

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**September 29, 2004**

CHAIR JAMES R. AUGUSTINE – The Chair would like to remind those of you who are senators to please sit in the center two sections. Those of you who are guests, please sit on the outside. If there is not enough room, certainly our guests can fill in on the outer edges. But when there is vote, we ask that those of you who are senators vote and the rest of you abstain – please.

**1. Call to Order.**

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I call to order the meeting of the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina on Wednesday, September 29, 2004.

**2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes.**

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The minutes have been circulated to all the senators and they are on the University Faculty Senate website. Are there any corrections or additions to the minutes, please. Seeing none, all those in favor of the minutes as they are written 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 has selected Professor Pat Flynn of Law to serve a one-year term on the University Committee on Academic Responsibility. Also, we place in nomination for a three-year term on the Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Mike Dickson, College of Pharmacy. Nominations will be taken from the floor at this time and later in the meeting.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – You have heard that recommendation. Professor Flynn will serve a one-year term that does not need your approval. Professor Dickson is a nominee for a three-year term on Faculty Advisory Committee and the nominations will remain open throughout the meeting.

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

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

**c. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Sarah Barker, Chair:**

PROFESSOR BARKER (Theatre & Dance) – Good afternoon. On behalf of the Committee of Curricula and Courses I'm going to move several things and I'm going to do them principally by number and I move that the Senate will accept these. First is

number 1 the Moore School of Business. We have two changes in title and description under Management Science.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The Chair reminds those of you who wish to speak to please stand and clearly state your name if you have a questions or a comment. The motion comes from a committee and does not need a second. It is from Curricula and Courses. Item number 1 on page 12 a change in title and description in the Moore School of Business. Is there any discussion please? Seeing none all those in favor of item one A. on page 12 please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BARKER – Number 2, College of Education – mostly changes in designator, prerequisite, and corequisites. There is one typographical error just above A. Department of Education Leadership and Policies. It is titled Change in designator, prerequisite, and corequisite – EDUC 402. Changing that to EDTE 402 we will keep corequisite 402P under the new designator EDTE. That was simply an omission. We are proposing also under the Department of Educational Leadership and Policies a change in title, course number, and description. And B. Department of Instruction and Teacher Education a change in title and description.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The motion with the changes noted comes from a committee and does not need a second. We are talking about item number 2 on page 12 in the College of Education as well as item A and B on page 13. Is there any discussion please of those changes in designator, prerequisites, and the editorial change that was made as well? Seeing none all those in favor of the motion please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BARKER – I have separated out a change in curriculum which is on the next page – page 14 – Department of Physical Education. Plus three changes in corequisite, course number, prerequisite and description. Before you take a moment just to take a look the changes in the curriculum – the changes are underlined on the right of the page – pages 14 and 15. I would also like to point out that we have another typographical error under the first change in prerequisite, it should read change in corequisite and it is changing to “PEDU 263 Introduction to Athletic Training, Coreq: PEDU 263L.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – This motion on pages 13, 14, and 15 in the Department of Physical Education as outlined with those typographical changes have been moved by the committee. Is there any discussion? Seeing none all those in favor of the motion please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BARKER – A quick one is number 3, College of Engineering and Information Technology. A change in prerequisite and description from the Department of Computer Science and Engineering is on the bottom of page 15.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The motion coming from a committee on page 15 at the bottom from the College of Engineering and Information Technology the Department of

Computer Science and Engineering a change in prerequisite and description does not need a second. Is there any discussion please? Seeing none all those in favor of the motion please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BARKER – With the Chair’s concurrence, I am going to do the entire College of Liberal Arts changes under number 4. That includes five new courses, two deletions, and several changes in title and description.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I believe that would go from page 16 the College of Liberal Arts number 4, items A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H which continue on page 17. The motion comes from a committee and does not need a second. Is there any discussion please? Seeing none all those in favor of the motion please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BARKER – Number 5 the College of Mass Communications and Information Studies. Item A is a change in curriculum. Item B will be tabled because we lacked a letter of concurrence from Computer Science and Engineering and will be reviewed at our next meeting. So number five is just curriculum changes that are in bold along the right side of pages 18 and 19.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Coming from the committee this motion does not need a second. Pages 17, 18, and 19 under number five College of Mass Communications and Information Studies in the School of Journalism and Mass Communications is a change in curriculum. Those are listed for you. Is there any discussion please of that motion? Seeing none all those in favor of that motion please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BARKER – Then finally if you would consider numbers 6, 7, and 8 at the same time. That is one new course and several deletions in the School of Nursing that are housekeeping matters. Number 9 is for your information only. So numbers 6, 7, and 8 on pages 19 and 20.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Again the motion coming from a committee does not need a second. We have a new course in the School of Music, a new course in the College of Nursing, a series of deletions, a new course in the Department of Geological Sciences and one in Statistics. Is there any discussion please of that motion? Seeing none those in favor of the motion please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes. Thank you Professor Barker. Remember on page 20 is an experimental course for your information.

