SPECIAL CALLED MEETING of the FACULTY SENATE
February 20, 2002

CHAIR ROBERT WILCOX - We do have a lot to do today. Time will be precious so we want to go ahead and start.

I will ask, as we proceed today, if the senators will migrate to these middle two sections because we will have some business that requires us to take some votes at the end of the meeting. So we will move the senators to the middle and non-senators to the wings and the back.

This is our final special meeting for purposes, at least, of this phase of the discussion of the SDI report. We have some matters that we need to take up today. Three resolutions have been circulated to you, two of them we will take up today, time permitting. My intention is to take them up. I will tell you in advance that at 5 p.m. we lose our feed to the regional campuses, and it is my ruling that we cannot do business once we have cut them off. So, we will need to do by 5 p.m. whatever we are going to do today.

I want to also mention that whatever we don’t do today can come in the normal course at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate, which will be March 6. So if there are things that need to be raised, they can be raised at that time. Additional motions can be made at that time as well. The trustees have their retreat this week. I do not anticipate them taking action per se at the retreat. I can tell you that they sent to various committees of the Board what they perceive as the major parts of the study for further review and those committees will report back to the Board as a whole. So there is a process of committee work on their part, which needs to be completed before, I think, we are going to see action. So I think the March 6 meeting will certainly be timely to any motions that need to be made in addition to those we take up today.

One matter hanging over from last time: we had discussed the Sociology/Criminal Justice merger. We did have a mention that the Department of Sociology would be meeting to discuss their reaction to that merger. They have had that meeting since we met last and Professor Smith if you would like to bring us up to speed a little bit on that.

PROFESSOR SHELLEY SMITH (SOCY) - The Sociology faculty met earlier this week and we have received a lot of documentation from Criminal Justice and discussed it. Primarily the tenure and promotion criteria for Criminal Justice as well as the vita of most of the faculty. And, we voted a resolution that if the college is brought into Liberal Arts we would prefer to see it become its own distinct department. We have a number of concerns, the most vexing of which are: 1) Issues of justice for the untenured junior faculty in Criminal Justice. They came in under standards that we think are substantially different from ours and the SDI report does not really offer a strategy for how that is to be resolved. We don’t feel in good faith that we could change the standards for those junior faculty. And, we think the potential for strife if we have to enforce two different sets of
criteria is probably going to be inevitable. We have had a period of internal discord in Sociology which we are, we think, putting behind us at this point and think it would be a very bad idea to have to introduce these two sets of standards. Further more the cost of administrating two sets of standards are going to detract time from our own research productivity activities which really goes against one of the main aims of the SDI report with respect to productivity aims. At the same time, administratively, we are talking about merging several hundred Criminal Justice students into the Liberal Arts curriculum. They do have different requirements that they take now that differ from Liberal Arts. We don’t see that administrative efficiencies are going to ensue from that, which is one of the goals stated in the SDI report, but rather we think that the administration of this will in fact become very, very costly for us. Both time as well as potentially monetarily.

We’d like to underscore that we are not against change. What we would like to see is perhaps leaving it open as a possible merger in the future if Criminal Justice is brought into the College of Liberal Arts. If it were there for awhile and things sort of worked their way out, we feel that it would pave the way for a much smoother merger of the two departments. If that is something that is in fact going to happen down the road. Thank you.

CHAIR WILCOX - Are there any additional responses that need to be made to that? I just wanted to complete the record from last week. We postponed last week the discussion of the merger of Health Sciences and some related issues dealing with the Medical School. All the senators should have received copies of a report from the Medical School senators, as well as one, I believe, from Social Work. Both of them have responded in writing in some detail and I am going to ask them not to read their reports to us. Dr. Augustine if you would like to begin the discussion, I will give the floor to you.

PROFESSOR JAMES AUGUSTINE (MEDC) - Thank you Professor Wilcox. First of all I think all of us should be indebted to Professor Wilcox for giving us an opportunity to have an open discussion about this very important report. At first when this came about, I thought this would be a not very fruitful exercise but I think that all of us have learned a great deal about one another and about the concerns and cares that all of us have as part of this university. So I want to thank him for his leadership in this regard. It really has been very helpful. Secondly, I want to thank Professor Wilcox for giving the School of Medicine senators a little time. A week ago Sunday we had our accreditation site visit, so it was a little difficult for us to get our act together and come up with a report.

