I. Call to Order.

CHAIR ROBERT WILCOX (Law) – I appreciate your attendance today and apologize for the delay from last week. For those of you who wondered what our policy was, we were simply waiting last week to see what the University did. If the University had stayed open, we would have met. When the University closed, we closed down as well. So that was the basis of our decision last week. I realize it put us in the middle of exams, and that it is an inconvenience for some senators. It was a matter of either doing it today or realistically waiting until February to meet. In deference particularly to the colleges who had curricula changes that were in front of us, it was desirable to try to meet sooner rather than later. So I appreciate your attending today.

For those of you who are watching from afar, I will give you the phone number again. If you have questions or comment on things call in at 888-531-0685.

II. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR WILCOX – You have before you the minutes from the November 6th meeting. Are there changes or additions that need to be made.

PROFESSOR ELDON WEDLOCK (Law) – I think this is in the one in which sidelines is instead of sightlines.

CHAIR WILCOX – I thought we had corrected that, we may not have caught all those. Okay we will change sidelines to sightlines on the coliseum discussion.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – I think it might be the other way around.

CHAIR WILCOX – Which ever way it was. Is there a motion for the approval of the minutes with that correction? We have a motion. All in favor signify by saying aye. The minutes stand approved. Thank you.

III. Reports of Committees.

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

PROFESSOR WISE (Retailing) – I would like to remind you about the committee list for next year. The list is due on Friday, December 13. If you would remind the faculty in your area about the list, I would appreciate it.

PROFESSOR WILCOX – And, I would ask that you not just remind colleagues but recruit some colleagues who you think might enjoy serving on committees or be well served by participating. One thing that committees do for, particularly young, colleagues
is that it introduces them to some aspects of the University that they might not otherwise experience. So I would urge you to take advantage of recruiting some people to volunteer for some committees, and we would appreciate it.

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

PROFESSOR BLANPIED (Physics and Astronomy) – We have business from pages 14 through 36 and I would like to move I. College of Education, sections A through E on pages 14 through 34. These are the changes in the bulletin that would establish three new degree programs in Early Childhood, Elementary, and Middle Level Teacher Education.

CHAIR WILCOX – The committee has moved I. College of Education, A through E. These are to add three undergraduate programs that were recommended as part of the SDI study to the College of Education in these fields, and these would be the curricula changes to give effect to those recommendations. Any questions from the audience? They are significant changes.

PROFESSOR ED Dickey (Instruction and Teacher Education) – I would like to add an amendment to page 28. And, I have a sheet that summarizes that, that I can pass out.

CHAIR WILCOX – Yes, if we could circulate that, and I have got your sheet -- if it is the one we had before?

PROFESSOR Dickey – Yes.

CHAIR WILCOX – While he is circulating that, the amendment is on page 28. There is a reference to HIST 300 under the Social Studies Specialization. The amendment would be to delete that reference to HIST 300 and to in its place insert HIST 409 The History of South Carolina 1670 to 1865 or HIST 410 The History of South Carolina Since 1865. That amendment is offered. Is there a second to that amendment? It has been seconded. Is there a discussion of the amendment?

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – Is this amendment being offered by a senator?

PROFESSOR Dickey – I am not a senator so no, I am offering it but I would appreciate it if a senator would offer it.

CHAIR WILCOX – You are in History?

PROFESSOR Dickey – I am in the College of Education.

CHAIR WILCOX – Is there a senator from the College of Education ….

LAURA BRINKER KENT (Education) – I’ll offer it.
CHAIR WILCOX – It has been moved and the second I assume will still stand. Yes. It is now on the floor. Thank you for correcting that. Is there any discussion? That being the case we will vote on the amendment first to make that change. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? Is there any further discussion of the curricula change in its entirety? Is there anyone here from the College of Education who could just maybe outline just little bit of what this is doing -- to make sure everyone understands what we are doing here?

DEAN LES STERNBERG (Education) – Just to provide some history, in February of this year I asked a number of task forces in the college to deal with some issues and concerns that some of the faculty had brought up. One of those task forces dealt with whether or not we should offer undergraduate programs in Early Childhood, Elementary, and Middle Level. That task force report came back in April with a recommendation that we pursue the development of such programs. That was followed then by a lot of work on the part of faculty and staff in the college to put programs together. It is my understanding that various constituent groups participated in putting all three programs together, including members from our professional educational unit which comprises seven other academic units on campus. We also had assistance from state department people as well as teachers in the field. The result of these efforts you have in your hands. If there are any questions you might have, I’d be more than happy to try and answer them. I also have a number of my colleagues here who could provide information as well.