**d. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Carl Evans, Chair:**

PROFESSOR EVANS (Religious Studies) – No report.

**e. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Timir Datta, Chair:**

PROFESSOR DATTA (Physics & Astronomy) – No report.

**f. Faculty Budget Committee, Professor Davis Baird, Chair:**

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Professor Baird is not here but I believe Professor Berube has a report from the VCM Committee.

PROFESSOR DAVID BERUBE (English) – We’ve had two VCM meetings one on July 15 and another on September 8, 2004. I’ve been doing grants so if this sounds like grant-“ese” you can raise your hand and I’ll try to explain it a little more deeply.

**JULY 15**

Three items on July 15 – We discussed funding the distribution of state cuts. The cuts in state appropriations were taken proportionately from the colleges based on the percentage of support that comes directly from state appropriations. Simply put, if a college received a high percentage of state appropriations, they shouldered a higher amount of the cuts.

Next, we discussed the projects for new tuition dollars for units in colleges and discussed the approved Board of Trustees’ initiative items and how the costs were to spread against the new tuition earnings from the colleges.

Finally, we discussed the doubtful accounts budget and how it would be covered. Doubtful accounts are accounts unpaid when students default.

**SEPTEMBER 8**

On September 8, we discussed the School of Environment and how to fund it. The Provost suggested we treat it as a public good since it does not generate revenue and should be treated like distance education.

We discussed charging units for summer expenses using hours as assessment. Charges for facility square footage would not occur.

And finally, we discussed service pre-set assessments and accountability for service units. Service units would be like buildings and grounds. We questioned the wisdom of the current recommended schedule and the amount of unnecessary expenses and data this might produce. We decided an appeal process would be in order when service units fail, so Deans could appeal and vice versa. We decided we needed to identify peer groups to produce a viable feedback loop. We would need to know functional efficiencies within base budgets to understand what a service unit could do with the resources they had and what they may be able to add with additional resources. And, we agreed committees to assess all service units would be unwieldy and the data sets would be overwhelming.

That is what happened.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I like that “doubtful accounts” phrase there, David. Next time my bank calls I’ll tell them that those things that I did not pay are in doubtful accounts and see how far that gets me. Thank you.

**g. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Linda Allman, Chair:**

PROFESSOR ALLMAN (Continuing Education) – Once again the Faculty Welfare Committee has voted to pay the cost of flu shots from the Family Fund and Faculty Enrichment fund. So that faculty who have contributed to the Family Fund can receive the flu shots for free. Those should be available around mid-October. The Thompson Health Center will receive a list of faculty who have contributed to the Family Fund so that they can verify whether or not you are entitled to a free flu shot. Thompson Health Services had requested that we fund 250 shots at \$15 each. Then if they need more, they will come back to the committee and we will probably be predisposed to grant that if it is not too great a number.

You have had passed out to you the Summer Compensation Policy. If you will recall at the February 2, 2004 meeting last year, we brought a motion to the Faculty Senate and that motion is on the very first page. This was voted on and approved by Faculty Senate. Subsequently, Provost Odom took this motion to the Council of Deans who apparently did not agree with the motion or the existing HR 1.81 policy. They formed a subcommittee which was chaired by Les Sternberg who is the Dean of the College of Education. They studied the matter and the results you can see from the statement by the Council of Deans.

Then HR 1.81 was revised based on this Council of Deans’ statement. That new policy was adopted August 17. You have the side by side comparison of the two editions of the documents.

The Faculty Welfare Committee members feel like we are in an information gathering stage. What we would like to do is just get a sense from the faculty of your reactions to the new policy. We want specific information, specific concerns and I would prefer that you send them to me: Linda Allman at [allman@gwm.sc.edu](mailto:allman@gwm.sc.edu) . We have extended an invitation to John Skvortez, the Interim Dean of the College of Liberal Arts to meet at our next meeting which is October 18. He will describe summer compensation and how that is handled in that large college. That is my report.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Any questions, for Professor Allman?

PROFESSOR MARCO VALTORTA (Computer Science & Engineering) – When will this policy be taken up by the full Faculty Senate?

PROFESSOR ALLMAN – Well, this policy is actually in effect. I think what we want to do is just get a sense from the faculty how you perceive this new policy. How do you think it will affect you?

