.

PROFESSOR MALDEN MILLCEVIC - The description clearly says what we do. We don't do the HTML source. We do what you see is what you get. Okay, which is totally different thing than what you should be doing in the Computer Department in writing the source. So what we do is an application and the application is more province in media arts than anybody else in this University.

PROFESSOR JAMES FRASER (CRJU) - It's possible this conversation could go on longer than the course.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - What is the time frame for getting for getting this published?

PROFESSOR WINBERRY - Through January. Check with the Registrar.



PROFESSOR WILLIAM STANLEY (GEOG) - It seems we have a parliamentary question here. The proposal was made and went through the proper committee and one person objects. If the majority objects then the proposal should be rehashed. If one person objects then move it on.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - We need a motion and a second.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN - I believe you said it could be presented in January.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - The problem is there is no January meeting. We are meeting February 4th of the Senate.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN - I said I would be prepared to do so, and perhaps it would be acceptable to move that Media Arts agrees to change the title and description to reflect the Media Arts nature of the course.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - There is a motion to have the Media Arts Department change the title and description to better reflect the media arts content of the course. Is there a second?

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - There is a second. Is there any discussion? Hearing none I will put the motion to a vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed - no. Division.

All those in favor raise your right hand. Total - 30. Those opposed - 30. The motion fails.

MARGIT RESCH (GERMAN) - Isn't this presented for the information of the Senate and not to a vote?

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - There is a parliamentary question about the status of these courses whether or not they come before the committee or the Senate. In any event, anybody can make a motion to delete one.

PROFESSOR MLADEN MILLCEVIC - Web Site Development in Media Arts.

APPLAUSE.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - That's it.

PROFESSOR GLEEN HARRISON (BADM) - That's not service, right?

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

No report.

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

PROFESSOR WILCOX - Our report to the Senate is on page 39 and the pages that follow in the materials. We have conferred from time to time with the University Computer Committee and we have prepared some comments to the proposed revisions to the computer policy. We have our comments prepared for submission to the Provost. On behalf of the Welfare Committee. I present them to the Senate and move that the Senate endorse our response. In summing up what we are trying to do here, there are several different policy proposals that have been made. For Policy ACAF 7.07, we don't really have a recommendation because that deals with cost recovery. The main one that we were concerned about, DLIS 1.06, deals with software licensing and we have some proposed replacement language that we would submit to the Provost. I don't think there will be a problem with that change being accepted. That is one that we have spoken about at some length with the Computer Committee. Also ACAF 7.06 deals with data security. There is no objection to data security and there are some very valid concerns behind this policy to ensure that there is not corruption of the University Data System. What we have, however, is some specific language in that policy that we are not certain will be widely followed. We feel that the University could well be creating a policy that will be largely disregarded, particularly dealing with passwords security. If at any time someone else, a supervisor for example, asked to use the password of a subordinate, which we think would be quite frequent in many usages in academic departments, you would have to go through a process of changing the password. We think it would be largely disregarded. Rather than have a policy that would be largely ignored, we recommended that the University go back and get a little bit more information in consideration of how these computers are used and we think that this was a policy that was created without a broad consideration of the realities, and we just ask that that be reconsidered -- perhaps with multiple security levels depending on different usages and types of use. Those are the two major concerns. The third dealt with really what was inventory control, which is in a form here that we perceived as essentially an unfunded mandate. It was to send some inventory control to the departments -- stuff that had been previously been done by the central administration. This would have the result of putting those burdens and costs on the department. We felt it was better just to continue the current policy. There seems to be a little ambiguity between what people say the current policy is and what it appears to say in writing. We would like that clarified. So those are the gist of our recommendations to the Provost and our motion is to seek the Senate's endorsement of those recommendations.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - You have heard the recommendation. Are there any questions or comments?

PROFESSOR ANTHONY ROSSINI (STAT) - stated he would like to modify the Faculty Welfare Committee's recommendation regarding the proposed policy DLIS 1.06 such that

the sentence "It is the policy of the University of South Carolina that all software utilized on University owned equipment must be properly licensed and that all conditions of the licensing agreement be observed." be changed to read "It is the policy of the University of South Carolina that all software utilized on University owned equipment must be properly licensed or in the public domain, and if licensed, all conditions of the licensing agreement be observed."

PROFESSOR WILCOX - I have no objection. I don't think the committee would have any objection to the addition of this language if the motion would be made. Since I this is a committee motion I don't feel I can simply accept the change. But it is consistent with the intent of our recommendation as the whole.

PROFESSOR ROSSINI - I'm not a senator.

PROFESSOR GREG ADAMS (LAW) - I move that amendment to the language.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - It has been moved. Is there a second?

? - second.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Is there any discussion on the amendment? All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. It passes. Are you ready for the motion as amended?