CHAIR WILCOX – If there are no further questions, I’ll proceed to a vote. All in favor of parts A-E signify by saying aye. Opposed? They are approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – We want to move the remaining parts of I. College of Education on pages 29 through 34 which has 38 new courses and modifications to 4 courses.

CHAIR WILCOX – Moving sections F and G which are new courses and modified courses in the College of Education. These would be the courses to carry out some of the curriculum changes you have just approved. They have been moved, is there any discussion? If there is none, we will move to a vote. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? They are approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – We move II. College of Engineering and Information Technology which has five new courses and modifications to two courses and one deletion of a course.

CHAIR WILCOX – The committee has moved II. College of Engineering and Information Technology courses – new, changes and a deletion. Discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? Roman numeral two is approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – III. College of Liberal Arts sections A, B, and C – three new courses.
CHAIR WILCOX – III. College of Liberal Arts with new courses in the African American Studies Program, Department of Philosophy, and Department of Sociology have been moved. Discussion?

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (Computer Science and Engineering) – I would like to move that the proposed new course PHIL 321 be tabled for the time being until such time as the Department of Computer Science and Engineering (one of the five departments in the college and apparently the only one that was not consulted by Philosophy about this course) has a chance to react to it. We have some concerns about it, and we didn’t get the proposal until late last week.

CHAIR WILCOX – There is a motion to refer back to committee the new course PHIL 321. This concern was raised to us before the meeting. The committee, however, had already approved the course based on letters from the colleges. But, as she points out, however, there was contact with the Engineering School but apparently not with your department of the Engineering School.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN – Or with student services or the dean’s office, according to the information I have. So the other four departments apparently were contacted, but we were not.

CHAIR WILCOX – So the request is to refer that course back to the committee until they can consider their reaction to a course in engineering ethics. Do we need a second to this motion? We do. Is there a second to that motion. It is seconded. Is there a discussion to refer back to the committee that portion of the proposal? Any discussion?

PROFESSOR EASTMAN – I would just like to make some additional comments about this. Those of you who have been in transitions know that transitions are not always easy. The Computer Science program recently moved to the College of Engineering and Information Technology, and we are sometimes seen as not really Engineering even though we have one of the five Engineering programs within our department and that I am responsible for as an Undergraduate Director. When I saw the Faculty Senate agenda, I was astonished to see this course in there that I had never heard of and my chair had not heard of it, our Student Services office had not heard of it, and Elmer Schwartz, who is faculty advisor to Student Services, hadn’t heard of it either. I have no doubt that they contacted the other Engineering departments, who were comfortable with it. The concerns we have relate to the part of the course having to deal with information technology. Half of the course is devoted to information technology, which is something we are interested in. We would like to coordinate this course with them as we coordinated our course that we proposed having to do with professional issues in information technology with the Philosophy department last year or two years ago (I don’t remember exactly when). We felt that we were due the courtesy of being consulted. We have now gotten the information and we are engaging in discussion, and we would be very disappointed in this body if this was not tabled at this point. We are
not trying to kill it; we would just like to have the same opportunity to discuss it as the other departments.

CHAIR WILCOX – Other discussion? We are voting on the motion to refer back to committee PHIL 321. An affirmative vote would be to refer it back to the committee. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? That course will be held back then. We can then consider the remainder of the proposal which is AFRO 350 and SOCY 540. Any discussion of those? In that case we will vote on the motion as it has been amended with PHIL 321 removed from it. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? It is approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – IV. Experimental Courses, one from the College of Mass Communications and Information Studies and the other in the School of Music.

CHAIR WILCOX – Two experimental courses have been moved in roman numeral four. Discussion?

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – I don’t think we have to approve these.

CHAIR WILCOX – There has been a lot of uncertainty on this. We have gotten in the custom recently of approving them on a matter of abundance of caution on these.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – Just to explain: These are experimental courses and we don’t approve them but they are brought before the Faculty Senate to see if anybody thinks they ought not be. And, if they ought not be then someone could move not to approve them. Otherwise they flow ahead.

