

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
November 3, 2004

CHAIR JAMES R. AUGUSTINE – Let me remind those of you that are senators if you would please sit in the center two sections and those of you who are visitors please sit on the outer sections.

1. Call to Order.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I call the November 3, 2004 meeting of the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina to order.

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The minutes have been circulated to Faculty Senators and are available on the web. I will entertain a motion to approve unless there are any additions or corrections.

PROFESSOR SARAH BARKER (Theatre and Dance) – I have a correction on page 3 under the last Professor Barker comment, 2nd sentence it should read: “That is **one** new **course** and several deletions...”

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Okay and, of course, it is not the last Professor Barker, we hope.

PROFESSOR BARKER – Thank you.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Any other additions or corrections? Seeing none, with that suggested correction, I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes. Is there a motion? Second? All those in favor of the minutes please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

3. Reports of Committees.

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

PROFESSOR WISE (Retailing) – Thorne Compton from the English Department has been appointed to serve a one-year term on the Admissions Committee. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee places in nomination John Logan, Moore School of Business for a two-year term, on the Admissions Committee. Nominations will be taken from the floor at this time and near the end of the meeting.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Professor Wise. The Faculty Senate Chair has the responsibility of appointing two faculty members to the Russell House Advisory Board. In consultation with the senators and those who responded to my e-mail, I recommended to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee today the appointment to the Russell House

Advisory Board of Larry Reagan from the School of Medicine and Stuart Usdan from the School of Public Health.

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

PROFESSOR STOWE (Hospitality, Retail, & Sport Management) – At our last meeting you graciously approved a proposal from the School of Journalism and Mass Communications on a curriculum matter. There was, however, imbedded in their report a request that affects transfer admission. They were asking to be able to admit people external to the University with a 2.5 cumulative grade point. The standard for transfer admission to the University currently is a 2.25. We point that out to you and tell you that we will take it up as an admissions item and bring it back to you later.

The Admissions Committee requests that proposals distinguish admission items from items more properly considered by other committees. Specifically we look at proposals that affect freshman and transfer admission as well as readmission to the University.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Don. Any questions for Professor Stowe?

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

PROFESSOR BARKER (Theatre & Dance) – We have several motions for you. We are going to start and go college by college. So number 1, College of Engineering and Information Technology - two new courses, ECIV 540 and ECIV 558 both also approved for telecommunication delivery.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – This motion comes from the Committee and does not need a second. These are two new courses in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering in the College of Engineering and Information Technology. Is there any discussion of these two new courses? If not, all those in favor of these two new courses please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BARKER – The College of Liberal Arts and we are going to go A. Contemporary European Studies Program a change in curriculum, and I believe this is truly a change in curriculum, that is designators to EURO, required number of hours in courses that the students take, and also the options to participate in summer study abroad and to do a thesis or non-thesis option. Then there are further changes in title, designator, and prerequisites; a deletion of Study Abroad.

Then we have B. Department of English Language and Literature with changes in number from 500 to 400 and deletions.

Then C. Department of Department of Religious Studies and yes that is a typo. So we are only going to have one Department up there. They have two new courses. In RELG 357 there is a typo in the description, instead of “Pegal” it is “legal.” In RELG

358 there is a typo in the description, the word “Literary” should be in lower caps “literary.” Those are two very exciting new courses with new faculty members. So those are the proposals we have for the College of Liberal Arts.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – This proposal comes from the Committee and does not need a second. On page 21 in the College of Liberal Arts, Contemporary European Studies Program a change in curriculum. On page 22 a change in title, designator, prerequisite, description and a deletion. On page 23 changes in number and deletions as well as new courses in two other departments. Is there any discussion please of those changes or recommendations from the Committee? Seeing none all those in favor of this motion please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes.

PROFESSOR BARKER – Thank you. The College of Mass Communications and Information Studies has a change in designator of many of their courses from CLIS (College of Library and Information Science) to SLIS (School of Library and Information Science).

I would also like to take us through number 4 and number 5. Number 4 is the Arnold School of Public Health a proposal for a minor that is a change in their curriculum and minor. There is a description of the minor there. Then a change in title, number, and description HPEB 101 to HPEB 300.

Finally, number 5 is from the College of Science and Mathematics, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry a new course CHEM 107.

Number 6 – Experimental Courses is for your information. If anyone in other departments wishes to communicate or have oversight in any of these X courses you can let me know, I will send you copies of their syllabi and then put you in touch with the people that are proposing those courses.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – On page 24 in the School of Library and Information Science a change in designator. In the Arnold School of Public Health, Department of Health Promotion, Education and Behavior a change in curriculum and a change in title, number and description at the bottom of 24. On page 25, number 5 from the College of Science and Mathematics a new course in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. Any discussion, please of these courses or changes in curricula.