I want to just summarize a few of the main points in that report for those of you that may not have had a chance to read it and share with you some responses from the faculty senators in the School of Medicine.

We are supportive of the stated goal of the SDI committee to establish USC Columbia as an efficient, nationally-respected, comprehensive research university within five years.
We are supportive of its efforts to dramatically increase research and scholarly productivity. The reality for us though in the Medical School is that the real major source of research funding and scholarly productivity in most medical schools in the United States is the clinical departments. And, unfortunately the clinical departments of the School of Medicine were left out of the SDI report.

We believe that a concerted effort should be made to increase markedly not only the academic quality of the student body of the university but also increase the academic quality of the student body in the School of Medicine. And, again that issue was not raised in the SDI report.

We believe it makes good sense to merge and create a College of Health Sciences to work to include the Schools of Medicine and Public Health and Colleges of Social Work, Pharmacy and Nursing. But we would prefer a broader and more enthusiastic vision in this regard that would seek to locate these colleges together on the present School of Medicine campus with new facilities for the faculty from Public Health, Social Work, Pharmacy, and Nursing.

As you know the SDI Committee recommended that each of the existing units in this College of Health should be named a school and be headed by a dean and the dean should answer to the Vice President for Health Affairs who would report to the Provost. We have serious concerns about this cumbersome change of command which would require that Vice President for Health Affairs to report to the Provost and introduce another layer of bureaucracy between the deans and the provost. Professor Rollinson, that might be called the “Rollinson effect” to do that sort of thing. So we would want to avoid that.

The SDI Committee would charge the Vice President for Health Sciences with expanding research funding from NIH, etc. Our concern is that this should be the responsibility of the Vice President for Research to expand research funding from NIH and other federal agencies.

The SDI Committee recommended that the six basic science departments, and these are their words, in the School of Medicine and they include the departments of Biochemistry; Cell Biology and Neuroscience; Developmental Biology and Anatomy; Microbiology and Immunology; Pathology; and Pharmacology and Physiology be combined into one department. The SDI Committee seeks to measure the university against its peer and peer-aspirant institutions. If we apply this principle to this particular recommendation it would lead us to conclude that combining the basic science departments into a single basic science department is a bad idea. There are 125 medical schools in the United States, only 3 medical schools in the U.S. have a single basic science department.

The SDI Committee recommends that the new basic science faculty appointments are to be funded from the allocated budget at no more than 9 months per year. It is expected that faculty members would generate up to 3 months additional salary through
extramural funding. More than 3 months of such salary from extra mural funding is encouraged. Unfortunately, this recommendation has already become a reality for us before we in the School of Medicine have had a chance to voice our concerns. Again it should be noted that of the 125 medical schools in the United States 115 of them appoint faculty on a 12 month basis rather than a 9 month. And, this would put us on at a distinct disadvantage in terms of not only recruiting faculty but retaining faculty. We already have antidotal experience having been turned down by someone on the basis of that requirement.

While the SDI report provide Goals and Objectives and some Strategies, there is little detail given in the report as to, of course, how these recommendations would be carried out and we are troubled by that.

The SDI recommendations suggest an obvious lack of understanding of the way in which a medical school operates including our own. Even more troubling is that no effort was made by the Committee to learn how we function. None of the recommendations were discussed with the Dean of the School of Medicine when he made his presentation before the Committee.

But perhaps most troubling of all, is that we did not warrant as a school, membership on the SDI Committee yet we were singled out among all of the health sciences for both school wide and for departmental micromanagement.

SDI report alludes to a “Department of Biochemistry” which they say exists in the School of Medicine. Something that should have been part of the school from the beginning but has not been. The lack of a Department of Biochemistry among the Basic Science departments had been a major set-back for all of us in terms of both our teaching and our research.

And the new organization into a single College of Health Sciences may further separate us from our clinical colleagues who are on the Palmetto Richland campus.