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Other questions? Excuse me, please stand and state your name.

PROFESSOR MARLENE MACKEY (Nursing) – On the bottom of page 2 under D1, it states that Graduate Faculty during the academic year have reduced teaching loads for supervising student research. I guess I am interested in knowing more about that. I had not heard of that before and how is that implemented?

PROFESSOR ALLMAN – That is what we would all like to know – I think. So I think maybe the Council of Deans might be able to respond to this or the separate deans in the different colleges, but we do not know. I think that is the crux of the matter.

PROFESSOR VALTORTA – Since you asked for input on how this affects people personally, I would like to make a general comment on this policy now in the spirit of the colleague who spoke before me. I see this as a dangerous policy because it puts a burden on faculty members based on something which we already have been given: release of time for research work during the academic year. Next time we may be asked to do something else that under a reasonable interpretation of VCM we should be compensated for. We could again be told that we already have this release that can be used for that. I think it is sad that the Council of Deans did not take the Faculty Senate motion that was passed last year.

PROFESSOR ALLMAN – And, would you send me an e-mail to that effect.

PROFESSOR VALTORTA – Sure.

PROFESSOR ALLMAN – Thank you.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Other questions or comments. Just please send your information to Professor Allman.

PROFESSOR KATHERINE CHADDOCK (Education) – Maybe in our e-mails we could also think about, not just about us, but the effect on trying to recruit new faculty who in fact are coming from places where they have had the kind of compensation policy that we passed in the Senate last spring. And, they don't have the kind of compensation policy that is a barter system where you trade summer unpaid, pro bono work for release time during the regular year. So I think if we could also broaden that charge, Linda, and send you e-mails not just about how it effects us, but also how it might affect the future of the University in terms of future faculty that might not be here yet.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Professor Allman. Just an observation, that if you stand up and give your name, you do not get immunity for the rest of the meeting. You have to stand up and give your name every time please so we know who you are. We end up with a tape recording of this meeting and it is very difficult to remember from time to time who it might be that is speaking unless you tell us who you are.

#### **h. University Athletics Advisory Committee, Professor William Bearden, Chair:**

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Professor Bearden is not here. That committee will next meet on October 13 but he does not have a report at this time.

#### **4. Reports of Officers.**

PRESIDENT ANDREW SORENSEN – Thank you very much Mr. Chair. I want to bring you up to date on several issues. There is a suit against the persons who sponsored the passage of the Life Science Bill, which among other things would increase scholarship support for in-state-students from 2% to 4%. And, also \$220 million for the three research universities: the Medical University of South Carolina, Clemson, and USC to construct laboratory and faculty office facilities. Related to the stimulation of economic development in the state both of those are critical to the future of the University. A Mr. Sloan from Greenville and a political action committee have joined Mr. Sloan as amicus curiae – friends of the court - to prevent the General Assembly leaders from implementing that bill. David Wilkins, who is the Speaker of the House, Bobby Harrell, who is chair of the House Ways and Means Committee, and Hugh Leatherman, who is chair of the Senate Finance Committee, are specifically named as defendants in the bill. The University, with the support of the Board of Trustees, has developed an agreement with Clemson University and the Medical University of South Carolina that we will be amicus curiae with these defendants. I am very much indebted to the General Assembly for their support of the research universities. Clemson, MUSC, and USC will have their respective foundations joining the defendants as amicus curiae. This case will be heard in the South Carolina Supreme Court. I hope we will have resolution before the General Assembly reconvenes in January.

Several deans have discussed the notion of differential tuition. We already have differential tuition at the Graduate School and Professional Schools. The Medical School has the highest tuition in the University and the Law School has a higher tuition than other parts of the Graduate School and so forth. But such differences do not exist at the undergraduate level. There was a request by several deans this past year to propose that we implement differential tuition for undergraduates. I have asked the Provost to meet with the deans and with the Faculty Advisory Committee to determine whether or not that is a good policy to propose. So Dr. Becker will be convening meetings with various groups of the faculty, deans, and students to develop a recommendation.

We had an historic meeting with the various committees of the Board of Trustees this past Friday. The Health Affairs Committee approved integration of the College of Pharmacy at the University of South Carolina with the Medical University of South Carolina. A copy of that resolution can be made available for the minutes, Mr. Chair, if you wish to have that done. It passed unanimously by that committee. Dean Sadik spoke in favor of the resolution. Mr. John Pugh, who was a student at the College of Pharmacy, spoke in favor of the resolution. Mr. Don Beam, who is an alumnus of our USC College of Pharmacy, spoke in favor of the resolution and pledged at that meeting to give \$5 million to the College of Pharmacy. Mr. Beam and I have had several meetings to

negotiate the terms of the gift. I am very pleased that we have a satisfactory resolution of that issue and look forward to moving forward.