All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. It passes.

PROFESSOR WILCOX - I might add with regard to the computing process that we are aware of several other computer policy issues that are going around. One is dealing with web pages. There have also been some concerns expressed to the committee about the University computer technology in general. You have heard the reference from the chair a few minutes ago. We had raised those questions with him. There is concern that Macintosh users are being squeezed out. There is some concern that hardware is not being replaced. Software is being upgraded and hardware is becoming inadequate. There is general concerns with a lot of these issues. One of the aspects of that is whether we will continue to handle that through various committees

that exist or whether we really need a more formal computer policy committee that deals with or perhaps some other form of -- maybe it is not a committee -- but some other form of handling of that and we are going to have to look at some of these issues in the near future.

A couple of other things to bring to your attention. A question was raised sometime ago for us to look into the copyright problems on distance education where you are using computer graphics and that sort of thing and the fact that they cannot be broadcast then through a distance education class. We contacted the University Counsel and I received back the response that we expected to receive and that is that the problems that are encountered are a result of the United States copyright laws and not internal university policies. There is some thought that these laws may be changed, the Copyright Act is now under consideration for amendment and a lot of that will deal with these type of issues. We have responded on behalf of the faculty, recommending that, if there is no active lobbying effort in this regard, and the University initiate one in this regard, because it is a concern of a number of faculty.

A third thing -- just to give you some information we had received a question about parking. We are not the parking committee and we don't want to be the parking committee but we know that parking affects the lives of faculty so we requested some information. We may have to think what we are going to do with it now that we have got it. But for those of you who have found it harder and harder to park on campus I was interested in looking at the assigned parking places figures. The figures are a little outdated because it is my understanding that they are August figures and parking decals are apparently issued throughout the year. In 1997, there were 3,535 assigned faculty and staff parking decals. 1,556, nearly half, of those were Z stickers which means that nearly half of faculty and staff get a hunting license and nothing more. An additional 500 were H stickers. So the two largest categories of stickers were not any of the lettered lots. They were Z stickers and H stickers. The D lot has oversubscription of about 70. It is 100 more than last year and in some of these cases, I don't quibble with the over subscriptions. They have done it to prevent moving more of us into the Z lot. The E lot has 153 more than there are spaces available. That is up 109 from last year. So if you wonder why it is harder to find parking on campus I think that tells us a little bit. The place to be is apparently either in the L lot or the G lot. There are fewer of those taken. I point this out because we have had some discussions with parking and I think things are going to be changing on this campus. I've often wondered when parking will change. I think the slow process has already begun to move, more and more peripheral parking and eventually that will lead us at some point to paying for parking on campus. I don't know that that is going to happen immediately. I think that is pretty clearly the direction it is headed. I think these numbers suggest that that is going to be one of the solutions. We have made clear to

Parking at the very early stages in discussions -- and they are very friendly discussions with the parking management people at this point: If you are going to do that, you have got to put in something that is equally convenient. If you can't find a parking place on campus, it may not be hard to be equally convenient in the future. This is viewed as one of the job perks here to have campus parking and if you are going to move it off you will have to add a transportation system which is extremely efficient and one of the first things we have had to do is begun to educate as to usage of our own cars. So this process I think has already begun. I just wanted to alert you to that. We are looking at it from the prospective of Faculty Welfare but we felt that we needed some faculty input into the parking process and I just wanted to give you that information.

PROFESSOR MYHRER (PHYS) - Outside here in the D lot, the handicapped parking has expanded quite dramatically over the last year. I observed over the last couple of years that there are a lot of seemingly very healthy people jumping out of those cars with handicapped stickers.

PROFESSOR WILCOX - You know I have run across that for a very long time, but before I am too critical, I remember that a lot of times they are not people with obvious handicaps. We may think those are healthy people but they have reasons. I think we rely on handicap stickers being issued with legitimate backup, but I am not prepared to say what the process is or that there is not a gray market for handicap stickers. Obviously if there is abuse I think the parking people would take measures to stop it. It is not just for someone with a cast on his leg.

? - Sometime ago there was a motion to deal with the dial-in phone capabilities to the University computer system and I have noticed just recently about, 4 or 5 weeks ago, we have information that one can purchase dial-in capabilities for about 180/up or so. I noticed that Clemson Web Page has a number of telephone numbers and for faculty it is free. Clemson students pay the same technology fee of \$50 that our students pay. So the question is: Why our Computer Services Division cannot offer this service as Clemson can?

PROFESSOR WILCOX - I said there were several computing questions on the table. That is one that is actually one that has been brought to us and probably will go in the hopper of things to look at. The dial-in capabilities is one of the issues.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Would you like to comment on that?