PROFESSOR FRANK HARDISTY (Geography) – I have a question concerning the GEOL 551 which I realize is an experimental course.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Could I have you hold that for just a second. That is for information only. Let me take care of the motion for 3, 4, and 5 and then we will deal with that. Any comments, additions or corrections to the motion related to 3, 4, and 5 and we will pick up 6 in just a minute.

PROFESSOR TERRY WOLFER (Social Work) – I think there is probably something I just don't understand under number 4 the current and proposed change. This looks like an addition to the Undergraduate Bulletin?

PROFESSOR BARKER – Yes.

PROFESSOR WOLFER – And, it talks about programs of study that lead to a set of masters degrees including one in Social Work and we are just confused about what that means. Or am I just misunderstanding the language?

PROFESSOR BARKER – This is information they wanted to include there in introducing the idea of a minor. Nothing is new in that information, that is a report of what already exists in terms of their graduate program. And, this is what they wanted to include in describing what the minor would be. Is that what you are asking about?

PROFESSOR WOLFER – It suggests that there is nothing currently on the left hand side and that this is new language.

PROFESSOR BARKER – It is new language. It is new to the bulletin at that point in talking about the minor.

PROFESSOR STUART USDAN (Public Health) – There is a joint Master of Social Work and PhD degree. That is what that is referring to. As far as the newness, this is just how we describe ourselves but it just hasn't been in the Undergraduate Bulletin like that, which is referring to the joint degree that we offer.

PROFESSOR WOLFER – Okay, that is probably what I was confused about because I know about that but I thought that this was the Undergraduate Bulletin.

PROFESSOR BARKER – That is exactly what this is.....

PROFESSOR WOLFER – Just announcing what else is offered in the way of minors.

PROFESSOR BARKER – Yes, right. Yes, this is simply a proposal for the minor adding the new thing is the minor but they have put that in there. Is that alright? Is that clear?

PROFESSOR WOLFER – I think so.

PROFESSOR BARKER – I will check on it again.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Other comments or questions? Again we are back on page 24 number 3, 4, and 5 the Colleges of Mass Communications and Information Studies, Arnold School of Public Health, and Science and Mathematics. The motion comes from the Committee. All those in favor please say aye. Opposed no. The motion passes. Now let's deal with number 6.

PROFESSOR HARDISTY – We were a little surprised to see this proposal here because this same course was proposed a year ago and rejected as being too duplicative of Geography’s offerings. So I have a question first, I guess, which is what is the mechanism for objecting to an experimental course. Or is there one?

PROFESSOR BARKER – At this point, the way I understand the process, you can advise you can communicate to them about it. They can only teach it once. Then they have to develop it and propose it once again. Then it will come officially before the Committee on Curriculum and Courses and we will approve or not. So there really does not exist, as far as I understand it, any process of stopping an X course once it is proposed. It can be taught.

PROFESSOR HARDISTY – Actually we support with modifications this proposal. We have been in discussion with the instructor. Can I say what those modifications are and get them in the minutes.

PROFESSOR BARKER – Yes, if you would like to get them in the minutes that is a good idea. If you can keep this brief.

PROFESSOR HARDISTY – Sure. Currently their prerequisites are “GEOG 363 or equivalent or consent of instructor” that should be modified to: Prereq: GEOG 363, 563 or equivalent at another university or consent of instructor.”

PROFESSOR BARKER – Are you saying that it is a prerequisite 363 “and” “or?”

PROFESSOR HARDISTY – Or, or.

PROFESSOR BARKER – Very good.

PROFESSOR HARDISTY – And, we would also like it noted that Geological Sciences has agreed to ensure that this course in the future is developed on the basis that it builds on the foundations that are provided in the Geography department by those courses (GEOG 363 and 563).

PROFESSOR BARKER – Well that sounds like you are working together on that.

PROFESSOR HARDISTY – We are! We like to be friendly.

PROFESSOR BARKER – Good.

PROFESSOR HARDISTY – Thanks.

PROFESSOR BARKER – We are done.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Professor Barker and thank you for your comments. I am sure that if any of you have objections to experimental courses in the spirit of

collegiality it would be appropriate to write a letter to the department that may be suggesting the course and send a letter to Professor Barker as well. Perhaps we can deal with these matters before they get to the floor of the Senate in the future.

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

PROFESSOR EVANS (Religious Studies) – We have no report.

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

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The Faculty Advisory Committee does not have a report.

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

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – I would take that as no report.

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

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Are we getting something instead of flu shots, Professor Allman?

