

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 11, 2004

CHAIR JAMES R. AUGUSTINE – Senators, please sit in the center two sections and those who are not senators or visitors please sit in the outer sections.

1. Call to Order.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I call to order the Wednesday, February 11, 2004 meeting of the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina.

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – You have before you the minutes of the December 3, 2003 meeting. Those are also available on the Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections to those minutes? Seeing none I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes as written. Is there a second? All those in favor of the minutes as written say aye. All those opposed? The minutes stand approved.

3. Reports of Committees.

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

PROFESSOR WISE (Retailing) – No report today.

b. Committee on Admissions, Professor Don Stowe, Chair:

PROFESSOR STOWE (Hospitality, Retail, & Sport Management) – I would like to report the following for your information. The Committee on Admissions has been asked to review the possibility of implementing a process of admissions called holistic admission. This comes after the University of Michigan Supreme Court decisions of last summer. Holistic admission represents not only a change in process but would, if we choose to approve it, also represent a substantive change in the freshmen admission requirements to this institution. Our committee at this point in time has not had time to study this process or this change. We find it very interesting as we hope you may. We would like, with Professor Augustine's permission, to put certain links to the Faculty Senate website so that if you have questions, you can review some of the same information we are reviewing. We are in the process of considering this matter, and we would like for you to know that in case you have questions of us or in case you have inputs you would like to offer us. At sometime in the future we anticipate offering informational meetings or perhaps meetings where we seek your input on the matter. Terry Davis, the Director of Admissions is here today and either of us would be glad to entertain any preliminary questions you have on the matter.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Any questions for Professor Stowe?

c. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Gary Blanpied, Chair:

PROFESSOR BLANPIED (Physics & Astronomy) – The committee has for your consideration on pages 22-32 the committee report. We would like to move the College of Engineering and Information Technology, Department of Electrical Engineering for changes in title, prerequisite and description.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The committee has moved number one on page 22 the College of Engineering and Information Technology in the Department of Electrical Engineering with changes in title, prerequisite and description. This does not need a second. Is there any discussion of this motion? All those in favor of this change please say aye. Those opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Number 2 the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management we move just the beginning curriculum from pages 22 to the top of 25. There is a friendly amendment.

PROFESSOR RICHARD CLODFELTER (Hospitality, Retail, & Sport Management) - Ann Swafford is passing a sheet around detailing item C. Program of Technology Support and Training Management with two changes in the material that you have. The first change would be going from eight courses in Liberal Arts to seven and the second change is in making that change requiring CSCE 204.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – There is a friendly amendment being circulated that would be added to this motion. Do I need a second to that amendment?

PARLIAMENTARIAN WANZER DRANE (Public Health) – Yes, you do.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Is there a second to that amendment? Any discussion please on the amendment or question? All those in favor of the amendment to the motion, please say aye. Those opposed no. The amendment passes.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – With the amended report, we move sections A, B, C under number 2 and the curriculum to the top of page 25.

PROFESSOR DAVID BERUBE (English) – Bottom of page 22 under change in curriculum printed in the Undergraduate Bulletin. The current description says “This major in the Department of Retailing....” And, since this is going to be an undergraduate bulletin the proposed one should read: “This major in the Department of Retailing prepares graduates for careers, etc.” They just left off “...in the Department of Retailing” in the proposed language which was in the current language. So I guess it is a friendly amendment from the floor.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Is there a second to the friendly amendment? Any discussion or questions for Professor Berube? It is simply the insertion of the department in the proposed terminology so it will be clear to those taking the course where the major department is for that course. All those in favor of the friendly amendment in the

addition of the Department of Retailing to the proposed terminology please say aye. Those opposed no. The second friendly amendment passes.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – With the friendly amendments, we move from number 2 page 22 to the top of page 25.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The committee has moved number 2 on page 22, College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management; from the Department of Hotel, Restaurant, and Tourism a change in prerequisite; from the Department Retailing a new course; and from the Program of Technology Support and Training Management a change in curriculum which extends down to the top of page 25. Let me ask for a second for this motion. Is there any other discussion just on page 22 to 25 with the friendly amendments that have been added as well? Seeing none all those in favor of number 2 as described please say aye. All those opposed no. The motion passes with the two friendly amendments.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – The committee moves the rest of number 2 from the top of page 25 to the middle of page 28. I think there is a friendly amendment for the prerequisite.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The committee has moved from the top of page 25 to page 28 up to number 3 not including 3. Is there a second to the committee's motion? Okay, now discussion or friendly amendments?

PROFESSOR MARCO VALTORTA (Computer Science & Engineering) – I would like to propose a friendly amendment. The amendment is to add CSCE 204 which is now a required course, as I understand, as a prerequisite of TSTM 352 which is on the top of page 27.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – This was the understanding I had in e-mail discussions on this. The committee was aware of this so I expected it as a friendly amendment to our report.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Is there a second to that friendly amendment? Any other comments or discussion on the motion including pages 25 through the middle of page 28?

PROFESSOR BERUBE – Go to the bottom of page 25 a change in designator and prerequisite, the second from the bottom is from AIME 342 to TSTM 342. I am going to ask if the committee would table that until we can open some discussion. This course is offered in the Business School and offered in the Liberal Arts College as well. The Board of Trustees said we should reduce the duplication and with VCM going in it becomes more important than ever.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Mr. Parliamentarian can we table that little piece of that motion?

PARLIAMENTARIAN DRANE – A table does not need a second.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Okay. Is there any discussion on that? We are just going to table on the bottom of page 25 where it says from AIME 342 to TSTM 342 until that matter can be more thoroughly discussed. All those in favor of tabling this portion of that motion please say aye. Those opposed say no. We are back to the remainder of the motion. Any comments or questions?

