

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
April 29, 2004

CHAIR JAMES R. AUGUSTINE – Senators please sit in the two center sections and those who are visitors and non-senators please sit on the outside.

1. Call to Order.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I call to order the meeting of Thursday, April 29, 2004 of the USC Faculty Senate.

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – You have the minutes before you and they are also on the web. I will entertain a motion to approve those. It doesn't need a second. Are there any additions or corrections? We all recognize the fact that the attendance sheet is duplicated back to back so half of you do not know if you were here or not last time. I apologize for that. We will correct it and post it on the web. Any other additions or corrections to the minutes? If not all those in favor of the minutes as they are printed please say aye. Opposed no. The minutes stand as written.

3. Reports of Committees.

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

PROFESSOR WISE (Retailing) – The Faculty Senate Steering Committee places in nomination for the two-year vacancy on the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions the following: Andrew Graciano (Art) and Kenneth Phillips (Nursing). Nominations will be taken from the floor at this time.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – So we have those two nominees for Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions and we will entertain other nominees from the floor as we move along through the meeting. Those nominations will be closed at the end of the meeting. Anything else Professor Wise?

PROFESSOR WISE – That is all at this time.

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

PROFESSOR STOWE (Hospitality, Retail, & Sport Management) – No report.

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

PROFESSOR BLANPIED (Physics & Astronomy) – The committee has for your approval on pages 21-32 nine different sections. We move number 1, Moore School of Business changes.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – A motion from the committee does not need a second. Number 1, on page 21 from the Moore School of Business has a change in prerequisite, corequisite and description. Are there any comment, or questions? If not all those in favor of number one on page 21 please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – We move number 2 in the College of Education, Department of Educational Leadership & Policies the changes listed there.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The motion comes from a committee and does not need a second. Number 2 on page 21 in the College of Education, Department of Educational Leadership & Policies proposes changes in title and designator. Is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor of this motion number 2 please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Number 3, the College of Engineering and Information Technology, Department of Computer Science and Engineering has changes as listed there.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The changes as listed here on pages 21-22 in the College of Engineering and Information Technology, Department of Computer Science and Engineering - changes in title and description. The motion comes from a committee and does not need a second. Is there any discussion? Seeing none all those in favor of the motion please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Number 4, College of Hospitality, Retailing, and Sport Management, Department of Hotel, Restaurant, & Tourism has some new courses.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The committee has moved item number 4 on page 22, College of Hospitality, Retailing, and Sport Management, Department of Hotel, Restaurant, & Tourism two new courses. The motion comes from a committee and does not need a second. Is there any discussion? Seeing none all those in favor of the motion number four on page 22 please say aye. Opposed no. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Number five, the College of Liberal Arts there is a typo in the first new course in Anthropology, in the last full line it should be “identity” instead of “identify.” We move number 5 from page 22 through the bottom of page 27 items from the College of Liberal Arts: A. Department of Anthropology – new course, B. Department of Art – has changes, on page 24, C. Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, D. Department of Geography has a lot of changes all the way to page 26, E. Department of Political Science has changes, and at the bottom of page 27, F. Department of Sociology.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The committee recommends number 5 on page 22 including items from the Department of Anthropology, Department of Art, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Department of Geography, Department of Political

Science and the Department of Sociology. The motion comes from a committee and does not need a second. Is there any discussion?

PROFESSOR DAVID BERUBE (English) – On page 24 make sure you carry over the editing in ANTH 581 to GEOG 581 as it is a crosslisting. In GEOG 581 on the fourth line it is “identity” not “identify.”