In summary then let me just say that having celebrated our 20th anniversary of the graduation of our charter medical class (which graduated in 1981) we believe, as faculty senators, that it is appropriate for the School of Medicine to move forward into a new phase in the development as a medical school. And, focusing on research activity that maximizes our potential. A research strategic planning process has been on going in the School of Medicine for quite some time and is nearing completion. Much work must be done to insure the successful implementation of the next new phase in the life of our school and the successful development of the basic and clinical science research areas. We look forward to the report of that committee and any additional resources that can be allocated to the School of Medicine from the university administration to support research and scholarly activity. Thank you Professor Wilcox.

CHAIR WILCOX - Thank you very much. We very much appreciate the detailed report that the school prepared for us in a manner that is easy to review. Additional comments?
Or responses to those comments? Anything from some of the other schools that are involved in this?

PROFESSOR MICHELLE CARNEY (SOWK) - Ours wasn’t particularly lengthy shall I still not read it?

CHAIR WILCOX - I think if you can do a summary - it is easier than reading it. Just give people the gist of what the concerns are.

PROFESSOR CARNEY - Essentially we had two large concerns. One of them is related to what our colleague at the School of Medicine just talked about and that is the chain of command structure within the new Health Sciences College. What we would like to recommend is that instead of what appears to be a demotion in terms of our presence to a departmental level from a college level and the cumbersome levels of a vice president and a provost, we would also like to reiterate the importance of having a dean for our college that reports to the vice president and then ultimately the president. Again taking out that middle layer which we think would just further weaken our program and in some ways could potentially have a negative influence on our accreditation. Because part of what they look at when we are accredited as a School of Social Work is our status as a college with a dean.

Additionally we had some real concerns about graduate assistantships and we haven’t had a whole lot of conservation about that here. For us, this is a major issue. We have many, many students who can only come to our program because they are assisted with tuition reimbursement and pay through graduate assistantships. I spoke with our Associate Dean and we estimated we could potentially lose two-thirds of our students. It could have devastating effects on our numbers of enrollment. And, at a time when we are talking about responsibility based management, value-centered management; where we need bodies of students, a change in the graduate assistantship could very effectively eliminate quite a few of the students that we already currently have.

We have recommendations that talk about the way we do graduate assistantships in Social Work that is different. They are typically graduate research assistantships which assist faculty in scholarly productivity, clerical assistantships which perform lots of different functions within the college that otherwise we would need to have paid staff to do, and doctoral teaching assistants. We currently pay our graduate assistantships $1,500 a semester which ends up being, I approximately $100 a day. Which we don’t think is a paltry sum of money to pay a social work student. If we had to pay someone large sum of money, we wouldn’t be able to do that. If we had to then depend on outside supporters to fund our graduate assistantships, that again would be something that would be detrimental to us because within the structure of our program we have field students. Field students - meaning that they have to be in field placement so many hours a semester, get field supervision from MSW (Master Social Work) agency staff who supervise our students. We do not pay them to do that. They do that on a pro bona basis. And, often they then also provide the $1,500 graduate assistantship. If we were to say that now it is $8,000 - $5,000 - $6,000 - whatever it is, then it would seem not that
unreasonable that they turn around and charge us to use them as field students. So having said all that I am not really sure what this body can do about that but in considering the reduction that would happen in our enrollment - I think that is key. So we are just a graduate program. We don’t have an undergraduate program. We have anywhere between, 400 to 500 active student in any period. So loosing two-thirds of those students is quite a bit. Thank you.

CHAIR WILCOX - Let’s look at the structural issue and let me ask one question. I detect from both of the written comments I have gotten that there seems to be some feeling that there are advantages to some close relationships in terms of research and that that is a desirable goal. There is no real reluctance on that. My untrained ear on this subject is telling me that what I am hearing is not so much that the administrative structure is going to affect those relationships, as perhaps it is going to be the geographic relationship to each other. Is that a fair statement?