PROFESSOR JUDITH KALB (Languages, Literatures, and Cultures) – Quick question. On TSTM 164 is it meant to be “Overview of automation systems...?” On page 25 in the middle.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Yes, thank you. That is a typographical error on both the from and to for AIME 164 and TSTM 164 – it should be “Overview” instead of “Over.”

PROFESSOR WISE – Excuse me Dr. Augustine, could the senators please identify themselves for the minutes?

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Could you please identify yourself? Thank you. So with that editorial change we are back to the motion and the tabling of a small section on page 25, we are back to the overall motion of the items on page 25, 26, 27, and down to number 3 on page 28. All those in favor of those changes in designator, changes in description, changes in prerequisites, as indicated on those pages – please say aye. Those opposed say no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Number 3 on page 28 the College of Liberal Arts, Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures a change in title and prerequisites. To add the cedilla to the title and to change the prerequisites as listed.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The committee has moved number 3 on page 28 under the College of Liberal Arts the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures – a change in title and prerequisites. Any discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion number 3 a change in title and prerequisites on page 28 please say aye. Opposed no. The motion is adopted.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Number 4 College of Pharmacy is from page 28 to 32. There are three typographical errors. One is on the top of page 29 in the Current column the top line the # sign should be a “3.” Page 31 the To: PHRM 578 there are no hours listed and it is going from a 4 hour course to a 3 hour course for Pharmacotherapy II. Then on page 32 in the To: PHRM 661 the word Drub in the title should the b should be a “g” so it is Drug. With those three changes we move number 4.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The committee has moved number 4 beginning on page 28 and extending through page 32, including the three editorial changes, down to the middle of page 32, down to number 5. That includes the College of Pharmacy changes in curriculum as well as changes in course numbers, title, description, prerequisites, credit hours, description, and a deletion. All those in favor of that motion please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Number 5 the College of Science and Mathematics has new courses in the Marine Science Program and the Department of Mathematics.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Any questions or comments regarding that motion by the committee on number 5 the College of Science and Mathematics – the Marine Science Program a new course and the Department of Mathematics new courses. If not, the committee moves number 5 A and B. All those in favor of number 5 A and B please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes. Anything else?

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – The Graduate School has posted guidelines for the syllabus for their courses. So any courses that are 500 and above the people writing those should look at the Graduate School guidelines. If people have questions, they can call the Faculty Senate Office or me to find out what the rules are.

We are going to look at the master courses that were approved in 1997 and 1998. Some of those it is not clear if people wanted to offer those in the fall and the spring and those were not approved for that. So we are going to try and generate a list of those courses so that the departments can put those courses in as regular courses to be approved by the Faculty Senate. Thank you.

d. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Jane Olsgaard, Chair:

PROFESSOR OLSGAARD (Libraries) – No report.

e. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor William Bearden, Chair:

PROFESSOR BEARDEN (Moore School of Business) – For your information the Faculty Advisory Committee approved a change to the content of the Faculty Grievance Committee. We are going to recommend on the agenda for the Spring 2004 General Faculty meeting that in the Faculty Manual we insert the following sentence:

“The committee shall consist of nine elected members (as opposed to six) for staggered three year terms and one ex-officio member from the Faculty Salary Equity Oversight Committee appointed by the Provost.”

We have also asked, and it is already on the Provost and Faculty Senate sites, that the annual report from the Faculty Salary Equity Oversight Committee be placed on those sites for faculty to review if they would like.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Any questions for Professor Bearden? I think that information is also on the Faculty Senate Website.

f. Faculty Budget Committee, Professor David Berube, Chair:

PROFESSOR BERUBE – Our next Budget meeting is February 16th at 3:30 pm. We will be having discussions with the Deans regarding their forthcoming budgets fairly soon. We have called them in before but we simply can't see all of them. If you have any recommendations, you may e-mail them to me (berube@sc.edu).

At our next meeting we are discussing:

- 1) Health insurance for graduate students.
- 2) A surtax on community sales of tickets to public events on campus to assist in indexing scholarships to tuition increases. Community sales of athletics event tickets alone were about \$10 million last year.
- 3) VCM issues.

The VCM Advisory Committee meets regularly. Recently, we have discussed graduate tuition predictions for this year, graduate student assistant abatements for next year, the effect of VCM on service units, and the role it may pay in the hands of the Board of Trustee.

We continue to discuss the “value” element in the calculus. While we view it as an information tool, we are aware others may see it as a planning and budgeting device.

There is little information on the implications of VCM when adopted during a period of “savage” budget cuts or when instituted as quickly as it has been at California. We are aware of that and we discuss it regularly at meetings. Please go to the VCM Frequently Asked Questions page for information:

<http://www.sc.edu/provost/vcmfaq.html> I have been getting inquiries about the Delaware Study and I am having this URL published into the records of the Senate – <http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/dela1.htm> and you can find it there. Also listing a second URL you can get it at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2003161> You can download a PDF file for your examination.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Could you make a few comments about the Delaware Study and how that might relate to VCM or the budget?

PROFESSOR BERUBE – The Delaware Study examines departments and colleges and provides useful information for members of this faculty and any faculty to see how they stack up against departments in comparable institutions. This is the fear I hear about VCM. What happens if we are really inefficient, if we are not efficient, if we actually spend more than we take in? The truth is no department in your discipline may actually be efficient in that way. You may be the most efficient of the least efficient departments in the grouping. So the Delaware Study may provide some solace when you start thinking about the implications, if you are worried about the grievous implications to VCM. You may discover that even though you are not efficient it is not so bad because everybody like you is more inefficient than you are. So that is why the Delaware Study might be helpful.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you. Any questions for Dr. Berube?

g. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Peter Graham, Chair:

PROFESSOR GRAHAM (Sport & Entertainment Management) – The Welfare Committee has two motions to bring forward today. I think you have copies of each in front of you. The first deals with the perennial problems of parking.