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – With that suggested correction, is there any additional discussion? With that suggested correction all those in favor of the motion number 5 on those various pages from 22 to 27, please say “I”. Oppose “No”. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Number 8 on page 28 the College of Science and Mathematics, A. Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, B. Department of Geological Sciences, on page 2, C. Program of Marine Science, on page 30, D. Department of Mathematics, and E. Department of Physics & Astronomy which goes to page 32.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The committee recommends number 8 on page 28 the College of Science and Mathematics; in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry a new course; in the Department of Geological Sciences a change in title and description; in the Program of Marine Sciences a change in curriculum printed in the Undergraduate Bulletin; in the Department of Mathematics a new course; and in the Department of Physics & Astronomy a change in credit hours, a change in credit hours and description, and a change in curriculum. The motion comes from a committee and does not need a second. Is there any discussion? All those in favor of item number 8 on page 28 through page 32, please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – The last item is the new course in Libraries, LIBR 100.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The committee moves number nine on page 32 in Libraries a new course. The motion comes from a committee and does not need a second. Is there any discussion? Seeing none all those in favor of the new course on page 32 under Libraries please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes. Thank you, Professor Blanpied.

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

PROFESSOR OLSGAARD (Libraries) – No report.

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

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I take that as no report.

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

PROFESSOR BERUBE (English) – No report.

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

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I know Professor Graham is not with us – so no report.

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

PROFESSOR WILLIAMS (Library and Information Science) – This is a report more for general information than anything else. There is nothing for approval. A new charge for the committee has been approved by the committee and has been referred to the Faculty Advisory Committee. It deals with changes in *The Faculty Manual*. If approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee it will be reported at the General Faculty meeting in September.

Secondly the Faculty Budget referred a request to the University Athletics Advisory Committee with a proposal to place a tax on all general admissions athletic event tickets to support the General Scholarship Fund of the University. We discussed this at some length. A motion was made to do this and that motion failed in the committee. Following additional discussion a second motion was made and I would like to read you that:

“Moved that Athletics Department be requested to increase at their discretion their contribution to the General Scholarship Fund of the University and that other auxiliary or revenue generating units will be requested to also support the General Scholarship Fund of the University.” That motion passed. We have advised the Faculty Budget Committee of that motion and so that matter has been referred back to them and will be taken up at some later date.

And finally, the committee has elected Professor Jean Ann Linney in the Psychology Department as the chair for next year.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Professor Williams. Are there any questions for Professor Williams? I should have asked if there were questions for any of the chairs, I apologize.

4. Reports of Officers.

PRESIDENT ANDREW SORENSEN – Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We had a ceremony yesterday recognizing recipients of 40 years, 30 years, 20 years and 10 years of service to the University. In that ceremony I mentioned that Jesus offered a parable that if a house is not built on a solid foundation that it will crumble using that as a metaphor for the University. These are the people that have laid the foundation for the University – a very dedicated faculty and staff who have worked for years and years and years. Provosts come and go, presidents come and go but the work of the University is sustained by faculty and staff. And, especially those who commit themselves to long years of service. We had a very nice ceremony and I recognized all of them during the General

Faculty meeting. Without their services and their incredible dedication, this University could not do all of the things that it needs to do and that it does so masterfully.

There are three search committees:

1) Provost Search Committee is having airport interviews tomorrow and Saturday. They are interviewing seven candidates for the position of provost. Jerry Odom has enormous shoes to fill – it is going to be very difficult to find someone as able as he. I have on several other occasions commended Jerry for his extraordinary service. My wife and I are hosting an event in which we will be able to do so yet again. I wish the members of that committee – several of whom are in attendance – well in their deliberations tomorrow and the next day.

2) Dean of Arts and Sciences search and Provost Odom is chairing that search and he will report on that in his remarks.

3) Dean of School of Public Health search and I interviewed the second candidate that the committee brought to the campus today. There is going to be at least one more candidate.

A few remarks about the proposed College of Pharmacy merger. President Ray Greenburg president of Medical University of South Carolina and I about two weeks ago sent out a letter accompanying a report by an external committee group of sitting deans of Pharmacy. The letter regrettably had some ambiguity and lack of clarity in it. It has caused some consternation. I have had two one-hour meetings, a little more than an hour each, with Pharmacy faculty and I met with the Pharmacy students. Dr. Greenberg and I are writing another letter that is much more explicit and unambiguous. At least we honestly and sincerely believe that it is. That letter will be sent out to the Pharmacy faculty and students within the next few days. We hope that will clarify matters that seemed to be ambiguous in that earlier letter.