PROFESSOR ALLMAN (Continuing Education) – Not yet. We are working on it. We are working hard. As a matter of fact we met October 18 and we had a number of diverse matters that we discussed, first was summer compensation. Dr. John Skvoretz, Interim Dean for the College of Liberal Arts, described summer compensation practices within his college. The standard teaching load for full-time instructor is 4 courses in both the spring and fall semesters but faculty members typically teach only 2 courses each semester. Duties performed during the summers such as supervising graduate students are considered one way of making up for reduced teaching loads during the spring and fall semesters. In response to my request for feedback on HR 1.81 dealing with summer compensation, I received 2 e-mails from 2 faculty both from the College of Education describing their situations. One respondent received reduced teaching loads during fall and spring with no summer compensation for graduate students. And, of course, this basically follows Dr. Skvoretz's practice. This faculty member advised approximately 23 graduate students last summer and she had more students in the fall and spring; two students in independent study, 6 students in dissertation credit hours, and received no compensation. The other faculty member felt that the policy should be expanded to cover field study and internship classes. So that is what we found out at this juncture. If anybody wishes to send us more information, we are happy to receive it.

Then had we Jerry Brewer who is Director of Student Life and Herbert Camp, the Director of Campus Recreation, discuss faculty membership fees at the Strom Thurmond Wellness and Fitness Center. They provided a chart that showed the range of figures for 11 SEC universities. Ranging from no fee at Auburn to \$455 at Vanderbilt University. We are not going to get the no fee. Jerry expressed interest in having more faculty members use the center and said they would welcome faculty who want to try the center

out for a week before joining. They invited our committee to submit a proposal which we are doing. We are in the process of that, we have submitted something and we are waiting for a response.

The next item was Jane Jameson, Vice President of Human Resources, who explained a proposed HR policy for job reference and other background checks. We suggested ways to clarify the policy and also questioned doing credit report checks on new hires. Jane agreed to take another look at that and talk to whoever in the administration she needs to. The Board of Trustees has mandated that the University have a policy in place by January. So I am sure we will be hearing more about that.

Then as Jim referred, the University will not receive any flu shot vaccines this year so we can't help you there.

The Committee decided not to fund a request to pay part of the fee for faculty members for the Weight Watchers At Work Program because it is expensive to support and would only benefit a limited number of people.

And, finally we are looking at other faculty perks. We are trying to ferret out all those perks that exist that we may not know about. I have discovered some that I had no idea existed. Some of the things are the discounts through Family Fund but there are other things like cell phone bills and purchasing computers and maybe some other things we don't know about. So we are working on that. Questions?

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Linda.

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

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – There is no report from University Athletics Advisory Committee. They did meet this month and I'm sure Professor Bearden will have a report for us next month.

4. Reports of Officers.

PRESIDENT ANDREW SORENSEN – Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. In the interest of granting President Greenberg, who is visiting with us today at the invitation of the Faculty Senate, I will keep my remarks very brief. There are numerous searches for deans and Provost Becker will report on those: a search for the Dean of the School of Public Health, a Dean for Social Work, a Dean for the School of Music, and a Dean of the Honors College. Dean Sederberg announced recently his intent to step down as the Dean at the end of this academic year. Also searches for a Dean of College of Nursing. A search for the Executive Dean of Pharmacy, there are four candidates, the fourth candidate was on our campus today. I will defer to Provost Becker to report on those. If you need more detailed information, Dr. Pastides is with us today and I'm sure he can supplement Provost Becker's report.

Plans are coming along very nicely for the research campus. We are going to have a ground breaking ceremony in early December for new buildings to be built at the so called Hardee's block. We are excited about conversations with various firms that engage in knowledge revolution-driven industries, as well as facilities on the campus to accommodate the number of scientists and researchers in a variety fields who need additional space. I am excited about those plans.

We have had some good fortune with respect to giving to the University. I call attention just to three schools that are benefiting not to suggest these are the only ones but these gifts have come through in the recent week to the Law School. The Library will be announcing a large gift to the Library on November 8 at 11 o'clock. A ceremony will be available for all who are interested. If you are interested in learning more about it, I will be happy to meet with you after the Senate meeting or you could call my office and get the precise location for that meeting. Recently we got a gift to the Business School of \$3 million from the Sunoco Corporation. That is the end of my report, Mr. Chair. I will be happy to respond to any questions about what I've said or neglected to say. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. Provost.

PROVOST MARK BECKER – Thank you, Jim. My report also will be brief. My report will focus on academic appointments in the Provost's Office and, as the President said, updates on deans' searches.

As has been published in USC Times, I have now appointed four associate provosts. They are:

Karl G. Heider, a Carolina Distinguished Professor in Anthropology and is now an Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies. A position he had held in an interim capacity since early summer.