The Welfare Committee has received several complaints about illegal parking in Faculty-Staff designated lots. Therefore the Committee:

“Moves to increase penalties for vehicles illegally parked in lots specifically designated for Faculty and Staff during the hours of 7:00am-5:30pm Monday through Friday. Vehicles in violation would be those failing to display a USC parking decal or displaying a decal other than those issued to Faculty and Staff.

The penalties for violation shall be increased to \$50.00 for the first offense, \$75.00 for the second offense, and \$100.00 and immediate towing for the third and all subsequent offenses that occur during an academic year.

Prior to enforcement, appropriate signage shall be in place at each designated Faculty-Staff lot indicating the penalties for illegal parking in the restricted lot.”

We’ve had discussions with Derrick Huggins, Director of Parking and he endorses this. He asked me to bring it to the Senate for your motion and to move it on. We think it is something that will help by putting some stringent penalties on illegal parking in lots that are designated for faculty/staff. Right now the indication seems to be that a number of people who park there consider the \$15 fine, or whatever it may be, as the cost of doing business and we are going to try and make it a little stiffer.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The committee moves on the hand out under parking the motion relative to the increase in fees for parking penalties. Since it comes from a committee it does not need a second. Are there any questions for Professor Graham?

PROFESSOR VALTORTA – I feel that \$50 is ridiculously high for parking violations. I think you could just as well say 3 years in jail. It doesn’t really address the problem in any sensible way.

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – I think the understanding is with the Parking Office and others that this will address the problem. I think if you were a faculty member who was closed out of your lot because of illegal vehicles parked in there, you might think the \$50 was too small a fine rather than too large a fine.

PROFESSOR LAURA FOX (Pharmacy) – Does that change right now the fact that right now at 2:30 pm we can move from one lot to another? Does that change that for faculty and staff?

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – That would not change that because faculty and staff will have a faculty/staff sticker on their vehicle.

PROFESSOR FOX – I would not have a D sticker which is outside my building.

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – We didn’t say specific to the lot we said the faculty/staff sticker. By the way we did discuss the issue of what happens, and we all get forgetful, if we take our vehicle in to be repaired and we forget to take the decal off. We drive

another vehicle onto campus. We get a ticket. Well we are going to work with Derrick Huggins and I'm sure he will work with the Parking Committee. As long as the individual bringing the vehicle on campus in the appropriate lot was legal but lacked a decal for that particular day I think the Parking Appeals Committee will handle that case with discretion.

PROFESSOR CARL BOGER (Hotel, Restaurant, and Tourism) – Hopefully we can get some information out and also post information on the lot because if you don't know about it, they park and get a \$50 ticket, I would hate for them to come back and say like he just said “This is ridiculous.” So why don't we not make enemies to the university by the outside public and in some way get this information out might reduce the animosity.

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – I think we can get it out through the various communication vehicles within the University. I am not sure about the general public at large – except that we included in this motion that there be appropriate signage displayed very prominently so that folks entering the lot would know that the lot was reserved for faculty/staff and what the appropriate penalties would be.

PROFESSOR VALTORTA – I think that regardless of how much publicity you give through University media to this, when the parents of a student who is fined \$50 for parking in a lot would see the ticket, they will become enemies of the University. I think this should be considered and it seems to me again that this is way too much.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Other comments or questions? Are you ready to vote? All those in favor of the motion on parking presented by the Welfare Committee please say aye. Opposed no. The ayes have it and the motion passes.

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – We have a second motion concerning summer compensation for faculty. The Welfare Committee has received several inquiries regarding appropriate compensation for summer work involving advisement for students registered for thesis, dissertation, independent study, or other such activities. After we received these we explored and found that the USC Human Resource has a policy on “Summer Compensation for Faculty” (HR 1.81) states:

"Compensation for teaching, sponsored research and/or other activity performed during the summer months (between academic years), and not related to a regular summer session for an employee whose base period is a semester or academic year, will be at the same rate of pay as for his or her base period for the academic year immediately preceding."

The Welfare Committee believes summer work involving advisement for students registered for thesis, dissertation, independent study, or other such activities for which a student must register and pay for credit should be considered "other activity" under the above.

Therefore the Committee:

”Moves that in accordance with HR 1.81 (Summer Compensation for Faculty policy), a

faculty member with a semester or academic year base period has a right to compensation when a student registers for May or Summer I or II credit hours considered “other activity” (e.g., undergraduate or graduate directed reading, research, independent study, thesis/dissertation preparation). The Faculty Senate requests that the President of the University of South Carolina require all academic deans to assure that the Summer Compensation for Faculty policy, including this area of summer work, will be enforced as of May 1, 2004.”

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The motion comes from a committee and does not need a second. Is there any discussion?

PROFESSOR RIG HUGHES (Philosophy) – Is it part of the Welfare Committee’s recommendation that departmental chairmen will have to find that money from the dean’s office or would it be expected to come from the regular working budget of that department?

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – It would be my assumption that it would be the responsibility of the deans to provide the departments with the appropriate monies needed. My understanding is that dean’s control budget and the dean’s allocate to the departments.

PROFESSOR BRIAN HELMUTH (Biology) – If this were to pass, would this mean we would have to request a release from teaching in order to apply for research grants?

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – That is an interesting question we had not brought up.

PROVOST JEROME ODOM – It is an interesting question. As you know, you can pay yourself in the summer from research grants and most of the time when you are doing that you are advising graduate students and supervising thesis and dissertations. In most cases, I think this policy says that if you are teaching you are provided 7.5% for one course, 15% for two courses. I posed the following question today at the Steering Committee – Let’s say a faculty member is teaching one student in a 3 hours dissertation course – does that mean that individual will be paid 7.5% of his or her base salary? Peter answered that from the Welfare Committee’s point of view – no, that would not be the case. This is to be worked out with each dean independently, and I would think that if a person had research funds for the entire summer that you can pay yourself actually up to 33.3% if you can pay your entire summer salary on a daily basis. I would assume that if a person were being paid that much they wouldn’t also want to be paid for teaching in a dual compensation or overload manner. I think again that this has to be worked out among each of the deans in the colleges, Peter.