There are rumors that persist among students and faculty that our intent is to close the College of Pharmacy here in Columbia. That is simply not true. There are also rumors that we intend to offer only distance education here, that we plan not to have professors here, that we are going to eliminate jobs of professors – not true, that we are going to require professors to move elsewhere – not true, that we are going to require students to transfer – that is not true. I continue to deny these rumors but I continue to be visited by them. So I am hopeful that this letter that Dr. Greenberg and I will be sending out will clarify all of that. We will sequester the scholarship and endowment support for the students and the faculty here at the University of South Carolina – none of that will migrate to Charleston. We propose that we improve the quality and quantity of distance education throughout the State. We desperately need more pharmacists in this State and we want to enroll more doctoral students in Pharm D programs, we want more pharmacists to be graduated, and we believe that we need to develop a presence in the upstate. We have had meeting this past week with Mr. Frank Pickney the CEO of Greenville Hospital system talking about ways in which we might expand pharmacy education to Greenville. I had a very appropriate and positive meeting with Senator Ronnie Kromer, a pharmacist who is in the Senate, we showed him a draft of the letter

that Dr. Greenberg and I were sending out. He made several excellent suggestions as to how we might improve the letter and we are incorporating his suggestions into our letter. So I feel optimistic that we will improve the communication and eliminate some of the current ambiguity and confusion.

Some senators from the College of Pharmacy faculty will be presenting a resolution letter in this meeting opposing the merger and I urge your careful consideration of their proposal.

We had a terrific month for gifts to the University. Last Friday we received a gift of \$45 million which was the largest gift in the history of the University. On Monday we received the second largest gift in the history of the University - \$40 million combined from the Greenville Hospital system and the Palmetto Health system matched by the Centers of Excellence for the State of South Carolina. We are very pleased with those gifts. On Monday the Centers of Excellence panel approved \$8.5 million additional monies for our research activities and we have \$6.2 million to match that - that we secured in the month of April for a total of \$14.7 million. So we had over \$100 million in gifts during April. And, as I said to the General Faculty after I announced those gifts to the Board of Trustees, one of the more prominent members said, "Well that's a good month of April. What are you going to do in May?" I am hopeful that we will continue to be successful in that respect.

There were a couple of questions about environmental issues at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Mr. Rick Kelly who is our Chief Financial Officer is here to answer them. Mr. Chair, at the appropriate time, you may wish to introduce these.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – You may do it now or you may do it later, whatever you prefer.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Do you still have the list of issues that were raised at the last meeting?

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I think they were Professor Ray's comments.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – There was some concern about microwave transmission and 1600 Hampton – Professor Ray?

PROFESSOR RICHARD RAY (Engineering) – Correct.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Mr. Kelly.

MR. RICK KELLY (Chief Financial Officer) – At Dr. Sorensen's request, the Director of Radiation Safety for the University, Daniel Zurosky, contacted the owners of the Radio Transmission Tower which is AT&T. The power is currently being used for cell phone transmissions. At the time cell phone transmitters were installed into that tower the emissions were gauged and met current FCC regulations. Dan went on to offer some editorial comments that I will share with you – that obviously the real threat is getting

close to the generation of those transmissions and that, because of fencing and the location of those radio transmissions, it is physically impossible to get close enough to them to cause a problem. Further the way the transmissions are formed and emitted, in the flat form, he states: “The tower would cause no exposure if one was standing directly under it or occupying the building close to it.” I will be happy to share this letter with you.

PROFESSOR RAY – That wasn’t my question. My question was as I went up to Staff Benefits and was looking out the window and I was not under it I was in the direct line of its transmission path. That is what I was concerned about.