GEORGE TERRY - We have increased dramatically the number of lines that people can dial in free, but unfortunately there are not enough lines in the world that can satisfy the 32,000 users of our computer systems. One of the solutions was to get an

outside provider but that is awaiting the recommendation of the ACITAC committee as to who should be the outside provider for those who live off campus. One of things that will alleviate the dial-in situation is the fact that we are wiring the dorms now. So we have about 6,000 or 7,000 students who will be accessing directly to the Internet.

? - But where can you find the telephone number?

TERRY - They are listed in the Bulletins.

? - They are not on the web page of the computer system?

TERRY - The Bulletin comes out every month.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - By the way, we are ahead of Clemson as far as our parking is concerned. I read their discussion in their Faculty Senate Minutes, and our parking situation was represented as unlimited free parking. They thought that was wonderful.

C. Committee on Admission, Professor Jim Burns:

No report.

D. Committee on Standards and Petitions, Professor John Lopiccolo, Chair:

No report.

E. Academic Responsibility Committee, Professor Kenneth Gaines, Chair

No report.

F. Faculty House Board of Governors, Professor Robert Beamer, Chair:

PROFESSOR BEAMER - As probably everyone knows by now the Board of Governors of Faculty House has decided unanimously after much discussion to enter into contract with Marriott to manage Faculty House. This does not mean that the Marriott is taking over Faculty House. What this means is that we are hiring them as managers. There is a number of reasons why we are doing this. No. 1 is that we are losing money and our profitability is going down pretty fast. If we don't do something to turn it around, then we are going to be in trouble.

The other is there has been a lack of service, complaints both among you folks here and also on our Board of Governors itself we have heard complaints. So by bringing

Marriott in they are professional expertise they will be able to maybe improve the service. I do know they are going to standardize it. They will have manuals that are being provided to our staff and these will be adhered to. The way this will work is that our current staff will be in place for 90 days and hopefully for longer. Then Marriott is over that. We are over Marriott. So that is the way this thing works. They are not coming in and taking over the whole thing. It will be managed not as a food service. It will be managed as a freestanding club, and they are managing clubs including faculty clubs all over the country as my letter to you folks that you should have received yesterday stated. That's about it right now. We will be bringing other proposals as to how we can turn this financial situation around so that we can keep our Faculty House. Any questions?

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT (MUSC) -

Several of the past chairs of the Faculty House Board of Governor have met to discuss these and other developments regarding Faculty House. After finally being "briefed" by various parties, most -- I think even all -- of us, support this action. However, I have to admit that I find the following aspects at least mildly upsetting:

1. We never received the report submitted by the special committee that reviewed the operations of Faculty House.
2. We, of course, never received the response to that report that was made by the Faculty House Board of Governors (penned by then Chair Peter Becker).
3. While we realize there are some financial and political "imperatives" here, as well as well as some personnel issues, the Senate as a whole should have been apprised of this course of action.
4. It was disconcerting to find that more than one of the Faculty House Board members did not know it was a "done deal."

Even before this development, a number of us were concerned that the Board of Faculty House was comprised predominately of individuals who--however nice and capable they are--do not really utilize the facility. We believe that this situation needs to be rectified--that is, at least, as it relates to the Faculty members elected or chosen to serve. Of course, I've already related some ideas to you on that, Bob.

Incidentally I very much like Marriott, the job they do, the way they do it, and the people who make it happen. I do have confidence that they will give it their "best shot" AND also actually keep those individuals who are doing their job the way they should be! I also trust that the University will take care of the sole individual there

that actually works for the University.....and, again, in case you've forgotten by now -  
- I do recommend that the Senate support this action.

PROFESSOR BEAMER - I thank you for your comments and your support. I do want to make a few comments here concerning one or two things that you said. First of all, I was not aware that we were to report. That came under another administration over there. But we would be happy to do so in the future. The second thing is that I don't know who you are referring to that did not know that this went on because the entire Board of Governors discussed this and the entire Board of Governors voted for this unanimously so I don't know where your facts came from on the other. But thank you very much for those comments, Richard. Any others?

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Were you making a motion?

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT - I don't think that is necessary.

## **VII. Unfinished Business.**

None.

## **VIII. New Business.**

PROFESSOR SARAH WISE, SECRETARY - We would ask that the Regional Campus

Senators **call** the Faculty Senate Office the day of the Senate meeting to indicate their attendance as we have had some problems getting the attendance records of the Regional Campus Senators.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Okay all you people out there send us a letter or a postcard.

PROFESSOR INA RAE HARK - Speaking of attendance I have not seen an attendance sheet yet today.

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - There is one circulating.

## **IX. Good of the Order.**

CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - Go to the Faculty House. Join now.

## **X. Announcements.**



CHAIRMAN WEDLOCK - The next Faculty Senate meeting is February 4th here in the Law School.

Meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.