CHAIR WILCOX – I appreciate that information, because we have had a lot of discussion as to what is the history on the experimental courses, and there are two views of thoughts on this.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – We established this process. It’s only a matter of notice.

CHAIR WILCOX – That was consistent with our recollections at first, but there were some uncertainties, so we have approved them out of an abundance of caution. If that is the pleasure of the body we will allow these courses to proceed, unless objection is raised. Is there any objection to that? That being the case we will move on. Thank you for your report.

c. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Betty Glad, Chair:

PROFESSOR GLAD (Government and International Studies) – We have been dealing with several issues this fall of general concern, I think, to the entire faculty and its governance. We are drawing close to some conclusions on these matters although we have not completed on any of them. Essentially we are dealing with four things:
1. The committee has been looking at its role in the tenure revocation process. We have discussed what kinds of matters the faculty handbook permits us to consider and we will come with a policy statement about how we see our role in this process sometime early next semester.

2. Faculty Advisory Committee has received some recommendations from the Executive Committee of the Graduate College which would open up its membership to assistant professors and require those who are tenured professors and already members to be reviewed periodically in terms of their membership in the college. We are reporting back to the Executive Committee of the Graduate College today about where we stand on this issue. We are suggesting that administrators should also be reviewed and are asking for some methods for making those kinds of processes regular.

3. The Faculty Welfare Committee also has been considering the rights of individuals in the terms of the promotion and tenure process when their departments or units have been reorganized in some fashion. We have had a report from them and we have discussed their recommendations. Our concerns are whether or not all the plans for the new criteria and procedures for promotion should be approved before the reorganization is seen to be completed or not? The second thing we are concerned with is whether or not the criteria and the procedures which were relevant to the older organizations should be carried over in some fashion.

4. Finally the Faculty Grievance Committee has told us that they do not feel equipped to deal with substantive issues regarding salary matters. So we are going to be looking at this and providing you in the February meeting with some alternative arrangements for dealing with substantive salary grievances issues.

If you have any recommendations in terms of policies or general procedures along these lines that you get in touch with me or some other member of the Faculty Advisory Committee. You can contact me, Professor Glad, Department of Government and International Studies in Gambrell Hall. I prefer hard mail, but my e-mail address is: glad@gwm.sc.edu. Please get in touch with me. I'd like these communications from you before January 5 so we can consider them the beginning of the semester. Thank you. Do you have any questions at this point? Seeing none – thank you Robert.

CHAIR WILCOX – We anticipate that we will have a discussion at the February meeting of alternatives for handling salary grievances. One of the big issues that I discussed with the committee is that, if we are to create another faculty committee to deal with salary grievances, that is going to be a substantial amount of time commitment for people. It is also going to be a question as to what you can actually do at the end of the day if you find there was a problem. Will there be authority to force a correction of the problem? I think those are some significant questions to be answered. Before we get into yet another effort like that, I think one of the things that we need to be assured is that the faculty wants a role in that process or what role the faculty wants. Are we going to have people willing to consider it to be a sufficient enough importance that they will spend the time
and the effort to do it right? So that is part of what is underlying the various proposals that you will see coming, hopefully, by the February meeting for discussion.

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

PROFESSOR GRAHAM (Sport and Entertainment Management) – There is no report of the Faculty Welfare Committee at this particular meeting. We do have a number of items on our agenda and hopefully will have some information to bring to next meeting.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – I just got something in the mail about the Wellness Center. What does this portend for access to the Physical Education Center for faculty?

CHAIR WILCOX – We had asked Jerry Brewer to be here today if he could, because I got that in the mail this morning too. At late notice, he was giving an exam this afternoon and couldn’t attend. I think I will ask him to perhaps prepare something for the faculty explaining the benefit that you will get for your $360 as compared to what will continue to be offered. My understanding is that essentially the offerings at the Blatt Center will not be significantly changed – that it will continue to operate many of the programs it has been operating. There just won’t be the same student activity there that there has been because a lot of that will move over. So I think one of the things is to get somebody in either Jerry’s office or Jerry himself to prepare an outline for us as to what expect. There is no information on the card that is sent. To answer another question in that regard, you will see it is $360 a year for faculty membership in the Thurmond Wellness Center, students are free. We have mentioned this before, but to be sure that the information is properly conveyed to you: The reason for that is that center is being built with student activities fees. They are paying for the center and that is why the students are not getting it for free; in essence. They are paying a student activity fee for the use of it. Others of us who use it did not participate in the funding of it so we are going to pay an additional fee to be members. That is the explanation for the finances on that. Any other questions in that regard or other questions for Peter?