MR. KELLY – I think maybe we ought to get you together with Daniel Zurosky but his letter says that occupying the building close to it would be of no danger.

PROFESSOR RAY – Okay.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Finally, is this the last senate meeting of this academic year?

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – No we have a meeting on June 23rd – I don’t know if you want to include that in the academic year or not.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – I want to take this opportunity at the end of the year as I prepare for these commencement ceremonies. I preside at 12 commencement ceremonies for the University of South Carolina at various parts of the State several of them here. I just want to thank all of the faculty for your heroic work and your good service. This is a time of year when some students express gratitude for the education they have received as they anticipate leaving here. My wife and I have hosted several receptions at our home during the past week. We had 340 students there one day who consumed an incredible quantity of food and walked out of the door with plastic plates filled up with a napkin over the top. Also leaving with plastic glasses behind them hoping that I wouldn’t notice as they walked out the door – it was not alcoholic. We also hosted a group of 30 students, another group of 75 students, and then an honors ceremony which Dr. Odom spoke about in his remarks. The gratitude that these students feel for the education they have received here is just overwhelming. It is very sincere. One of the qualities that they report about you as a group of faculty is that you care about them. I have this habit that very few presidents have, when I walk across the campus I talk to people and I engage students in conversation. When I do my morning bike ride, I occasionally stop and talk to students (I get off my bike when I talk to them), and I find these very frequently expressed and unsolicited expressions of gratitude. So thank you very, very much for all that you do for the University. Thank you that concludes my report, Mr. Chairman. Are there any questions?

PROFESSOR MARLENE MACKKEY (Nursing) – During the last meeting the General Faculty meeting you asked Jerry Odom if Nursing had submitted a proposal to the Centers of Excellence, in the break time I gathered some more information.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Good.

PROFESSOR MACKEY – Nursing at USC and Nursing at MUSC wanted to submit a proposal to the Centers of Excellence but apparently the President over at MUSC absolutely forbade it. So there are funny things going on.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – I appreciate your calling that to my attention. The President at MUSC and I are talking a lot these days and I will ask him at our next meeting. I will report at the June 23rd meeting on that happened. Okay?

PROFESSOR MACKEY – That is fair enough. We are going to keep asking questions.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Well I want you to.

PROFESSOR MACKEY – You can count on it.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN - I am counting on it. I respect that. I did not think for a minute that you wouldn't.

PROFESSOR MARJA WAREHIME (French) – I was asked to raise two related questions about space. One is – given the renovation that is about to take place or should take place at the Moore School of Business – what are the current plans for housing the offices and classrooms in that building? Then a related question – where would the offices be for the new College of Arts and Sciences?

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – I am going to defer that to Mr. Kelly. The answer is with respect to the first of College of Business Administration that is going to present a horrendous array of problems. We have only begun to think that through. The current plan is to do it in two stages. Move half of the faculty and staff out of the current buildings of the College of Business Administration and refurbish that half. Then move the people that have been moved out back in that half. Then take the other half and do the same thing. Next question of course, is where are you going to move them to? Mr. Kelly is going to work on that one. Mr. Kelly, please stand up and give them a response.

MR. KELLY – That is the answer that we have right now. We are trying to figure out if we can consolidate to one side of the building and then back to the other and move it back and forth. Clearly there are some other alternatives that could be available to us. There are one or two fairly large facilities that are on the perimeter of our campus that might serve as some overflow space on a lease basis – not an ownership basis. I don't think we have another solution on our campus per say right now. So either internally we will just move people back and forth, maybe doubling up some of the office space and really extending the classroom sections in the small sections.

Let me answer a piece of the Arts and Sciences situation question, from our standpoint I don't believe we are going to deal with the faculty and with the classroom

space any real changes in the locations of that. Dr. Odom and I have some conversations about that and maybe, Jerry, you want to address the administrations side of that.