There are several searches for deans. There will be an executive dean for this College of Pharmacy. Some people refer to him or her as super dean – I don't know what title we are going to use. Has a title been agreed on Mr. Provost? And, Les Sternberg, Dean of the College of Education, is the co-chair of that search. We have 4 or 5 candidates who are scheduled to come through in the near term. Public Health has had numerous candidates here and they have one more candidate coming in early October. The Nursing faculty have been asked by Dr. Pastides to nominate 4 faculty members for the search for the Nursing Dean. He has not heard from them yet. The Arts and Sciences search had its 4<sup>th</sup> and last candidate on campus here today and yesterday. Contrary to a report in the Gamecock the search for a Music Dean has not started yet.

We continue to experiment with modifications of the VCM model and Dr. Becker has been charged with tweaking that model. Making sure it is sensitive to and responsive to the needs of the faculty. Then finally there have been numerous discussions regarding using what is referred to as holistic admissions policy to make sure that we are appropriately inclusive. There have been discussions with Mr. Kip Howard, who is the Director of Enrollment Management with Professor Don Stowe, who is the chair of the Admissions Committee and we've gotten our University General Counsel involved because there some legal questions about how if we do this, precisely how we do it and so these conversations continue and I hope they have a report to you for the next meeting.

There have been several questions regarding the Athletics department funding to the University. I thought I would give you some information about the funding for this year. First of all for student athletes who are not residents of South Carolina, we insist on the Athletics department paying full out-of-state tuition. In many instances, after a student has been here for awhile, they can appeal for a conversion to an in-state status and pay a lower tuition. We do not allow that for the student athletes. The tuition that they pay is \$1,250,000 and under VCM that goes out the respective colleges. They also pay \$650,000 in annual and direct cost. They contribute \$761,000 to a scholarship fund. It is stipulated that no student athletes can be eligible for the \$761,000. They give \$145,000 a year to the band which goes principally to students and some of it for equipment. They give \$47,000 a year to the Student Government Association. They give \$23,300 a year to support the Martin Luther King Celebration. And, they give \$275,000 from concessions to the University General Fund. For a total of \$3,151,300. The University in turn gives \$175,000 from the Trademark revenues that they generate from selling hats, sweatshirts, sweatpants, various memorabilia with the Gamecock insignia and \$245,000 that it secures in revenues from parking for athletic events. Then there is a transfer of \$280,000 for a total of \$700,000. So the net is \$2,451,300 that the Athletics department transfers to the University.

I will be happy to respond to any questions about anything I have said or not said.



PROFESSOR MICHAEL DICKSON (Pharmacy) –I am going to ask a question about the Health Affairs Committee of Board of Trustees meeting last Friday. At that meeting there was kind of implicit in the discussion that Pharmacy would be the first of other integrations in the Health Sciences and I am wondering if there is a plan for that?

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Thank you for bringing that to my attention. The second motion recommended a complete and full integration of the research foundations. So the research foundation of the University of South Carolina and the research foundation of the Medical University of South Carolina will be integrated under this plan. Both of these motions assume that when the Board of Trustees meets in October it will concur in the recommendation of the respective committees. I think it is fairly safe to predict that, it will happen, but it is not official until the entire Board approves of it. There are at this time absolutely no discussions about other colleges being merged.

PROFESSOR DICKSON – A follow-up question. There has been a statement in a number of papers in Charleston from President Greenburg that Pharmacy was in fact the cornerstone of what was to follow. So we are confused about whether there is a plan or if it is just Pharmacy.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Professor Greenburg is going to speak to this body on November 3 and I suggest that you ask him that question directly when he appears before the Faculty Senate.

PROFESSOR JESSICA KERR (Pharmacy) – Also at that Health Affairs meeting on Friday, there was a resolution passed to explore the integration of USC and MUSC colleges of pharmacy but we were under the impression that this would be a carefully measured step process. So I guess what I am wanting to know is, do you particularly have a time line that would be accordingly? And the other side to that question is after this meeting it was also noted to say that admission to this new integrated school would happen in July 2005. I am just trying to figure out if that time line is considered careful measured steps or even realistic.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Again the faculty are going to decide. I’ve said this before at this meeting but I will repeat what I have said previously. The faculty are in charge of all admissions policies and procedures. The faculty are in charge of curriculum policies and procedures. I have been told that faculty committees are working on these issues. I am waiting to hear from committees that have been designated to look into these issues.

PROFESSOR DICKSON – Then this 2005 target that was in the Gamecock article is not firm I guess. Is that right?