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – I agree.

PROFESSOR OPAL BROWN (Nursing) – Has there been any dialogue with the academic deans about this policy?

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – At this point no, there has not been. This is a policy that has been in Human Resources right now (HR 1.81) I am unsure as to whether all colleges in fact are complying with it.

PRESIDENT ANDREW SORENSEN (Epidemiology & Biostatitics) – When I was a P.I. on NIH grants and I was occasionally paid 100% from the grants for summer work. It was the expectation of the NIH that the students who worked with me on those grants for credit for thesis supervision was an integral part of my research activity. So I would submit that it would be inappropriate to have that expectation from the NIH and then have the University be expected to pay people for teaching on top of that 100% support from external funding source. I would appreciate if the committee could clarify that.

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – Well we can bring it back to committee and certainly bring it back to the Senate. My thought would be that it would be the discretion of the deans in a situation of that nature to deal with individual cases.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – As long as it is held in the view of the NIH that is not violating an NIH policy, otherwise you are in trouble.

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – We will have to put some exclusive language in that. We can bring it back if that would be your preference.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – It is up to you.

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – Well we want to make something that is compatible with them as we don't want to have any problems.

PROFESSOR KATHERINE CHADDOCK (Education) – The deans currently have to sign off on dual employment. So I would assume that a dean would understand not to do something that the NIH was funding at 100% and did not want.

PROFESSOR SORENSEN – I would hope so.

PROFESSOR CHADDOCK – And, I would hope that that would happen that way. We were hoping that also the deans would have a key role in determining how the compensation formula worked. I would hope that they did not determine that a person with one credit hour of 899 got paid 7.5%. I have the confidence in the deans that I know that this would not happen. That they wouldn't accidentally sign off on dual comp that should not be signed off on and they wouldn't have formulas that were truly bizarre in their colleges.

PROFESSOR DAVID COWEN (Geography) – The logistics of the summer – all the money that a department receives for independent studies and thesis/dissertation hours goes into a pot of money that then a department chair (I am Department Chair of Geography). I then hire instructors from that pool of money. If there is any profit left after that, then we divide that with our deans. So the independent study and the thesis and dissertation study is part of a pot of money that has to be utilized to compensate people who are teaching regular classes. If you don't make enough money there is no money left to pay people who might be doing an independent study or thesis or dissertation hour. It would be a very difficult thing to logistically handle. It all becomes part of a pot.

PROFESSOR BOGER – My other concern is that we have to very careful to keep this flexible enough because some department’s graduate program directors oversight that in the summer because many faculty are not on the campuses. But, we do not pay them 7.5% as we pay them a stipend to be the graduate program director and to cover those costs. So what I hope is that we can keep some flexibility. I think your concern is that Faculty is not being compensated.

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – I’d like to think, Carl, that that was the assumption in within the motion that the dean in fact will be making those decisions. One college can be quite different from another.

PROFESSOR BOGER – It needs to be. Thank you.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Other comments? Call for the question. All those in favor of the motion for the policy regarding summer compensation for faculty please say aye. Those opposed say no. Let us have a show of hands if you don’t mind. All those in favor of the motion please raise your hand. Opposed please raise your hand. Our eyes are better than our ears, Mr. Parliamentarian. The motion passes. Peter, anything else?

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – No that is it. Thank you.

h. University Athletics Advisory Committee, Professor Robert Williams, Chair:

PROFESSOR WILLIAMS (Library and Information Science) – For several months the Athletics Advisory Committee has been studying the issue of athletics reforms that is being dealt with by a number of institutions around the country. Jim Augustine went to a national meeting on this issue last October and then came and talked to the committee. The committee has studied the issue, considered it, and agreed to present the following motion or recommendation to the Faculty Senate:

“The University Athletics Advisory Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate endorse the spirit of the framework for comprehensive athletics reform published by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) and actively participate in ongoing discussions on athletic reform by appointing a representative to the COIA. Further we recommend that Jim Augustine be appointed to represent the Faculty Senate at these discussions.”

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The motion comes from a committee and does not need a second. Are there any questions or discussion?

PROFESSOR WILLIAMS – While you are thinking, let me just say that the “framework” document and several other documents regarding this have been available on the Faculty Senate website for at least 2 or 3 months.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Are you ready to vote? All those in favor of the motion from the University Athletics Advisory Committee regarding the joining in spirit of and endorsing in spirit the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics and appointing a

representative to that group, please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes. Anything else Professor Williams?

4. Reports of Special Committees.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I am not aware of any reports of special committees.

5. Reports of Officers.

PRESIDENT ANDREW SORENSEN – Thank you very much Professor Augustine.

Welcome back! The Horseshoe was eerily quiet during the break between semesters. There was no difficulty parking, Professor Graham. But I missed all of you. I like very much the spirit of community, the traffic, nods, and greetings I exchange walking about the campus and I am delighted that you are back. Some of the students have expressed to me that they have somewhat limited enthusiasm for returning. One student suggested to me yesterday that we should have classes only four days a week because he found he was having difficulty recuperating from the weekends on Mondays.