PROVOST JEROME ODOM – I can tell you that the search committee has had some conversations about the location of the office of new dean. The thinking is that it would be good not to have it at either place where the deans are located right now but somewhere in between. So we are looking at the possibilities of somewhere in between. We think the Horseshoe would be a wonderful place for that dean to be.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Unlike the issue of great concern to many of the faculty in the College of Pharmacy about the location of the dean of the merged college the recommendation of this committee that we had was that the dean be located in Charleston. Charleston faculty, as you might predict, are comfortable with that arrangement and the faculty in Columbia are not. So recalling the story of Solomon and the two women who came to him with one baby each claiming to be the mother I propose that we move the offices of the Dean of the College of Pharmacy to Orangeburg and have the dean commute both ways. Maybe we will do something analogous to that. Any other questions or comments? Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Mr. President.

PROVOST JEROME ODOM – Mr. Chairman I will make the assumption that all faculty senators are most interested in general faculty matters and thus attended the previous meeting and I will not make a report. But I will be happy to answer questions.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Any questions for the Provost? Thank you, Mr. Provost.

5. Report of Secretary.

PROFESSOR WISE – No report.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Do we have any additional nominations for the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions? We had two, as you recall, at the first of the meeting.

6. Unfinished Business.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The Chair is not aware of any unfinished business.

7. New Business.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Any new business or anything for the good of the order?

PROFESSOR BUDDY LINGLE (Pharmacy) – I have resolution I would like to propose.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Senator Lingle would you please read that resolution since we do not have a copy of it.

PROFESSOR LINGLE – Copies will be passed out now. The Parliamentarian also asked me to read it.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The Chair of the Senate is asking you to read it as well since the Chair has not seen it.

PROFESSOR LINGLE – Before we begin, while the resolution is being passed out, I would like to first of all thank President Sorensen and Vice President Pastides for the time that they have spent in discussion of this proposed merger. Even though a group of our faculty are at a professional meeting and we also have another group of faculty at practice activities right now I would like to recognize faculty from the College of Pharmacy on whose behalf this resolution is being presented – if you folks would please stand. Does everyone have copies?

Mr. Chairman, I propose this resolution:

“Whereas, A merger of the USC and MUSC Colleges of Pharmacy has been recommended by the Presidents of the respective institutions; and

Whereas, The USC College of Pharmacy faculty support the concept of collaboration for the purpose of the improved effectiveness and efficiency; and

Whereas, The proposed merger is based on an incomplete and inaccurate evaluation of the capabilities, facilities, resources and performance of the USC College of Pharmacy by a group of three outside consulting Deans that spent approximately six hours conducting a site visit to USC; and

Whereas, A merger of the two colleges of Pharmacy was presented to a joint USC/MUSC faculty study committee as the only option to enhance collaboration between the institutions; and

Whereas, A report by a professional consultant hired by USC and MUSC to consult with the joint USC/MUSC faculty study committee raised a number of concerns about the planning and implementation of the merger of the two colleges; and

Whereas, The impact of the proposed merger needs to be scrutinized thoroughly and openly; and

Whereas, The logistics of a merger of two public Colleges of Pharmacy with diverse cultures, histories, faculty governance structures and terms of employment have not been considered; and

Whereas, There is no precedent for accreditation of a merged College of Pharmacy by the national accrediting organization for Colleges of Pharmacy (ACPE); therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina opposes the merger of the USC and MUSC Colleges of Pharmacy professional programs until such time that the consequences and costs of the merger can be fully examined.

Resolved, That the Senate opposes any institutional mergers unless the proposals are examined thoroughly and discussed openly among all affected parties.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the College of Pharmacy by myself, Dr. Laura Fox and Dr. Jessica Kerr.”

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – You have heard the resolution from Senator Lingle is there a second please? Any discussion?

PROFESSOR LINGLE – May I also request of the Chair that during the discussion that questions be addressed to Professor Gene Reeder.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Answer all the questions?