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – For professors to cite the Gamecock as a source of information is truly amazing. The headline in the Gamecock on Friday, on the day of this meeting, read and I quote very close to verbatim: “Board of Trustees Committee will reject the School of Pharmacy Merger Proposal.” Is that correct?

PROFESSOR DICKSON – It did say that.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – So to depend upon the Gamecock for your information about what is going to go on is interesting.

PROFESSOR DICKSON – That is why I asked the question because we get a lot of confusing information from the press and other places and .....

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – That is why I make myself available so you can ask me.

PROFESSOR DICKSON – I did.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Yes, and I gave you a straight answer.

PROFESSOR KERR – This is one correction, Dr. Sorensen, it was actually posted on the USC website.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – What was that?

PROFESSOR KERR – His quote as far as 2005. Leaders of both schools hope to complete the integration of the schools in 2005 in order to enter their first classes.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – I think it is highly appropriate to call it hope. Notice it says hope that they will. It does not say they will. If the faculty want to stall it and sabotage it, the faculty are perfectly capable of doing that.

PROFESSOR DICKSON – I don't think that the faculty are interested in sabotaging it but they are interested in a deliberate process with measured steps. Just yesterday, for example, I received an e-mail from a small university in Illinois that is about to establish a College of Pharmacy. They were hiring consultants to lay out a process by which this would happen over several months. I think we should be doing the same thing.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – I have been talking about this for nearly two years so I don't think I am moving at warp speed to engage in these conversations. Furthermore, when I met with the ACPE representative, he said that getting the accreditation of one college would take years. So I don't think several years is moving at Mach 2 speed.

PROFESSOR LAURA FOX (Pharmacy) – The motion passed on Friday also states there will be Pharmacy dean on the USC-Columbia campus and that the resident Columbia dean will be responsible for the day to day operations of the Pharmacy program in Columbia. I am just interested, I know we have a search out for the Executive Dean and that is for the dean of the merged college.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Yes, Madame.

PROFESSOR FOX – The dean that will be on the Columbia campus will that also be a full dean or will it be an associate or an assistant dean?

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – The Pharmacy faculty and students that met with Dr. Pastides and Mr. Beam were clear that they want a person who is called a dean – so we are going to call that person a dean. We are very clear about that – absolutely no ambiguity.

PROFESSOR FOX – Thank you.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – You are welcome. Other questions? Thank you very much Mr. Chair.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Mr. President.

PROVOST MARK BECKER – Thank you, Mr. Chair. There are several items that I would like to mention for faculty information.

First off, the senators received copies of a draft working document on a teaching and learning center. This is an initiative that was developed under Provost Odom. He charged Vice President Bill Hogue, Interim Associate Provost Karl Heider, and former Associate Provost Gordon Smith with getting this going. They've developed a working document. I forwarded that to your Chair to distribute to the Senators. When the working draft was presented to me, not only did I forward it for your information and, hopefully, for your feedback – I charged the group that has developed it to this point with putting some flesh and bones on it, if you will. In the sense that the working document talks about a mission, talks about program areas, talks about activities and resources but it doesn't talk about how we would actually develop and operate the center. So, I have charged the initial development team with: "What would it (the teaching and learning center) look like? What would we have to do to implement the proposal?" If you are not familiar with them, Teaching and Learning Centers exist at a number of our peer institutions and the fundamentally exist to improve the quality of instruction at the University. And, in cases where there has been significant philanthropy involved, have had dramatic impact in helping with faculty development on both early career and mid-career. At this point the document is very much a working draft. So, if you have a particular interest in this activity – a Teaching and Learning Center – and you have particular feedback either positive, negative or different, I suggest that you forward that information to Karl Heider in my office. He will collect information and use it to help inform the development of a Teaching and Learning Center here at USC.

The next issue that I bring forward is about new faculty recruitment plans. They are projects that are being shepherded by Vice President Pastides and myself. There are two new faculty hiring plans that we are in the process of developing and rolling out. They have been under development for sometime and they represent directions both in growth in the tenured/tenure-track faculty as well as in research faculty. One plan goes under the name of the Faculty Excellence Initiative. This plan is to increase the number

of tenured, tenure-track faculty, meaning new faculty hires at this University by 150 over the next 5 to 6 years. Second, the Centenary Plan is a plan to hire an additional 100 research faculty. So this plan will address the hiring of faculty whose primary responsibility would be research and whose primary source of support will be sponsored research over the next several years. In a nutshell, the goals of the plan are many. The FEI program plan will direct resources to look at improving the student experience. So one goal here, in some cases, is to decrease class sizes. Another overall goal is to decrease the student/faculty ratio to bring us more in the 15 to 1 range than the 16 to 1 range. In addition, the FEI plan puts us in a position to recruit in interdisciplinary areas whether it is a cluster approach or some other approach to hiring. Areas where we want to build programs, faculty strength and expertise that cut across boundaries. So, we are looking for proposals that will have multiple units participating and there is a plethora, I'm sure, of good ideas out there.