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT (Music) – What about retired people? I didn’t get that letter not that I am worried about it but I am sure that question will come up.

CHAIR WILCOX – I am not sure if I have the answer as to whether emeritus faculty are included or not. I will put that to Jerry Brewer at the same time I ask him about our other questions. I am not sure what the policy on that is. What I understood from the mailing today is that there will be a 1,000 non-student members. That is the number they have said and, that they are giving faculty and staff first preference. Now whether they are including emeritus faculty in all that, I don’t know. I’ll ask Jerry what the story is on that.
e. Faculty Budget Committee, Professor David Berube, Acting Chair:

PROFESSOR BERUBE (English) – This is my second year on the Budget Committee, Al Leitch asked me to do this because he was unavailable last Wednesday but since I was all prepared - here it goes. There are five things I want to report:

1. We had a report a few meetings ago from Bill Hogue, he is the CIO here. He reported on something called the Enterprise Resource Planning System its acronym is ERP. For anybody with an institutional memory Smart Stream came up a few years ago as a planning system and was rejected by USC because at that time we would have pretty much been the test site for a business planning system being put into an academic setting. Now the systems that have been used in academic settings and their efficiencies have been tested a little more. What ERP would do would be an alternative to our current process of data warehousing. And, its primary justification is that we have an aging data infrastructure here at USC, so vendor supplied enterprise administration systems are the new way to deal with the problem. The system covers a plethora of things including human relations, student financial systems, registration, and financial aid services. There are a few observations I want to share. The first is that the implementation would take place over a long period of time – over many years. There was a number thrown out of a cost of $54 million and it was criticized as being high and considering the phase process I would presume that would not occur at once. Also there is information that phased implementation of systems like this can mitigate a lot of the disruptions. The third observation is that even though when you read these efficiency systems it appears as if primary beneficiaries are administrative there is a lot of added efficiencies that trickle down to faculty and students.

There are two personal observations, I did some research on it, and first: the data on how much value is added remains unclear because most of the reports you get are self collected by the companies who promote the products – we know a little bit about that, and the second personal observation is that the realities of the aging infrastructure at USC are just indisputable - it is a real problem. So it is some thing we are looking at and we are beginning to discuss.

2. The second issue is the state of the State and I am not referring to the newspaper. Most economic indicators are still pointing downward. If you look at how the economy functions it really hasn’t reached it nadir yet. The curve hasn’t really curved upwards. In terms of investment earnings the State is down about 17.2 million. Tax revenues are down 4.4% and, of course, by law that means the BCB has to cut spending and you probably read about this. Also there is a 15% decrease in projected lottery revenues. It is unlikely the General Assembly will do much more than allow the BCB to do what they did. If you want to learn more about this, I believe if you look in Section A of The State newspaper you will find it there and then you can flip about 10 pages in and read a lot more.

3. Budget and Control Board as you know announced reductions on the 10th at 4.5% and we are mostly protected against these (and I am sure Provost Odom will discuss this)
because the deans were asked to reserve funds and it seems to be a wise thing to have done. Also the additional 0.5% may be covered as well. For your notes a 5% decrease is about $7.8 million - that gives you a sense of it. Additional projected reductions of course, might be announced and that would demand other reductions. We had a brief discussion a few meetings ago regarding using targeted rather than across the board cuts and that was directed at Provost Odom. The committee recommended a deeper examination of centers and institutes in terms of faculty/staff ratios and their overall efficiencies on campus. In addition, at the last meeting we asked through a representative of the vice president for Business Affairs Office to get the deans to present data on all individuals who are now receiving release time for administration work, special stipends, and administrative supplements and/or all non-tenured track faculty or staff including non-teaching instructors receiving $50,000 or more a year.