I hosted a breakfast this morning for the Speaker of the House of Representatives, David Wilkins from Greenville; the Speaker ProTem, Doug Smith from Spartanburg; Bobby Harrell from Charleston, Chair of the House Ways and Means Committee; and several heads of committees dealing with education, generally, and higher education, specifically: Harry Stilley and Ronnie Townsend. We had a good discussion. I had invited all of their staff and several other representatives were there as well to thank them for their support. To my mind the most single accomplishment of the Legislature since I became president July 1, 2002, was the passage by the House last year in the Spring of 2003 of the so-called Health Sciences Bill by a vote of 84 to 10. It was killed in the Senate by a filibuster on the last day of the legislative session, but then passed last week in the Senate by a vote of 32 to 10. There were three people who were especially instrumental in securing the passage in both the House and the Senate. If you happen to run into them you may choose to thank them for this bill, several of whose provisions I will discuss with you momentarily. They are: David Wilkins, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Bobby Harrell, Chair of the House Ways and Means Committee; and Senator Hugh Leatherman, who is the Chair of the Finance Committee. Each of those three men was particularly instrumental in securing passage of the bill.

The three provisions that are most pertinent to the University of South Carolina are the following:

(1) They endorsed a one-half percent increase in the bonding authorization for the three research universities and the 10 four-year public universities. The estimated \$250 million is to be divided in the following way: \$220 million is designated for the three research universities, and a total of \$30 million would be divided among the 10 four-year universities three of which are parts of the University of South Carolina, namely: the campuses at Aiken, Spartanburg, and Beaufort. That \$30 million would be divided according to a formula. There was sentiment among some of the four-year institutions that they should get more of that money than the \$30 million and it was a zero sum

model. So every dollar that went to the four-year schools was a dollar that did not go to the research universities. That did not gain sufficient momentum to be passed. The stipulation of this money is that it be used only for the construction of new buildings and that the buildings be designed to house researchers whose work can be directly linked to stimulating economic development. Working with Provost Odom, Vice President Pastides, and Vice President Kelly as we construct these new buildings, we plan to have people who are working in fields in which their research is highly likely to stimulate economic development move there. When they move out of the facilities they currently occupy, this would make available space for others of you who are in fields that are vitally important to the University but in which we can't demonstrate the direct stimulation of economic activity according to the criteria that the Legislature has defined. Then those of you who are in crowded quarters, as most of you are, then can move into those buildings that are vacated. So the domino effect should have a serendipitous benefit for all the faculty throughout the University. I have spent a lot of time recently visiting companies whose research interests are such that they would like to work intimately with our faculty. For example, I visited a pharmaceutical company in San Diego, California two weeks ago whose president is very interested in working with our molecular biologists.

(2) The second provision of this bill that is of particular interest to us is granting us regulatory relief to circumvent some of the incredible restrictions of the state procurement code, so that we can in fact have for-profit companies engaging in arrangements with us to build buildings on our property that this pay for. The combination of the money and the regulatory relief was really remarkable. However, a stipulation of the bond money is that we have to match dollar for dollar with outside sources. So we don't get any of the money unless we match it with money from other sources.

(3) Third, an amendment was attached to the Senate bill by Senator Phil Leventis from Sumter to make Sumter a four-year campus. It has been alleged in many quarters that I am opposed to Sumter becoming a four-year campus. That is not true. I have stated very clearly in three separate letters to Les Carpenter, who is the Dean of the Sumter Campus, that I am supportive of Sumter becoming a four-year institution. But there are several criteria that have to be met before I will propose that to the Board of Trustees. The criteria are very explicit and have been endorsed enthusiastically by the Board of Trustees. So as soon as Sumter meets those requirements, I will be happy to forward that proposal to our Board of Trustees.

There is some discussion of the possibility of a tuition cap. I am in favor of keeping increases in tuition to a minimum. I have encouraged and stimulated our Student Government Association, which is represented here today by Vice President Zachery Scott, to engage in lobbying with the other institutions throughout the state to work to persuade legislators that we need to have the state invest in all of education, whether it be in kindergarten or in PhD programs and everything in between. But we cannot have the state continue slashing out budget and then saying we are going to cap tuition. I have explained to you before that even when we have dramatic increases in tuition they don't even come close to offsetting the amount of cuts that we get from the State Legislature. I continue to hold out the hope that we will be able to offer a salary increase to faculty and

staff during this coming legislative session, but if they cap tuition and at the same time slash budgets, I can guarantee you that won't be possible.

I want to thank all of you for your diligent work in research. Our revenues from grants and contracts, for the first 6 months, are up over last year which was a record year. They are especially up in the NIH and NSF grants. So for those of you who do NIH funded and NSF funded research, I thank you very much for that dramatic increase. Giving to the University is also up. Last year was the highest year ever for non-capital campaign year. We had \$53.7 million in gifts last year and we are currently ahead of last year I am hopeful that we will have continued success in that respect.

I proposed the research campus to the Board of Trustees exactly a year ago this week. I am pleased that tomorrow we will be presenting to Board of Trustees, a Research Campus Foundation Board that will enable us to be more nimble in responding to these high tech companies and entities that are based on knowledge revolution. When these CEO's come to us and propose deals, they want to be able to move them along very quickly. We need an entity that can respond very nimbly and give them the regulatory relief that we trust is eminent. In this Life Sciences Bill we hope to be able to accommodate that. I have spoken to several people who have agreed to serve on the Research Campus Foundation Board and I will be presenting their names to our Board of Trustees tomorrow.

There has been considerable concern expressed on the part of members of the Board of Trustees about admissions policies. We hired the firm of Noel Levitz, a firm that is nationally recognized for expertise in enrollment management. The conundrum I face is this: on the one hand, I am very much concerned to make the University of South Carolina accessible to all South Carolinians without respect to gender, race, age, or academic background. But at the same time, I am also desirous of having the University's academic reputation enhanced. This is our dilemma: a lot of the people to whom we wish to give access aren't particularly talented as measured by grade point averages and SAT scores. Yet if we are going to raise the reputation of the University, one of the ways – admittedly a simple minded way that US News and World Report assesses excellence - is by the average SAT score of the incoming freshmen and the kind of academic honors that they bring. So how do we deal with both of these simultaneously? Noel Levitz will present a report to us giving us some recommendations. I will share those with you after I have received their report tomorrow.