I actually had the pleasure of meeting the 4<sup>th</sup> Arts and Sciences candidate, Dr. Fitzpatrick, yesterday. Her campus, University of Wisconsin-Madison, has been in a clustering hiring model for sometime. She mentioned when they first rolled out this idea, they got in 600 proposals for clusters, ideas for trying to create broader, interdisciplinary initiatives.

We are also interested in using the FEI initiative, where appropriate, to leverage impact so that if we can make appropriate targeted investments and really take ourselves to a new level that is desired and sought after. We also welcome proposals for new initiatives that will make a distinctive impact on this campus and this institution.

The Faculty Excellence Initiative will be administered out of my office and all of these new appointments are going to be shared commitments. Meaning, deans will have to put a shared commitment behind these appointments.

I raise the FEI hiring initiatives here, and they will be communicated repeatedly across our campus as we roll forward in the weeks ahead, because, of course, the ideas of where to hire new faculty are going to come from the faculty yourselves. If your deans haven't mentioned this, you are aware of it now and hopefully you will be seeding ideas and feeding them through the appropriate channels.

The Centenary Plan is a similar faculty hiring mechanism. In the interest of trying to make this as efficient as possible, and to allow the ability to perhaps combine these plans in some cases where there may actually be recruiting plan that would include tenure-track faculty and research faculty, there is a one application process that will come in through USCeRA and will be jointly administered by the research office and by my office.

I think I will stop there Mr. Chairman. Are there any question, comments or discussion on anything I've discussed, or failed to discuss? Thank you.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you Mr. Provost. A rumor has it that every institution that you worked in Professor Becker has earned a national championship. Is that true?

PROVOST BECKER – Not every institution but .....

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The last two. How about those?

PROVOST BECKER – No, all the ones since 1985. Since 1980, sorry.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Do you have any predictions of the areas that we might expect to see some?

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Be careful, Mark.

PROVOST BECKER – I can give you records and then you can choose your own inference.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Okay, we just want the data.

PROVOST BECKER – The first three were in football. The next four were in ice hockey.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Bad data.

PROVOST BECKER – And, then there was golf and then, I believe, women's ice hockey.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – We have our work cut out for us.

PROVOST BECKER – But there are opportunities at USC.

PROFESSOR WANZER DRANE (Parliamentarian) – The women have already won one national championship. Maybe they could win us another one.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – That is correct. Associate Provost Heider, I believe, has comments for us with regard to the on line T&P. Or are we not going to mention that? Apparently we are not going to deal with that.

VICE-PRESIDENT WILLIAM HOGUE (and Chief Information Officer) – Mr. Chair and members of the Faculty Senate. Thank you for the opportunity to talk for just a couple of minutes about several IT issues and I promise that I will go through them rather quickly.

The first one is closely related to an issue that I know has come before this body or its subcommittees on more than one occasion and that is plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty. I've been approached by a number of faculty members in person

and contacted via e-mail and through other means to acquire for the University of South Carolina a site-wide software license for anti-plagiarism software. I wanted to let you know that I am going to proceed on that advice and respond to those requests by initiating a procurement process to in fact acquire a site license. Just so that you can familiarize yourself with the tool and it is only a tool there are certainly many non-technical ways to approach the issue of academic dishonesty. So this is yet another tool that you may have in your portfolio.

One of the pieces of software that is most frequently talked about is a piece of software called turn-it-in and you can look at it and get additional information about it at [www.turnitin.com](http://www.turnitin.com) on the internet. Just to give you a quick preview what this particular software does is it allows faculty members to submit a piece of work that has been submitted to you. The software then matches it against an accessible internet archive of 4.5 billion pages that are out on the internet and they update those pages at a rate of 40 million pages a day. It also includes millions of published works including proquest commercial databases ABI and form, periodical abstracts, business dateline, etc., etc. And it also maintains a database of previously submitted student papers. One of the issues for us will be to make sure that whatever we acquire integrates well with Blackboard, our course management system. So that will be a consideration as well. If any of you have a particular passionate interest in this particular topic and this area of software, I'd love to hear from you off line. But I did want to make you aware since a number of your colleagues have approached me, that that will in fact be something that we proceed to acquire for the University as a site license.