4. VCM is still on the table. The subcommittees keep meeting. We as a committee have not discussed a whole bunch of things that I am sure eventually we will (maybe because I am very anal type of individual and I always ask for a lot of information.) We really haven’t talked about the size of whatever surtax is going to have to be done on overall administration. We haven’t talked about how it will be administrated yet. We really haven’t discussed how you deal with units who don’t fit into VCM very well and that would include things like the Honors College, libraries, police services, and things like that. We really haven’t talked in great detail about how service expenditures will be shouldered by a unit – like lighting, heating, and ancillary services associated with teaching classrooms. We really haven’t discussed what happens when you have competitive bidding and then all of a sudden you have an institutional based provider who becomes less viable. We haven’t really decided calculi of efficiencies and how to weigh variables and how long the cycle will last and which cycle is applied to which given cycle to determine efficiencies.

So there are a few observations that I wanted to make. The first is this the thing about VCM: I think and the observation at the last meeting which was most informative, is that it is primarily a data collection tool – that is what it does. It is not necessarily a decision making tool and I think that is where a lot of misunderstanding I get via e-mail is about. In other words, right now current funding goes through the Provost Office and respective deans and department chair persons and they make judgements and what VCM will do is provide them with better data. It doesn’t mean that it binds them to some ridged and formulaic way of making decisions. Simply put, what VCM does is teach us more about our efficiencies and it is not really a data facto policy or decision making calculus. I think if you look at it that way it is not really that foreboding. It is a way to get information. It is not necessarily taking the information and strapping it into some fixed calculus and then just employing it across the board.

5. I spent a lot of time studying VCM and I think the thing you need to understand which is the fifth and last thing, is that there is a real openness of discourse on this committee. Everything has been placed on the table. We have talked about revenue considerations from tuition and fee increases to rents, to licensing of trademarks, to surtaxing public athletic events. We talked about reductions in terms of how to achieve efficiencies by
reducing faculty hiring or reducing staff hiring or more efficient facility usage. And, we have talked about general efficiencies such as faculty staff ratios, alternatives to the two semester system, adjusting the size of the incoming class. I mean it is really an open process. It has been at least for me an enjoyable process because everything is being discussed. So if you have anything you need to vent, please vent it to Al and I because we are at the meetings. People on the committee know qualitative and quantitative methodologies and the representation on the committee is from colleges across the entire campus. It is really not dominated by the Business School. That is this rumor going around that is not true. We understand efficiencies are not solely the product of generated revenues from fulltime equivalences and development funding and we are going to report to the Senate regularly. And, I am there for another year and half and I am up for being chair next year.

There was a metaphor which I want to share with you because I like playing with metaphors and I’m in the English Department now so I have to play with my tropes. There was a metaphor that institutions have cash cows and lame dogs. It has been bounding around and everyone is having a lot of fun with it. I grew up in New Hampshire and I grew up on a farm and I used my dogs to herd my cows. So my philosophy is if you don’t have the dogs you simply have a lot of cows milling about and that is not really very efficient. So that is the philosophy I am bringing to this and I think it is a philosophy we all share. If you have any questions, please just e-mail Al or I and we will be happy to bring them up at any of the budget meetings. Thank you.

CHAIR WILCOX – Any questions for David while he is heading back to his chair? The Provost will also discuss the budget a little bit more in his report to the faculty. Any other committee reports that need to be made?

IV. Unfinished Business.
None.

V. New Business.
None.

VI. Reports of Officers.

CHAIR WILCOX – The President was unable to be with us because of his schedule changes. When we changed our meeting he had some conflicts that he could not get out of, but the Provost is here.

PROVOST JEROME ODOM – Andrew asked me to convey his apologies today but he had a long standing commitment to go to USC Aiken so that is where he is. I talked to him this afternoon just for a few minutes and he wanted me to remind you first of all that there is an investiture on Saturday afternoon (December 14) at 2:00 p.m. It has not been decided apparently, I checked right before I came over here, whether we will have this on the Horseshoe or in the Thurmond Fitness Wellness Center. I think there are a lot of us who are hoping they’ll have it in the Thurmond Fitness Wellness Center because it is
going to be at best, I think, what it is like outside today which will be rather cold and breezy — if it is not raining. We will put on the University website just as soon as we know where we will have it. There is plenty of parking at the new fitness wellness center and they also plan to run some shuttle buses from other parts of campus as well. So just stay tuned. Right now we have had good faculty response to the invitation and we look forward to that ceremony. Besides President Sorensen speaking for a few minutes, Dan Carter of the History Department will also give a fairly short address.