PROFESSOR LINGLE – Well, unless he can’t answer one.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – How will we know that he can’t answer them?

PROFESSOR LINGLE – By the look on his face.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I’ve seen that look before, Professor Reeder. Yes sir, that is fine. Are there any questions please of Professor Reeder, Professor Lingle or other senators in Pharmacy?

PROFESSOR DAN SABIA (Political Science) – I guess I would like to ask about the degree to which faculty have in fact been involved in this process as there is a reference here to a joint faculty committee. I wonder to what degree they have been involved. It seems to me that this is an issue which substantively it is really hard for senators to assess, but I would like to know about the process. Maybe I should say that as a former Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, one of the last things we looked at was precisely faculty involvement in reorganizations and mergers. In fact Gene, you may have been on the Committee at that time. But anyway that is the question I would like to ask, to at least get us started.

PROFESSOR GENE REEDER (Pharmacy) – Probably a thumbnail history would be the best way to do this. As I recall it was late last summer August or early September that the college was informed that we were to explore ways to collaborate with the College of Pharmacy at the Medical University in Charleston. As a part of that process a committee was formed and I’ll have to ask my colleagues as I was not on that committee, but I believe it was three faculty members each from MUSC and USC. Was there more than that? Four from each of the colleges. So that the total composition was eight people. They met periodically, Mike (Professor Mike Wyatt) were you on the committee? Mike

can answer the questions, but this committee met and discussed the issues and during that process a consulting firm from Boston, I believe, was brought in to facilitate the process and generated a report. It essentially said, and someone correct me if I am wrong, but I was told by the committee that the instruction was that you have to figure out how to do this. The only option was, as is in the resolution, a merger in some way of the two schools. Obviously when you get an equally balanced group of MUSC and USC faculty it is not surprising that the group could not make a recommendation where the host site should be. To resolve that, and President Sorensen correct me if I am wrong, I believe that you commissioned the outside deans to come in and help resolve this issue. A group of three deans – one from Texas Tech University, one from Oregon State University, and one from the University of Florida-Gainesville visited the USC campus on one day. They met with the Basic Science faculty 30 minutes, 30 minutes with the other two departments combined and, met with students about 30 minutes. They did not take the opportunity to visit our clinical sites in the area. They expressed the feeling they were too tired to do this. I think there was a dinner that evening – we were not there. The next day they spent an amount of time at the College of Pharmacy at the Medical University in Charleston. Based on that site visit, and I know we supplied some supplemental background material in anticipation of their visit and I'm sure MUSC did likewise, taken together was the basis of their report and their recommendation which qualified their decision substantially. They raised a number of issues and in a very obtuse form of reasoning recommended that the host institution be in Charleston. So I guess in terms of full faculty involvement in the discussion it was probably an hour. We had indirect input in that our representatives on the committee would certainly have asked for our opinion and updated us along the way. But it was very much a focused activity among those committee members. Professor Wyatt is a member of that committee perhaps if he would care to say anything or if you would like to direct some specific questions about the process there as I was not a part of that.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Do you have a follow-up Professor Sabia?

PROFESSOR SABIA – Let other senators speak.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE - Other senators please? Questions?

PROFESSOR WANDA LOFTIN (Nursing) – I am a faculty senator for the College of Nursing. For those of you who were here at the General Faculty meeting we voiced some of our concerns from the College of Nursing because we see a great many parallels between what is happening in the College of Pharmacy and what those implications may have for the College of Nursing. We also are going to be visited by consultants who will make recommendations for collaboration and we are not sure yet what that means. So we do have some concerns because we have not even had a joint committee of USC/MUSC faculty to even look at methods of collaboration but what we have had are already substantial rumors that the administration of the College of Nursing will be at MUSC. We are just beginning to look at collaborative efforts so perhaps President Sorensen could dispel those rumors also as we are dispelling rumors.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – For those of you who were at the General Faculty meeting, I thank you very much for raising that issue. I responded that I would appreciate an invitation to the College of Nursing and would be happy to meet with them as many times and as long as you wish. I don't have a plan.