Christine Ebert, a Professor of Science Education in the College of Education and a principal in the development of the GK 12 Fellows Program is now Associate Provost for Institutional Outreach and Dean of the Graduate School. She too held the position of Dean of the Graduate School as an interim. Dr. Ebert's new duties for Institutional Outreach include facilitating the coordination and advancement of the University's academic outreach activities.

William T. Moore is Associate Provost for Budget and Operations. He is a Professor of Finance and holds the David and Esther Berlinberg Distinguished Professorship. Professor Moore also is the Executive Editor of the Journal of Financial Research.

Gordon Baylis, a Professor of Cognitive Neuroscience and a member of the MUSC Center for Advanced Imaging Research is Associate Provost for Academic Initiatives, is the Associate Provost for Academic Initiatives. This is a new position in

the Provost's Office and the focus of it is assuring that new programs, including faculty hiring initiatives, and particularly the faculty excellence initiative, achieve maximum success in advancing excellence in the University's education and research programs.

Each of these candidates is outstanding in his or her own right for the position they are assuming. I am delighted that we have been able to attract such a strong team to the Provost's Office.

Deans' Searches. As has been reported publicly, Mary Ann Fitzpatrick, Deputy Dean of the College of Letters and Science at the University of Wisconsin-Madison has accepted our offer to be the founding dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Dr. Fitzpatrick is an energetic and visionary leader, a nationally recognized scholar, and has an outstanding record of accomplishment in University Administration and Leadership positions at a large, comprehensive public research university. Under Dr. Fitzpatrick's leadership, we now move to effect the merger aim to developing a nationally prominent college of Arts and Sciences. Dean-elect Fitzpatrick assumes her USC responsibilities effective mid-January.

Search committees being formed - Dean Rossi of the School of Music has announced that he will be departing USC in May at the end of the spring semester and I am in the process of finalizing that committee. A public announcement of the committee members will be made as soon as we get to the final membership. As the President reported, Dean Sederberg will be stepping down at the end of this year as Dean of the Honors College. We are in the beginning of forming a search committee to replace Dean Sederberg.

In the Health Sciences, Dr. Pastides has asked me to report on the following four dean searches: In Public Health the search committee has given the names of three finalists to Dr. Pastides and we anticipate having progress to report soon. In both Nursing and Social Work committees have been constituted. Dean Willis, who happens to be present today, is Chair of the Nursing Search Committee. Dean Moody is Chair of the Social Work Search Committee. Social Work will meet Friday, November 5 and the Nursing Search Committee meets Tuesday, November 23. Finally, as the President reported, in the Pharmacy search for an Executive Dean three candidates have been to campus and the fourth candidate is on campus this week.

This concludes my report, Mr. Chair. I am available for questions, comments, or discussion. Thank you.

PROFESSOR MICHAEL MYRICK (Chemistry & Biochemistry) – Has a decision been made about where the new dean of Arts and Sciences will be located?

PROVOST BECKER – In terms of her office?

PROFESSOR MYRICK – Yes.

PROVOST BECKER – No. That is part of what she will figure out in effecting the merger.

PROFESSOR MYRICK – Do you know if there will be satellite offices located in one or the other places?

PROVOST BECKER – I do not know that at this time. We don't know where she will sit and I know of no plan to create multiple offices. Other questions? Thank you.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Mr. Provost.

5. Report of Secretary.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Let me do the report of the Secretary and then we will move on to new business to introduce our guest.

PROFESSOR WISE – Additional nominations will be taken at this time for the Committee on Admissions.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Remember Professor Logan was nominated by the Senate Steering Committee for a two-year term on the Committee on Admissions. Are there other nominees from the floor? If not, I move the nominations closed and Professor Logan elected to that position.

6. Unfinished Business.

None.

7. New Business.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Last April, I wrote to Dr. Greenberg at the Medical University of South Carolina and invited him to come to the Faculty Senate and address this body. He graciously accepted my invitation. Dr. Greenberg is the 8th President of the Medical University of South Carolina, a native of Chapel Hill-North Carolina where he graduated from that University in 1976 with highest honors in Chemistry, in 1979 he completed his medical studies at Duke University, and received not only a medical degree but later a Master of Public Health from Harvard University in 1980. Dr. Greenberg then undertook training in Pediatrics at Boston Children's Hospital before returning to Carolina for a PhD in Epidemiology in 1983. Dr. Greenberg joined the faculty of Emory University where he was an active participant as a cancer researcher. Then in 1990 when Emory decided to establish a School of Public Health, he was appointed as its first dean. In 1995 Dr. Greenberg was recruited to the Medical University of South Carolina as Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and 5 years later he succeeded James B. Edwards as the President of the Medical University. Dr. Greenberg is the author of about 150 scientific publications and is nationalized recognized for his research on cancers. He has served on many national scientific advisory boards. He and his wife, who is very

much involved in the local arts community, live on Sullivan's Island. I have asked Dr. Greenberg to make a few remarks and open the floor to questions. If you do have a question, please stand and state your name clearly and your question. We will let him deal with the questions after his comments. Dr. Greenberg, welcome to the Faculty Senate at the University of South Carolina.