Let me talk about the budget because that is something that is certainly on our minds and I think everybody’s minds here at the University. Before I even start talking about that let me thank David for that excellent report. I thought you covered a lot of material that the Faculty Budget Committee covers. Al Leitch is the chair of that committee and I try and meet with that committee every month. I depend a great deal on that committee and input from that committee. And, as David said, there are many members first of all who are not in the Business School but do understand quantitative and qualitative aspects of budgeting. So it is a very valuable committee to me. As he also said, we received basically, I think you would say, a 5% budget cut yesterday — 4.5%. They are taking another 0.5% and it is being said that that 0.5% will be returned to us if the economy picks up and that is highly unlikely. What we are really hoping will not happen to be very candid is that we will not have another budget cut this year. We may get through the remainder of the year without a budget cut and if we do, we almost certainly will see a budget cut as we begin the new fiscal year, July 1st. So anyway we look at it, it is not an encouraging picture. As David mentioned, I had asked the deans and other vice presidents had asked their unit heads, to set aside 5% of their budget at the beginning of this fiscal year. In meetings last night as well as most of the day today, what we think that we will be doing is asking the units to cut their budgets between 2.5% and 3% and we will try and cover the remainder centrally. That is the current plan. Now that may change but when I left the meeting right before 2:00 p.m. this afternoon things seemed to be pretty well set that we would ask units for 2.5 to 3% and that has not been set yet and then we would cover the remainder from central funds. There have been some questions already about a mid-year tuition increase. We do not anticipate that happening at this point.

Let me talk about two searches that we currently have underway. First of all a Vice President for Advancement, three candidates have come to campus, another will be here this week, and one or two perhaps even next week. The President is hopeful that the search committee which is chaired by Joel Smith, who is Dean of the Moore School of Business, will be able to give him three names at the beginning of the Spring Semester but no later than the middle of January. We also are searching for a Law Dean. The Law faculty met last week to consider candidates. They meet tomorrow again at 2:00 p.m. for a short time to give their opinions to the search committee. The search committee will meet later on tomorrow afternoon and at that time I hope that the search committee will be able to come up with a short list of names that I will present to the President either tomorrow afternoon or Friday morning.
Let me remind the Senate that there are three Carolina Distinguished Professorships that will become open this year. If you remember at the General Faculty Meeting, the Faculty Advisory Committee had proposed that everyone on the faculty be notified of this in their colleges and I hope that has taken place. You can self nominate - you can have someone else nominate you. There should be some procedure within the colleges for recommending candidates to the deans, and the deans then recommend to the administration their candidates for Carolina Distinguished Professorships. But three open in one year is a little bit unusual.

The President asked me if I would just thank the faculty for our increased external funding this year. Thus far, we are up about 30%. We also have submitted more applications this year at this time than we had last year. And, he wanted me to convey his appreciation and I certainly convey my appreciation for that as well.

That I think covers what I needed to cover but I will certainly be happy to answer any questions that I can. Thank you very much.

CHAIR WILCOX – Thank you Jerry. If you will allow me a brief report just to give you some information on some things that you may wish to know about. One is the Board of Trustees meets on Monday for their regular meeting. Among some academic matters that may be of interest on the agenda for the Trustees approval is a new Executive International Masters of Business Administration Program, a new Bachelor of Science in Business Administration with a Major in International Business, and a PhD in Nursing Science. Also the Board will be asked to approve some Bachelor of Arts programs at USC -- Beaufort that are part of their transition into a four-year campus. These will be programs of Liberal Studies, Hospitality Management, English, and Early Childhood Education. They will also be asked to approve a Bachelor of Science in Human Services at Beaufort. And, finally at USC Spartanburg they will be asked to approve a Bachelor of Arts in Non-Profit Administration. So those are all on the agenda for the Trustees meeting on Monday. There doesn’t appear to be any other major business before the Board that would be of particular interest – some emeritus professorships and the routine business. But I wanted to let you know of that. If you have any comments that you wished conveyed, I will be happy to convey them on.

Also I wanted to make you aware that the Faculty Senate chairs, chair-elects, and past chairs from the Southeast Conference Schools are going to get together in the spring at Vanderbilt. Part of this is an effort to try to share some information on common issues, problems that we have in terms of faculty governance, tenure promotion procedures, university athletics, all sorts of things are on the table. This is the beginning of a process that began a few years ago in the Big Ten. Those schools have recommended that it is a great thing that they have, and we are going to try that this spring among the Southeastern Conference schools to see if we can bring these schools into some contact at levels other than just the athletic level and the trustees and presidents level. I think the faculty sharing ideas between these schools could be very helpful for us. I may be driving there on my own gallon of gas and picking up my colleague at Tennessee on the way (and sharing the gas costs with him) but we will get there one way or another.
VII. Good of the Order.