PROFESSOR REEDER – Mr. Chair, may I add just a comment since I referred to Professor Wyatt. Just as a point of information because I always hoped I'd be here my 30 years without every having to disagree with the President, but we do in this regard. But in the same vein I would say we are not opposed to what I think is a great vision for the University, that is looking at a merger of the research enterprise within the Health Sciences. That makes a lot of sense, I think, to many of us. In fact we have crafted what we believe to be a solution to the dilemma. All we are really interested in is the integrity and autonomy of both colleges. This is not a USC vs MUSC; we have colleagues and friends at MUSC, I've taught classes at MUSC – I hope I get invited back to do so, but I know the college and the history of both schools, the cultures that are there. I think there is another way to do what this is all about. I was delighted when I read in the paper on Monday of the venture that was taking place among the hospital systems in Columbia, Charleston, and Greenville. That is a very worthwhile activity and one that should be nurtured and I would champion that cause. But I think we can do that and at the same time maintain the integrity and the autonomy of our two colleges. Because I will tell you, and someone will have to show me numbers to refute it, merging these two colleges of Pharmacy does nothing for the quality of education in this institution and it does nothing to save money. I don't know if any of you have ever visited the College of Pharmacy at the Medical University, substantial renovation and expansion would have to occur there for that program to upgrade. We are very proud as we should be of our graduates and their performance and we wish equally well for our colleagues at MUSC. We think that will best occur under autonomy and integrity of individual professional programs. Graduate education, graduate research enterprises, that is another matter. I personally would champion that and would love to see it happen. So I think there is a solution here. It is not an all or none. All we are asking you to do today is vote in favor of our resolution that the professional programs, the professional educational programs in Pharmacy be maintained separately. That we explore with all great enthusiasm the research enterprise and collaboration but leave the professional programs as they are. Thank you.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Are there any other questions related to the resolution by senators please?

PROFESSOR RIG HUGHES (Philosophy) – Can you tell me whether any of the three deans who visited you have experiences about merging programs?

PROFESSOR REEDER – To my knowledge, no sir. I guess they all come from a medical center orientation. Oregon State University has what I would call a split campus. The College of Pharmacy is housed and accredited at Oregon State in Corvallis. They have a clinical program that operates under contract, not as a satellite campus, but under a contract with Oregon State at the Oregon Health Sciences Center in Portland. Texas

Tech University is a relatively new school - eight to ten years old maybe. Actually the person there who started the school – Dean Art Nelson – was Dean of Nebraska, then at Idaho State. He is sort of an entrepreneur. He has avoided closure of one school (Nebraska) and started a new school at Texas Tech. The other Dean was from Florida. Since that was his first dean’s job and he has been there, I think Dr. Sorensen hired him – Bill Riffey as a Dean, in his capacity as Provost. So it has been eight years or so – is that right Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Yes, correct.

PROFESSOR REEDER – He has been a dean there, very innovative individual but to my knowledge none of them have had merger experience - to my knowledge there has never been a merger of two public schools of pharmacy period.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – We should point out that one of the deans is a former faculty member from the USC faculty of Pharmacy.

PROFESSOR REEDER – That is correct, Art Nelson the individual who started the Texas Tech Program was a former faculty member here before taking the dean’s job in Nebraska.

PROFESSOR GARY MILLER (Education) – Are both programs accredited? In your resolution it is not clear.

PROFESSOR REEDER – They are independent colleges of pharmacy both of which have their own accreditation and that is another of our concerns because we have an excellent record of accreditation having received maximum six year accreditation in the previous three accreditation visits. Whereas the institution in Charleston has not fared as well but they are separately accredited programs and looked at independently by the body.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Other comments or questions from senators?