PRESIDENT RAYMOND S. GREENBERG – Thank you very much. It is an absolute pleasure to be here with you today. I am pleased to have the invitation and have an opportunity to meet with the Faculty Senate. I have tremendous respect for this institution which I think is evident by the close ties that we are trying to build between the Medical University of South Carolina and the University of South Carolina. I am on this campus probably almost as much as I am on our own campus and it is a great pleasure to be with you.

I also want to express my appreciation to you for the work that you do as members of the Faculty Senate. I have had the privilege of working with the Faculty Senate both at Emory and at the Medical University. The Faculty Senate clearly performs a very important role for the campus. It is vital to the administration of the University to hear the concerns, the issues, and the ideas that are percolating through the faculty. I know that this comes on top of many other responsibilities that you have and I congratulate you for making the effort to be so involved in the life of the University.

I am very cognizant of the fact that I appear before you today the day after the election. November 2 will probably be a day we will remember as a critical day in the life of the State of South Carolina, of course, because mini bottles were done in. And, anything I can say is probably insignificant compared to that major political development.

I do want to talk about the context of collaboration between our campuses. I suspect probably the greatest interest involves discussion about the integration of education programs and I will come back to talk about that, but I do want to emphasize that this is, in my opinion, part of a much broader context of building partnerships between our institutions. Let me start with saying why I think it is an important thing not just for the University of South Carolina or the Medical University of South Carolina but the State of South Carolina. I think we all realize that this is a modest sized state of about 4 million people. It is a state that has had typically a very modest amount of financial resources available and it has invested, I think we would all agree, a very modest proportion of that modest resource in higher education. On top of that, the state has chosen to have many institutions of higher education distributed regionally. What that has done has effectively taken an unfortunately small pie and split it into a lot of even smaller pieces. And, that is a challenge to all of us in trying to build the highest quality education environment that we can in this state. It has become clear to me in the almost 10 years I have been in South Carolina that one of, if not the greatest strategy for overcoming those structural challenges is to put our resources together. That is what I think is probably the greatest opportunity for us to create high quality programs in this state. I wish that my regular meetings with the General Assembly made me optimistic

that huge new investments were going to be made in higher education in South Carolina, but we are living in a time and culture where that simply is not going to happen. So we have to figure out how to take the resources that we have and make the most of them.

In my opinion the relationship between the Medical University and the University of South Carolina is a particularly important interface because we are very complementary institutions. We have important relationships with other higher education institutions in South Carolina and beyond the State of South Carolina, but I would say that this is probably the single most important strategic relation for us because of the complementarity of our programs. MUSC is not a comprehensive university and we will never be a comprehensive university. As a result of that fact, there are key disciplines increasingly important in the health sciences that we don't have on our campus. We don't have a Chemistry department. You have a nationally prominent Chemistry department on this campus. It makes no sense for us to try to replicate—to build a small inadequate version of a great Chemistry department. We don't have a Physics department. Physics is becoming an essential discipline in areas such as Biomedical Imaging. We don't have an Engineering department, and obviously Biomedical Engineering is a very important growth area not only in this state but nationally. We don't have the resources to build these activities independently. What we need to do is go out and find opportunities to build partnership with those institutions that do have those strengths. As I say, USC represents for us the best research-oriented campus to build those collaborations. Now these kind of collaborations are happening in my opinion not driven by administrative fiat, but by investigators sitting down and working together on collaborative projects.

We see that happening in a number of areas. The lottery funded endowed chairs program is just one example of where many of those collaborations are taking place. We see them happening around brain imaging, regenerative medicine, cancer drug development where there are two endowed chairs, there are three new proposals that have just been submitted for joint USC/MUSC endowed chairs. So we are going to increasingly have centers of excellence spreading the collaborations across investigators on both of our campuses.

The second thing that has been brought together related to the endowed chairs program is the hospital collaborative. South Carolina is the only state that I know of—I can't claim that it is truly the only one but it is the only one I am aware of—where you have the two health sciences academic campuses and the three major teaching hospitals all working together in a joint effort to build programs of quality both in the clinical arena as well as the research arena. Having grown up in North Carolina and having worked for 12 years in Georgia, I can tell you that in neither of those states would it ever be possible to establish that kind of collaboration. I think that is a unique resource and an opportunity that presents itself for us to utilize to the greatest possible advantage.