The Provost search is moving along nicely. There have been quite a few candidates who have responded to solicitations and committee is going through those diligently. I was informed that there is a rumor that I have a secret candidate and I am just waiting for the committee to sift through all of these names and then I will present my candidate. That is absolutely untrue. I have not spoken to any member of search committee about any candidate at all. I don't have a nominee. I don't have a friend waiting in the wings for me to bring her or him out and be introduced to the search committee. I have not met with the committee since I charged them with a search and I don't expect to meet with them again until they had me an alphabetical list of three top candidates of their judgment. I have supreme confidence in their ability to attract really outstanding candidates and I am confident they will present an outstanding short list.

Finally, I would like to invite you to a reception for Burnele and Brenda Powell, Burnele is the new Dean of the Law School. It will be at 5:30 pm this evening in the Capstone Campus Room. If you are able to attend, my wife and I would be delighted to see you there. Are there any questions about anything I've said or neglected to say?

PROVOST JEROME ODOM – Thank you Mr. Chairman. Let me follow up on one thing that Andrew mentioned about tuition cap. The Governor's budget caps tuition at the higher education price index. Last year that was 2.5% and we anticipate it will be about the same this year. Two days ago the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Higher Education recommended to the full committee that it be HEPI again the price index plus \$250 as a cap. If that were to stick, that would be a maximum of a little bit over 11% tuition increase that the University could level if it felt that it were necessary. We will, of course, wait and see (as the President said) what kind of budget cuts we think we will get from the Legislature. We are hearing more encouraging news about that and hopefully we are hearing that we might not suffer double digit budget cuts that would start July 1, 2004. We will have to continue to watch that.

Another area that we are watching very closely primarily for Peter Graham and the Welfare Committee are any bills that would effect our faculty and staff directly. Right now there are three bills dealing with the TERI program that are in the Legislature. One which was in committee last year and did not come back out but now has resurfaced has to do with the fact that if the House and Senate should vote to end the TERI program and the Governor signed it, it would end immediately on his signature. The second bill has been introduced by Senator Greg Ryburg from Aiken and several others and that would end the TERI program. The last day to enroll in the TERI program would be June 30, 2004 so the last person coming out of the TERI program would be June 30, 2009. The third bill that was introduced yesterday is a bill that would basically cease the double payout of annual leave that people accumulate. That does not effect most of the faculty who are on 9 month appointments but it does affect our staff at the University. The annual leave payout would not occur when you retire and enter the TERI program but it would occur when you leave the University at the end of whatever time period up to 5 years you decide to leave. There is a joint resolution that has been offered that would let people who are retired and this would include people in the TERI program on a one time basis and a 2 month window to change their option. Right now there are 3 different options that a person in the South Carolina Retirement System can take for how their retirement pay will occur. This would allow a person to make a one time change in that option. We will continue to monitor that and talk to Peter and the Welfare Committee about that.

We would like to call your attention to the fact that tomorrow and Friday there will be a joint Board's retreat on the campus including the Board of Trustees, the Educational Foundation Board, Development Foundation Board, Research Foundation Board, Business Partnership Foundation Board, and the Alumni Council. These are all people who are very good friends of the University and we try to use this day and a half to educate them on challenges and opportunities that are facing the University at this time.

Let me tell you some good news. We got a letter recently from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in their December 2003 meeting they considered our second follow up report to our site visit a couple years ago and no further follow up is required so we have successfully passed our SACS reaccreditation for another 10 years.

I am chairing the search committee for a Dean of the new College of Arts and Sciences. That committee has now been fully constituted. Each of the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Science and Math elected three members. Liberal Arts elected Davis Baird from Philosophy, Nina Levine from English, and Thorne Compton from English and the dean's office. Science and Math elected Bob Thunell from Geology, Colin Bennett from Math, and Vicki Vance from Biological Sciences. In consultation with the President we have added three additional members: Rosemarie Booze from Psychology, Valinda Littlefield from History, and Cathy Murphy from Chemistry and Biochemistry. Our first meeting is at 8:30 Monday morning – this coming Monday. The President will charge the committee. We have an ad ready to go The Chronicle and other venues so we will start immediately. I would like to appeal to the faculty to please pass along names of any potential candidate either to any member of the committee or directly to me. I think most people understand that these advertisements don't usually turn up the kind of people you are looking for. You have to be very proactive and you have to go after those people yourself and we will do that.

One other dean's search – Public Health – Larry Faulkner, Dean of the Medical School is chairing that. That committee has started receiving applications and are currently reviewing applications.

One of the things that I am a little bit concerned about right now is that this is the time of year when we solicit nominations for faculty awards. This year for some reason and I really don't understand why nominations have been slower and they have not been coming in as fast or with as many. This is particularly true with Russell Research Awards in various areas. So I would urge you to talk to your fellow faculty members, to the chairs of your departments and urge them to nominate your best faculty for the awards. Right now with the possibility of no raise again, this is really the only way we have of recognizing and honoring our best faculty. So please help us with that.

I attended a meeting fairly recently of Southeastern Conference Provosts and we have another meeting coming up. We are doing this at the urging of the Presidents of the Southeastern Conference. We don't hear very much about academics with the SEC and the provosts would like very much to change that. So we are going to be discussing ways that we can enhance the academic life in the SEC and I would particularly like to encourage you to give me any suggestions you have for ways that we might do that. I am very excited about this and hope we can move forward with some academic incentives.