PROFESSOR MACKEY – I am speaking in favor of, to support this resolution because I believe that Nursing is going through the same thing that Pharmacy is going through. We are supposed to have consultants tell us how to collaborate when in reality the Nursing faculty of Charleston already believe that when our USC Dean retires in one-year, Gail Stewart – the Dean at Charleston, is going to be our dean. We are going to be merged – not collaborate – we are going to be merged. This is very strange especially when we have USC Nursing programs at some of our other campuses and they are not part of this collaboration. So something is a little bit funny here. So we need to stop, support this resolution, and we need to have more information about what is happening to the Health Sciences.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you. Other comments or questions from senators?

PROFESSOR MILLER – I hear about consultants coming in. Are the faculty inviting those consultants in?

PROFESSOR REEDER – In our case no but I don't know about Nursing.

PROFESSOR LOFTIN – We will be able to be present when the consultants are coming. However our concern is that it is most likely that they will come during the summer we have been informed. That is when a majority of the faculty will not be there to be able to dialogue with consultants or have the opportunity to really showcase the many strengths of the College of Nursing. So that is a concern.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Other comments from senators or questions?

PROFESSOR MACKEY – I just want to say that we did not request consultants. We were told to identify some people who could possibly be consultants. So I guess we need to have consultants to tell us how to collaborate.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Other comments related to the resolution?

PROFESSOR DWAYNE YOCH (Biology) – I would like to speak in favor of this resolution. With these two faculties located a 100 miles apart, it is difficult to imagine that much research collaboration will be initiated. Twenty years ago we saw that when the USC School of Medicine moved from the main campus to their new campus, only five or six miles, most of the collaborations with faculty on the main campus were not sustained. This leads me to believe the administration cannot count on extensive collaborations being initiated between researchers of these two pharmacy schools, or the big influx of grant dollars that are apparently anticipated. Therefore, the payoff off for giving up our college of pharmacy seems questionable at best.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Any other senators who wish to be heard.

PROFESSOR KENNETH PHILLIPS (Nursing) – I would like to make a comment. It seems premature to call collaborators or rather consultants in from colleges of Nursing throughout the United States when the faculty here, at the University of South Carolina, have not been asked to collaborate or to consult. We actually think that we have some pretty good ideas about nursing ourselves. So it seems to me that the more appropriate way to do this is to sit down and understand from our perspective in the College of Nursing what we think and what we believe about merging the two colleges of Nursing. And, then if it is appropriate to go and get consultants. I do speak in favor of the resolution.

PROFESSOR LOFTIN – I do want to say that we support research collaboration. As a matter of fact, even though it is a good way away from us, I have a very strong research collaboration with faculty in the College of Nursing at MUSC and also with medical physicians there. So we do support that. It is doable and it has been a very good experience so far. Last week the faculty went to MUSC to explore other ways to

collaborate specifically on research. So it is doable and we do strongly support that. So I did want to make that clear.

PARLIAMENTARIAN DRANE – I'd like to call for a question.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The question has been called for. Does that need a second? Not debatable.

PARLIAMENTARIAN DRANE – I would like to have a second to it.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Is there a second? Is it debatable?

PARLIAMENTARIAN DRANE – It is votable not debatable.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Okay. The question has been called for on the resolution before you. That the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina oppose the merger of the USC and MUSC Colleges of Pharmacy professional programs until such time that the consequences and costs of the merger can be fully examined. That the Senate oppose any institutional mergers unless the proposals are examined thoroughly and discussed openly among all affected parties. All those in favor of this resolution please say aye. Opposed no. The resolution was passed unanimously.

8. Announcements.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – We have two nominees for the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions. Are there any other additional nominees for that committee? If not I rule the nominations closed. Is there anything else for the good of the order?

9. Adjournment.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn. Our next meeting will be June 23, 2004 at 3:30 pm. Is there a motion, please, to adjourn? Second? All those in favor please say aye. The meeting is adjourned.