The Life Sciences Act was passed last legislative session through strong joint legislative efforts of our two campuses and Clemson. This act provides money from the state's borrowing capacity to build research facilities at the three research university

campuses. The State thinks of this as a huge investment, but we might put this in some context. In the State of North Carolina a few years ago they passed a bond referendum to build new buildings on the 16 campuses of the University – a \$3 billion effort. The campus at Chapel Hill alone has \$1 billion of new construction taking place as we speak. Together the research universities in South Carolina—all three campuses—are sharing a quarter of a billion dollars. So all three of our campuses put together share about a quarter of the investment that is being made at Chapel Hill alone. That is the kind of environment in which we must compete. So we have to use every nickel of that money to the greatest possible advantage. We have to find programs that can be successful and that can compete with the best on the national level. Still, we need to be grateful for that resource. In the 10 years that I have been in South Carolina, that is the first significant investment in research facilities that I have seen our legislature make. I can't say it is the first one that has happened, but in 10 years, that is truly the first significant statewide investment in building research infrastructure.

In the context of all that happening, we have been in discussions about academic programs that we have on both of our campuses where there are opportunities for creating strength by leveraging our collective resources. The conversation started as everyone in this room knows with Pharmacy and I think it is important to say why Pharmacy was a place to start with these discussions. For one thing both colleges had deans that had announced that they were about to step down within the next year or so. So there would be a succession process both campuses would face. Secondly, both of those schools have had a joint PhD program now for over 20 years—a very successful program, in which over 60 candidates have been jointly trained by the two campuses. Thirdly, in addition to that joint degree program there is one core degree offered by both campuses with largely similar curricula—the PharmD Program—it is not a discipline in which there are 20 different degrees offered as might be found in some other colleges. So being able to find integration between the curricula should be easier in Pharmacy than it might be in some other areas. Finally, and maybe most importantly, there are very complementary strengths at these two schools. The college on the USC campus has the advantage of having a very large undergraduate student body here and a resource base for dealing with a large undergraduate student body. We have on our campus mostly graduate and professional students so we don't have all the infrastructure to support undergraduates. We don't have pre-pharmacy students on our campus—a strength that USC brings. We don't have a Chemistry department, so we don't have strong medicinal chemistry as exists on the USC campus. On the other hand we have some things that the campus at USC doesn't have. We have all of the clinical health disciplines on our campus. We have our own core teaching hospital, and a very strong residency program that is part of our college. So, there are strengths that both campuses can bring together and add value, so that the total is greater than the sum of the parts.

We have tried to go through the process of looking at the integration in a very deliberate way. We started with the two deans of the two schools making a series of proposals. We then put together a working group involving faculty from both campuses and asked them to look at those proposals and refine them. We then brought in outside consultants to review the recommendations that were made. Was the consultant report

perfect? No. As Dr. Sorensen said yesterday, and I would agree with his statement, there is no consultant report where everybody agrees with everything that is said in the report. On the other hand, these were objective people from the outside who came without any bias that I know of and looked at our system and made some suggestions. There was no question in their mind that there was great value added to bringing the two campuses together.

Maybe one of the biggest tests of whether the integration makes sense is if you advertise a job for somebody to come and run this combined entity is there any interest in that job? Would people want that job, would they be interested in coming? We have a stronger pool of candidates for this new position than I have seen for almost any academic job. We've had in the pool of finalists a sitting dean, a former dean, an associate dean, and someone who was a full professor at a very prominent institution who is now working in private industry. All the candidates who have visited our campuses remain interested in further discussions. So I think we have a very strong pool with some range of backgrounds to choose from in the candidates. And, they are expressing their hope and optimism about this integration based upon their interest in the position.

So we are at a very critical juncture and we are continuing to pursue the process of bringing these two campuses together. There are two committees that have been identified to work on curricular issues and research collaboration and I hope that those committees will become active soon. I hope we will be able to reach a decision on the dean for the overall entity very soon and move forward as expeditiously as possible.

I imagine there are many questions. I don't want to preempt any question that anybody might have on this or any other topic, so let me pause at this point and entertain any questions.

PROFESSOR MICHAEL DICKSON (Pharmacy) – Thank you for coming it is a pleasure to have you here and it is very helpful to us to hear about the plans of the merger for Pharmacy from your perspective.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Let me remind everyone to please state their name for the record. Thank you.

PROFESSOR DICKSON – The State Newspaper reported in various places that you believe the Pharmacy merger is a cornerstone even a foundation on which to integrate other academic programs – to build larger scale collaboration – not a direct quote but close. Could you indicate exactly what other programs might be integrated and how that integration might occur?

PRESIDENT GREENBERG – I would like to be able to give you a complete list. I am not sure where that quote originates. It has become very clear to me that any such discussion on any integration of academic programs is very time consuming. I am speaking only for myself, but I think it would be true for President Sorensen. We have probably spent more of our personal time on this issue than any other single academic

issue we've had to deal with. So we will continue to focus our energies on Pharmacy for the foreseeable future.