Finally, I think the Senate would like to know and certainly the full faculty would like to know that one of the problems, one of the challenges, that we have faced for some time at the graduate level has to do with stipends and benefits. All of us know that we pay low stipends and we pay essentially no benefits to our graduate students. That really hampers the quality of our students. The stipends are something we are still

wrestling with and we are hoping that through the VCM process, through the grant process, and other ways of generating money that we will be able to address stipends. I plan to appear before the Educational Foundation Board tomorrow to ask them to ask them for \$100,000. I will appear with Harris Pastides next week to the Research Foundation Board to ask them for \$100,000 to help us offset some premiums for health insurance for graduate students. We anticipate that that will probably cover about 20% of the premium. That is not nearly enough, but it is a start and we will continue to work on that. Hopefully we will be able to offer our graduate students reduced health insurance premiums. This will be graduate students who hold assistantships. That is where we will start.

I will be happy to answer any questions. That completes my report. Yes, Marco.

PROFESSOR VALTORA (Computer Science & Engineering) – Jerry, I notice that all of the members of the Search Committee for the Dean of Arts and Science are from the two colleges that are to be merged. I think that normally when you have a search committee like that you have some external members. I am wondering why that is not the case here?

PROVOST ODOM – What I wanted to try to do was to keep this committee fairly small and as active as possible. The larger the committee the more cumbersome it is. That is why we tried to follow the rules as much as possible and that there be a majority of elected members from the unit and the unit will be the merged colleges. So it will consist of those two (Liberal Arts and Science and Math). There were six elected members and I count as one appointed member and that meant we could appoint three maybe four more members. It was my decision to stay within the college on this one. Have a small committee, nine members plus a chair and try to work as hard as we could, be as quick as we could and move forward.

PROFESSOR JERRY WALLULIS (Philosophy) – With regards to the TERI bills, I believe that at the same time TERI was introduced that retirement became a 28-year system.

PROVOST ODOM – That is correct.

PROFESSOR WALLULIS – When they are putting forward these bills are they also changing the 28-year requirement?

PROVOST ODOM – No it is 28, Jerry.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED (Physics & Astronomy) – The question of course duplication, the committee looked at it last year and we decided that our committee could not address this. That this should be done at the deans and provost level and this matter that was tabled today there is no action item that we can do to untable it without the Provost's Office acting.

PROVOST ODOM – The Provost's Office will be happy to be involved. This has been something we wrestled with earlier with Rob Wilcox, who was the previous chair. He actually convened a committee to look at course duplication and talk about it. It really

has to be handled through Curriculum and Courses from the Faculty Senate – that is one place it has to be handled. It has to be handled between the deans and it has to be monitored from the Provost Office level. We will do that, Gary, and I will work with you on this particular one.

PROFESSOR DAN SABIA (Political Science) – Jerry, I also want to go back to the TERI. You said you were monitoring the legislation. Does the University have a position on it either pro or con? I ask the question because I assume and you can correct me if I am wrong, that the University doesn't particularly like TERI but its employees do. So I am wondering what the University's stance is.

PROVOST ODOM – That is a good question. We have not discussed taking any stance on this. There are a number of things that I don't think are right about it. One is double payout. It is really a double dip with respect to annual leave. I think being paid once for annual leave is enough. The other thing that I consider to be something of a problem is that this is totally the employee's decision. The employer has nothing to say about it pro or con. That has been discussed in the legislature but there is nothing that has been put forward about that at all. So we really have not taken a stand. I try to keep up with the number of faculty and staff who have TERI'd for planning purposes. Right now I am reviewing chaired professorships and it is interesting that the Carolina Distinguished Professorship, which is the number one professorship on campus, I think, the number one endowed chair. There are 27 of those currently in existence. Eleven of those 27 have TERI'd and will leave the University by 2006. I can just look down the list and I can see an incredible amount of institutional memory and institutional history that is going to leave this University within the next three years. I think the University needs to be concerned about it, but we have taken no stand.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Provost Odom and I have reviewed this situation and it profoundly saddens me. We are losing some incredibly talented people for whom TERI is an incentive. However, we choose not to try to get in the way of those people deciding to leave, but we are losing some remarkably talented and wonderfully gifted faculty members as a result of this program.

PROFESSOR SABIA – It was my understanding that TERI was designed to keep people on longer not to get them out quicker.

PROVOST ODOM – Yes, but let's talk about faculty. For faculty there is no mandatory age that you have to retire, so you can go on forever. If you TERI and it is financially, I think, to most people's benefit to TERI – then that says that at the end of five years you are gone. So it actually is placing the University with respect to its faculty, its human resources, at a disadvantage.

PROFESSOR COWEN (Geography) – Jerry, an administrative issue with respect to the TERI plan also is that one can sign up for it at any month they wish to. For example in the middle of an academic semester and when the clock comes we can figure out what to do about that. When somebody's month is the end of March and they come in and say, "Goodbye I won't be back next year."

PROVOST ODOM – Yes and that is one of the reasons we try to monitor this for planning purposes. Some kind of arrangement has to be made and basically it falls on the chair to cover that course in whatever way he or she can do that.

PROFESSOR COWEN – Well I only care because I'm TERI'd.

PROVOST ODOM – I understand that. I wasn't going to say that.

PROFESSOR WALLULIS – But didn't you perhaps unintentionally also give an argument in favor of supporting TERI? Because if we do not have an incentive program, will you also have to have from the University side an incentive program for retirements if you want to do the sort of planning that you wish? And will that not also come out of the University budget?

PROVOST ODOM – Well we did an incentive program in the early 1990's I guess after the Future's Committee and it really ended up costing the University so much money that I don't think we would be able to consider that any time soon with our current financial condition. What I am saying is there would not be an incentive program otherwise.

PROFESSOR WALLULIS – We can work on forever like you said.

PROFESSOR COWEN – The salary compression issue is just the most severe for at least the department chair, if there is anyway we can address that. When we are hiring young new people it is the only opportunity that we have and we have to have a competitive wage for that.