I also want to mention ERP. ERP is a meaningless acronym that stands for Enterprise Resource Planning which is also an empty construct but in itself it refers to student information systems, financial systems, and HR systems which are really the heart of the systems that run our \$750 million a year enterprise at the University of South Carolina. Our current systems work but they are not flexible. They are rooted in information technology architecture that is approximately 30 years old at this time which as you know, makes them ancient in IT terms. We have been granted through President Sorensen and his senior teams good graces and through approval of the Board of Trustees some funding for an intensive planning process for looking at those systems. That is underway now. The sponsor team which consists of myself, Provost Becker, CFO Rick Kelly, and Vice President for HR Jane Jameson will meet for the first time as a group this coming Monday and we expect to make a formal announcement of this planning process which we will send to all of you late next week.

A third area that I wanted to mention is the campuses wireless initiative. The current status is that if we look at the campus as a whole, including the VA campus, about 40% of the University of South Carolina campus currently has access to wireless technology for connecting laptops and other wireless devices to the network. The goal is, during the course of this academic year, to build it out to 100%. That process as I indicated is currently underway. Right now we have ordered our equipment, we have selected our contractors, and as soon as we finish some last minute testing for authentication which is a way that we know that there are legitimate users on the network

and make sure that that authentication works seamlessly across the campus so that if you are on a electronic device and you walk from one part of the campus to another you don't lose signal and have to re log in. As soon as that testing is finished, we will initiate the project. We've divide the campus up into four quadrants. You will see the results first in the area around the Horseshoe going down to the Colonial Center, over as far as Pickens Street and then all the way out past the dormitories and out to Williams-Brice Stadium on USC property not on private commercial property, residential property. The second phase of the project we will take care of the rest of the campus and you will be learning a lot more about that as we go on. I am very excited about the flexibility that this will afford us particularly in some of our academic areas. Students are keenly interested in wireless technology and this will allow us to meet their expectations.

The final thing that I wanted to mention today is another project that will have a significant in your face, if you will, at your desktop impact on how you conduct your daily business. I announced to the Council of Deans this morning that we will launch in October an Enterprise E-mail Calendaring and Electronic Directory project. This will be a very large project because we currently manage about 35,000 e-mail accounts we can currently process about 12 million e-mail messages a month so nearly 150 e-mail messages a year.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – And I get a million of them.

VICE PRESIDENT HOGUE – You get a million of them and we filter for you sir. For those of you who say well a lot of the stuff I get is garbage and a lot of the stuff I get is garbage too and I'm not talking about correspondence that I don't want to hear from. I'm talking about infamous spam that is bedeviling all of us. Just so you know we protect our campus with what are called fire walls that essentially filter suspicious looking messages before they ever get to end users. Our filters catch 1.5 million e-mail messages every month that are garbage – spam, the worst of the spam. Unfortunately it is a moving target. Any of you who read any piece of press, it does not have to be technical, in the lay press know that spam is a very serious issue. It often brings with it viruses and so forth. We continue to fight that battle but the point is that we are in fact making some headway, we'd like to make a lot more. Those 150 million e-mail messages a year are delivered, supported, all of the underlying technology with a grand total of 3.5 full-time equivalent staff. So it is a very lean operation and it is critical. We recently did a survey. A number of you participated. We had nearly 1,000 responses last spring when we did an e-mail survey. You won't believe this perhaps but the results were that among faculty and staff (and that is who this survey was addressed to) e-mail now is considered to slightly more important than the telephone for communication. It has become the single most important means of communication. So as we move to a unified e-mail system, that is an e-mail system that everyone shares in, a unified calendaring system and perhaps the most complicated and the most important part a unified directory (so that all of us can find automatically e-mail addresses for one another for groups of people with whom we work) that will probably not actually go into operation until after the spring semester. Between now and then we will do the planning, we will do the communication, we will work on the acquisition of the necessary servers, training not only our core IT personnel

but also those of you who have IT personnel in your departments, schools and colleges. We will pick a transition date with lots of publicity ahead of time that has the smallest impact we think on daily operations. If you are moving 150 million e-mail messages, the last thing that you want to do is pick a peak time and pull the plug. So that is certainly not our intention.

Another positive effect of this is, we currently have through our current electronic directory system a situation where a student who is enrolled in multiple schools and colleges for course work may very well find out that he or she has to use 3 or 4 different user ids and 3 or 4 different passwords. That is really not the way we want to do business for our students or our faculty at the University. So we expect that that “single sign on,” as it is called, implementation will be vast improvement in how we currently do business. More about that as time goes on.

Could I address any questions? Feel free to send me e-mail at your leisure. Thank you for your time.