CHAIR WILCOX – I remind you of the installation of Dr. Sorensen as President. If you are planning to attend, if you would be at the Rutledge Chapel assuming we are on the Horseshoe at 1:30 p.m. for robing. Also if you would notify the Provost’s Office in advance to be sure we have seating for you – I suppose that is the main reason for doing that. If you haven’t, we are going to make you stand.

PROVOST ODOM – Rob. one thing -- if it is in the Fitness Wellness Center, the Aerobics Room is where the faculty will robe.

CHAIR WILCOX – Okay the Aerobics Room if we are in the Thurmond Center. So come in your outfits.

Monday afternoon is graduation at 3:30 p.m., I believe it is in the old coliseum not in the new center. So go to the place you have always gone before for graduation. The Elephant Room is where the faculty will robe. The Doctoral Hooding is in the Koger Center at 1:30 p.m. I will point out that if you go to graduation we will have good seats for you in the old coliseum. If you are sitting in my new basketball seats, you would know what I meant by that.

Is there anyone here from the restaurant school that could tell us a little bit about the new restaurant? If not, I will do my best.

PROFESSOR STEPHEN MORSE (Hotel, Restaurant, and Tourism Management) – What do you want to know?

CHAIR WILCOX – I think the people have seen some of the construction going on at the McCutchen House but may not be aware of what is going in there.

PROFESSOR MORSE – As you know the McCutchen House has been taken over by the School of Hotel, Restaurant and Tourism. It is being used as teaching laboratory. There are two kitchen on two floors and a lot of renovation is taking place right now. We will holding about eight classes there that will be producing a lunch buffet from Tuesday through Friday. There will be more information coming out on that. It is under some renovation now, I understand, with some new kitchen equipment that has been donated, some decorating that has been donated, we have been very successful at going out in the industry and getting a lot of things donated there. It will begin January 21, 2003.

CHAIR WILCOX – In case you have not seen the work, if you go inside you will notice there is new wallpaper, new furnishings – the place looks good. The restaurant school has raised a lot of the money for the internal work there on their own private money to refurbish the place. Also the McCutchen House is still going to be available for parties and the like. It is my understanding that, if you go, there will be a fee for using it and those monies will be recycled back into the maintenance and improvement of the
building. So it continues to be available for wedding receptions and the like. It continues to be available for committee meetings on the third floor as we always have used it. The old basement has become the culinary institute. The main floor -- as we know it -- is where the lunch buffet will be held, and in the spring when the weather gets better I understand they would also like to move it outside as well as use the patio. So that is what is going on there, and when January comes I urge you to wander over there and give it a try.

VIII. Announcements.

PROFESSOR BERUBE – I told my debaters I would do this. They recently got back from England. I took a week and a half and went to England with the debaters which is a tough thing to do in the middle of a semester. There are two juniors. One of them is named Glenn Prince, the other is John Shipman – they are both in Political Science. Glenn is from Arkansas and John is from South Carolina. They went to the United Kingdom representing USC and the United States and they were in something called Intervarsity World Debate Championships. After two weeks of debating (a long two weeks of debating) in which they debated 80 of the top teams from the former Soviet Union, Israel, France, Holland, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, Canada, England, and some other countries, they ended up posting the best record of any American team at the tournament. And, because it is world competition they let graduate students compete. We were third place of all the undergraduates who were at the world competition. If you see these kids, give them a little positive reinforcement. I was just really hoping we would just not be embarrassed and when we ended up placing tenth I was ecstatic especially after Mr. Shipman on our debate team in a debate on debt relief after getting a lot of grunt from the Oxford team asking us, “What is it about these land grant universities in the United States and what do they have to teach us?” Mr. Shipman turned to the Oxford team, who were arguing that we should not release debt from poor countries, and said, “They should take out their wallets and start paying back on the Marshall plan – we would greatly appreciate it.”

CHAIR WILCOX – I think we could offer a round of congratulations for Professor Berube and his team. (Clapping)

Any other matters? If not, is there a motion to adjourn? We will meet again on February 5, 2003. Have a good holiday.