PROVOST ODOM – I understand that is such a big problem all over the University. In some areas interestingly enough, full professors who leave we cannot hire an assistant professor with a full professor's salary. That shows you how bad things have gotten. It really is a problem. Andrew Sorensen has asked Rick Kelly and myself to sit down and try to bring to him some way of offering raises or bonuses or something to faculty and staff but, David, we did this three years ago if you remember and it was 1%. It is such a small amount to be able to see if we can even do that because we have to eat it out of our own money. Basically the tuition right now is the only new money we have. We cannot continue to gouge the students or continue to increase tuition so much to pay our faculty. But, that is where it has to come from. It is a real dilemma. Thank you.

6. Report of Secretary.

PROFESSOR WISE – I do not have a report.

7. Unfinished Business.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I am not aware of any unfinished business.

8. New Business.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Any new business to come before the Faculty Senate.

PROFESSOR KALB (Languages, Literatures, & Cultures) – Quick question – I do not know if this is the time to bring it up but some students and colleagues have asked me about this. Where the construction is being done near the Senate Street garage and Pendleton Street garage, the lighting that was there has been removed and going past it at dark is like going across a desolate wasteland. A lot of people are finding it alarming and I am wondering whom I should address to try and get fixed.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Judy, I will talk to Rick Kelly about this.

PROFESSOR KALB – It is where that new construction is going on near the Senate Street garage and they took out the light. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Thank you for telling me.

9. Announcements.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Under announcements, I want to introduce Marsha Cole the Executive Director of the Carolina Alumni Association.

DIRECTOR COLE – Thank you Professor Augustine and thank you to everybody for staying. I will be brief. I wanted to tell you about a program that the Alumni Association has just launched and for which we would like your support. With the President and Provost both talking about how important the actions of the legislature are to the future of our University - I know you are well versed in that topic and with the Alumni Association funding program to involve alumni, faculty, and friends of the University as citizen advocates for University related issues. We call it CAN which stands for the Carolina Action Network. We CAN make a difference for Carolina's future if we get involved. And, who better than the educated people in the State of South Carolina to talk to legislators about the important role that our University plays? One of the really elegant things that we have done as part of this project is to create a website that you can visit. Let me introduce Shelley Dempsey she is a graduate student in the Business School but also a full-time member of the Carolina Association staff who is in charge of this program working very closely with Johnnie Gregory and our members who work with the legislature. So Shelley is the person in charge and any questions can be directed to her. Her contact info is on the card she will hand out. It has our web address on it. We would ask each of you to come to the website and register.

What you can do at this website is really quite elegant. For instance Dr. Sorensen has mentioned 3 members of the legislature we need to be thanking. There will come a time later when we will also need to be hammering (I guess) upon legislators who need to know that we elect them and that we care about the decisions that they make. The website will make it very easy for you and for alumni and other friends of the University to do that. You go, you join, and you receive the newsletter which will keep you up to date on the key issues that we are tracking in the legislature, tell you what is going on with them. It will tell you which legislators can make a difference in a particular issue. It will send you a quick e-mail news alert that we need you to talk to someone right now about something. Should that happen as we go through this legislative session, you will

be able very easily to do that. If you don't know the legislator you are interested in talking to, you can look them up right on the site and click on them and there is their e-mail address. We will have bullet points, talking points for the issue that we are interested in. We will also have pre-written and descriptive e-mail messages that can be sent. Our lobbyists tell us that every one of these makes a difference and the more there are the better.

Now if you do this, please do register but please remember to do this from your home e-mail address and not to use your "sc.edu" when you do this. Actually we will be watching for that and we will get back in touch and we won't sign your address up if it is "sc.edu." That is why the Alumni Association is the perfect place to do this because we are not using State resources to lobby the legislature. We are using private dollars do to that. So when you join us come to us from your home e-mail and we will get you involved and it will be very easy to participate.

On March 24th we are going to have Carolina Day at the State House. We are going to try and reach across the entire State to bring people up during the legislative session, when the House is in session – there will be 126 House members waiting right there for us. We are going to walk over there in force after a little orientation on how to do it and what to say. We are going to let our elected officials know that we are here, we are in number, we know what is going on, we are paying attention and we vote. We will support them when they support the University. Now we are into the present legislative session and we hope to make an impact this legislative session and we are also in it for the long run. So the building of relationships with legislators, helping them with legislative issues if they need help. From an alumni point of view we are asking them to attend their fund raisers, contribute to their campaigns, introduce them to friends, help them so that when we call upon them to help us they will remember why they should do that. Carolina Action Network (CAN). You've got the website or just go to www.carolinaalumni.org . Sign up please from home. We hope to have an impact this year.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – What about the rally, are they going to be invited to the rally?

DIRECTOR COLE – Absolutely, you are invited. You just sign up but you do have to register in order to attend.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Tell them what it is the rally. Do you all know about the rally?

DIRECTOR COLE – Didn't I just say that? March 24 we will be at the State House we are going to gather at the South Trust building, we will have an orientation. Johnnie Gregory will tell us how to do this. We will walk over together to the State House, meet the members of the House who are in session. You can also go over and visit Senators in their offices at that time. We will reconvene with Dr. Sorensen back at the South Trust building afterwards to talk about what has happened and what our next steps will be. March 24th it starts at 9:30 in morning you will be out by 1 pm.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – And, I am paying for the lunch from private monies. Please if you have a class that is convening during that time, don't just dismiss this class and march them en masse over to the building because I will hear about that from one of the legislators.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Marsha. Are there any questions?

Are there any other announcements or is there anything for the good of the order?

PROFESSOR WISE – I would like to announce that the USC Phi Beta Kappa lecture will be will Thursday, February 19 in the Rare Books Room of Thomas Cooper Library. There will be a reception following the lecture. Dr. John Spurrier will speak on “Learning What Different Groups Consider Important in Teaching.” I invite you to attend.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Professor Wise. Anything for the good of the order or announcements?

10. Adjournment.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I will entertain a motion to adjourn. Second? All those in favor say aye. All those opposed no. We are adjourned until March 3, 2004. Thank you very much.