## **5. Unfinished Business.**

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

## **6. New Business.**

PROFESSOR ALICE KASAKOFF (Anthropology) – I would like to share with you some questions I have about the case of Dr. Afflitto who was teaching at the University in Sumter until, I think, August 30. I offer this in the spirit of openness, to try to stop rumors and to also look towards the future as to whether this case has implications (as I think it does) for academic freedom and the future of that on this campus. I have many questions because there has been very little information about this available but what I understand happened is that Dr. Afflitto was a beginning Assistant Professor at USC Sumter. He started in August and on August 30 he was suspended without pay. He was arrested and put in the Lee Sumter County detention center. I heard just in the past 2 hours that his official status with the University is that he has been terminated.

Let me tell you a little bit about Afflitto. He is Islamic and he is a US citizen. His research is on violence and victims of violence. He won a prize for his dissertation on the disappeared in Guatemala. He has done research with Palestinians and Palestinian refugees. If you google him you, you will find an article sympathetic to Palestinians but you will also find an article opposed to the September 11 bombing saying it was contrary to Islam. He believed he was on an FBI Watch List. Now at about the same time as I discovered this information, Attorney General Ashcroft was noted in the press as having called the US Attorneys, asking them to round up people who are on FBI Watch Lists, if necessary, on minor charges, so that they would not disrupt the elections. I thought that perhaps Dr. Afflitto could be one of these cases.



Now in the course of pursuing these inquiries just today I have new information but even with this new information, I think a case could be made that it is one of these cases. As I understand it, he was extradited to Florida where he faced 3 charges. One a cocaine charge, another a probation charge – a violation of probation, and third driving with impaired equipment. That I think certainly could be a minor charge – it could be a broken headlight. Of course there are many questions here and we may never know the answers. As for the other two charges, he had told a faculty member that he was doing his research with people who possessed drugs and that was the result. Also I heard that he had been arrested in Tennessee, where he had previously worked, on a drug charge. However, I haven't heard that he has been convicted. I still have some questions about this case which I would like the Welfare Committee or some appropriate committee to look into. Our policies have a lot of information about just cause, the person being able to defend himself. A person who is arrested on a drug charge may not necessarily be convicted. And, we still don't know whether these procedures were followed. It seems to warrant suspension, yes, if a person cannot carry on his duties. Termination is a whole other kettle of fish.

Let us move beyond Dr. Afflitto's specific case and ask ourselves if there are things that as faculty we should be aware of. If this, of course, becomes a pattern we need to think about it but it seems to me that it raises some other more general issues for the future. For example, what is the University's policy concerning the employment of people on watch lists? What is the University's policy about people who have been convicted or arrested in the past? Should the policy be changed to protect academic freedom, especially of people who engage in controversial research like this? Research that might expose them to the risk of being arrested in the course of their research. Also I would like to know whether there are any other cases in which Islamic students or faculty have been dismissed.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Mr. Chair.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Mr. President.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Yes, if I may speak to this particular case. Normally I would refuse to talk about an issue regarding any faculty or staff member but because the person has been identified and because there have been articles in the Sumter newspapers regarding him, I offer the following. He was arrested for drug trafficking in Tennessee and convicted.

PROFESSOR KASAKOFF – I didn't know that.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – He was convicted in Tennessee. In the course of the processing of him, they discovered that he had felony conviction in Florida and that he was on probation. He violated the terms of the probation by having another felony conviction so he was remanded to the jails in Florida. We have a policy that every staff and faculty member is asked upon hiring: "Have you ever been convicted of a crime?" And, you have to fill that out. It is cause for dismissal if you are dishonest and he said

that he had never been convicted of crime when in fact he has. So we have two convictions for drug trafficking or related crimes and violation of University policy that is cause for termination in itself. So those are the facts of the case as told to me by the head of the Sumter campus.

Now with respect to discrimination against because of their political beliefs or because of their religious beliefs, I have zero tolerance for anybody in anyone of the 8 institutions that makes up the University of South Carolina to be harassed, dismissed, fired, or treated malevolently because of their religious or their political beliefs. I am absolutely clear about that and I am very bold in stating that. I will be happy to say that again.

### **7. Report of Secretary.**

PROFESSOR WISE – Additional nominations will be taken at this time for a 3-year term on Faculty Advisory.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Seeing none, Professor Dickson is declared elected to the Faculty Advisory Committee.

### **8. Announcements or Good of the Order.**

None.

### **9. Adjournment.**

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – We will next meet on November 3, 2004 at 3:00 pm. Dr. Greenburg from the Medical University of South Carolina will be our guest. The Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn. Motion to adjourn please? Second. All those in favor say aye. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.