As you think about other programs that we share in common it is very clear to me that every one has its own merits. There is not a single formula from one discipline that would work in any other discipline. We are going to have to deal with them one at a time. I am just not prepared to talk about any other program at the moment. There is no educational program that I am aware of that is in an active discussion at this moment. There are many research programs in which there is very active discussion about integration and joint proposals.

The USC Board has supported a research foundation integration. Our board has talked about that issue as well. I don't know how much background this group has on it, but what we are looking at is an umbrella research organization that can span both campuses. Our board has discussed that and has encouraged us to continue to pursue discussions. I think it makes a lot of sense. Our faculty frustration derives from the duplicative processes required to perform joint research. For example, you have to go through two separate IRBs right now on the USC and the MUSC campus. That makes absolutely no sense. We ought to be able to come up with an integrated system that makes life easier for people to do collaborative work across the campuses.

Research is an area where I think there is opportunity, but as I've said to Dr. Pastides on many occasions, there are so many issues that you have to think through in terms of beginning to integrate research operations. It is going to take some time for us to work through the process. But we have already been to the National Institutes of Health, where we met with the Deputy Director of the External Grant Program to talk with her about integrating our research organizations. What kind of structure should we put in place? Would she encourage us to move forward? While they can't take an official position on it, they have been positive about the idea of having this sort of joint effort. The only example they could cite nationally of multiple campuses with one kind of umbrella research organization is the State University of New York system. It is working very effectively there. I think it is going to take time for us to work through, but we are committed to it in large part because we think it is in the interest of the faculty of both campuses.

PROFESSOR DICKSON – Some of this may seem trivial but it is an issue that has been around awhile and I think it would be good to have some clarity on it. From several sources now we've read that the Executive Dean will have offices at MUSC and USC. Various words are used but, the phrase that I've seen most recently is "...but will reside in Charleston." I am assuming that you are not telling this person where to live so I would like some interpretation about what it means to reside there when you have two offices.

PRESIDENT GREENBERG – Well, I don't think the person should be asked to live in two different places and with no candidate have I said that there is a requirement that they live in Charleston. I would like for the person to choose to come to South Carolina and

figure out how to manage two geographic locations to the best of their ability. There are clearly advantages of one location and advantages of the other location. We had a conversation yesterday with the two vice presidents and two presidents with one of the candidates where they were asking us a lot of detailed organizational questions. He was looking for us to define much more structure for that individual on a personal basis. I think our collective general response was: “We can make all these decisions, but having been a dean myself, I would like a free hand. I wouldn’t want the president of a university making every organization decision about internal operation of my college.” So we have intentionally not tried to micromanage decisions that we feel that the dean should make. Now that doesn’t mean that we won’t help the dean think through these decisions, that we won’t provide advice and guidance. We will make ourselves available to support the dean. But in the final analysis it is absolutely critical that the faculty of the college and the dean are making many of these internal management kinds of decisions, rather than being directed by the administration of either or both of the campuses.

PROFESSOR DICKSON – A brief follow up. I would certainly agree with that approach. That is why it was a bit troubling to hear these statements that said that the person would be based in Charleston. Now you seem to be saying that is an open question. Is that true?

PRESIDENT GREENBERG – I am often told that I’ve said this or said that. It is an interesting phenomenon because in some instances I know I haven’t said what was attributed to me. Nevertheless, when the report of the consultants came out, as you well know because you read it very carefully, they made comments about the need to identify a base and they reviewed carefully both settings and they came up with a recommendation that Charleston be the base. Not everybody is happy with that decision, but the comments that I have made that you are citing must be in the context of that report. I think if a dean candidate came to us and said this is absolutely unworkable, I have to be in Columbia. That is something that we would have to take very seriously. That has not yet occurred. Nobody has said, “I have to be in Columbia.” What I have actually heard from both candidates is, “What is absolutely critical for me to be successful in this role that I be physically present in both locations substantial portions of my time such that I am not perceived by either faculty as having a bias towards either campus.” I have heard that from all four candidates independently. So to me where they reside is really a secondary issue. It is as unimportant as whether I live in Sullivan’s Island or Mount Pleasant or Charleston for that matter. That is a personal decision. What is absolutely critical is that the individual who is chosen can represent the interests of both campuses. He or she must know what is going on in both campuses, and be sensitive to the culture and the environment of both campuses, and represent them effectively. I am convinced that we have people that have tremendous sophistication and experience and desire to do that, but ultimately it is going to come down to who we choose and can they do it well.

PROFESSOR MYRICK – I would like to thank you also for coming down today to speak to us. I understand that one of the purposes of this combination of the two colleges is to conserve the resources and focus them. I’ve heard you say that the strength of MUSC is

the research programs and graduate programs and the strength of USC is the undergraduate program. Does that mean in furtherance of focusing resources that a dean is likely to focus the growth of the research program into MUSC and reserve all the undergraduates stuff here at USC?

PRESIDENT GREENBERG – First of all, let me be very careful, I did not intend to give a complete compendium of the strengths and weaknesses of the respective campuses. I just cited some obvious examples of differences between the two campuses and how putting them together might create an entity that is greater than either one alone. There have been a number of students on this campus who've had some concerns about the integration. One of the things that I think is very important is increasing their educational opportunities. Right now if a student wants to go into a more clinically oriented area, their options are not as wide as I would hope they would be under this kind of formulation. So I am hoping what this will do is create more opportunities for students in Charleston to be mentored and to work with faculty on the USC campus and vice versa. Students who are presently on the USC campus will have opportunities to work with colleagues in Charleston.

In terms of research focus on one campus or the other, the faculty working group had come up with a formulation that said, "We should have a Pharmacy Research Institute on one campus and the other campus should concentrate on education." The three outside consultant deans came back and said, "That is not a good idea." We really need to have education continue on both campuses as well as having vital research on both campuses. Again, reflecting the respective research strengths on both campuses. My hope would be that we have strong research presence on both campuses and I would like to see the day, which we already achieved with Clemson, where full-time faculty members of Clemson University are working in Charleston side by side with clinical colleagues at the Medical University. We've had a bioengineering alliance for years and it has never gone anywhere because you have 200 miles separating the engineers in Clemson from the clinicians in Charleston. They really have got to be working side by side in order to take the very basic fundamental work and translate it to the clinical setting. In the last year, more has happened by virtue of 3 or 4 faculty members and a dozen graduate students being located in Charleston. President Barker is coming down to meet with me next week to talk about doubling the number of faculty that they located in Charleston and jointly building a facility together. Andrew Sorensen went to visit a similar program at Georgia Tech and Emory. It was just being created while I was at Emory, but here you have a private university and a state university who share a bioengineering department. Not only that, but they have an endowed chair holder that they just stole away from us in bioinformatics. So if we are going to compete with the Georgia Techs of the world, that is the kind of creativity that we are going to have to have in our program. I would love to have engineers from USC down on our campus. I would love to have pharmacy researchers down on our campus. I would love to be able to have some of our faculty up here on the new research campus. I sit on the advisory board of the new research campus at USC and nothing would make me happier than having some of our investigators in that setting.

So I think we are going to see research flourish on both campuses and I hope that as we work more intimately together we will find this kind of synergistic activity to a much greater extent than we have experienced historically.

PROFESSOR MYRICK – Is it appropriate to ask a question not to the speaker here but to our own administration at this point?

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – We can have that opportunity but for now let's focus on questions for our guest Dr. Greenberg.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – I'll meet with you afterward, if you prefer.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Other questions for Dr. Greenberg? Don't be shy.

PRESIDENT GREENBERG – Let me just say that any time I am invited, I will be with you. I have had the opportunity to come and meet individually with a small group of Pharmacy faculty. I hope it was useful in doing so. I will make myself available at any time to come and talk with you about any of these issues. I think this is an extraordinary opportunity, an extraordinary moment in time and I just hope that we can find all of the advantage of working together. Thank you very much.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – As you came into the room today, many of you were handed a blue sheet from Laura Talbott from the Alcohol & Drug Programs Director here at USC. She is more than willing to help in any way to facilitate any faculty involvement in these alcohol and drug prevention programs here on campus. So I would encourage you to read this little blue sheet that she passed out. There is contact information and they would be more than happy to actively promote low-risk, healthy choices about the use of alcohol and other drugs by providing preventive and educational services as well as substance-free events for USC students. So I would encourage you to take a look at that information. Is there any other new business for this group?

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Mr. Chairman? If I may, this alcohol and drug free group is promoting social activity among undergraduate and graduate students, encouraging them to avoid the use of alcohol and other drugs or to use alcohol in moderation. At last Saturday's football game, before the game we have this incredible array of tailgating parties. A fair amount of alcohol is consumed at a lot of those parties. They had a special tailgating activity with a rock band, with a lot of activities with absolutely no booze. It was refreshing. I encourage you to support them, if you are so inclined to do so, by visiting their programs and by encouraging the staff and faculty who are involved with this organization. Thank you.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – Thank you, Dr. Sorensen. Other items of new business?

8. Announcements or Good of the Order.

None.

9. Adjournment.

CHAIR AUGUSTINE – The Senate will next meet on Wednesday, December 1, 2004 at 3:00 pm in this room. The Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn. Second? All those in favor say aye. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.