PROFESSOR WANZER DRANE (HEAL) - We too look at the administrative structure as perhaps causing some problems because it puts in another person who is now the provost in between us and the provost. So, if the School of Health Sciences or College of Health Sciences were to be created, I think, we would rather see a division or call it whatever else but still have only one person between us and the president instead of one person, then the provost, and then the president. As we now operate, we have a provost and president currently. We don’t need a second provost to answer to. We don’t think it is going to be more efficient because it will cost more money. I think the geographic problem is here and that is going to be very hard to solve and I think the others have been spoken to. Thank you.

CHAIR WILCOX - One other factual question I will ask. Have there been identified difficulties in getting these NIH grants and things because of the current structure that anyone is aware of? Are we addressing a need that exists or what is the perception?

PROFESSOR LUCIA PIRISI-CREEK (MEDC) - No, we have no problems with individual collaborations. Where there is a problem is in trying to go above the individual collaborative ROIs. It is in putting together things like program/project grants. That is where we run into trouble but the reasons we run into trouble there I am not sure will be solved by putting us all together administratively because the administrative hurdles can actually be overcome rather easily. We have collaborations from the Medical School across disciplines other colleges including the School of Public Health. We have never had any trouble. I worked with the people in the College of Science and Math for years without any trouble whatsoever. This idea that being in different colleges is a hurdle to collaborative research is old and absolutely not true at least for what my experience is. Now my experience is of course limited to what I do so if anyone else has anything to add I’ll be glad to hear.

CHAIR WILCOX - Other comments on this. This is obviously a fairly major component of this plan.
PROFESSOR BETTY GLAD (GINT) - Could you have people use a microphone or stand up and talk I didn’t hear anything she just said.

CHAIR WILCOX - The gist was that there were some difficulties that arise but she thinks they could be resolved under the current system administratively and she does not see the proposed administrative changes as necessarily solving those problems. If you need to, come down front or stand up and project out.

PROVOST JEROME ODOM - If I could make a couple of comments here with regard to the structural change in particular. I certainly don’t have any desire to have a vice president report to me if a vice president should report to the president. I think that the five deans have weighed in on this measure and I think that that is something that will be changed within the recommendation on that. The other thing that Wanzer mentioned some of the deans have asked that this not be a college that it be some other terminology again that is really not that important, I think. It is a division. If you want to have a division, that is fine. We looked at several different models. In talking a little bit about the response to whether this will work or not. Clearly we don’t know whether it is going work or it is not going to work. The Medical School accreditation team that was here last week was chaired by the Vice President for Health Affairs at the University of Florida and that is one of the models we looked at. I questioned him about whether he thought it had worked there to have units work together and so forth and he was very positive about it. He thought it had. Lucia mentioned “program project grant.” Program project grant is a very large grant that the NIH gives. Having strengths in a lot of different areas. We’ve never had one. We have never had one. The question is why? Well it may or may not be because we are collaborating or not collaborating. I know that Lucia has worked very hard with people in science and math. I don’t know how hard and how much collaboration we’ve had between some of these units that are proposed to work together. I do know that a vice president for health affairs in dealing with the deans in areas of hiring can certainly make a difference in looking at program project grant areas and deciding where do we need to hire people, where do we build strengths.

ASSOCIATE DEAN RUSSELL PATE (HEAL and SDI Committee) - Lucia is absolutely right. There are collaborations now. I personally benefit from them and they can happen and we hope that we will have them to a greater extent in the future. We can’t know its cause and effect, but I do think it is very important that the senate understand where the university is now with its pursuit of NIH research dollars. For fiscal 2000, which is the most recent year of the data on the NIH web site, USC received $9.7 million in funding from NIH. To give you some perspective on where that fits in I’ll give you a few of the regional flagship university figures for comparison. University of North Carolina - $207 million, University of Virginia - $95 million, University of Florida - $72 million, University of Kentucky - $60 million, and University of Georgia - $21 million. Now I don’t think anybody here can prove that we rank lower in NIH funding because of our current structure nor do I think anybody would argue that the proposed restructuring divisional arrangement with the health science units will automatically change that and move us up the rankings. But I think those figures do indicated rather convincingly that we have progress to make in terms of our funding from NIH and it
certainly is reasonable to think that coordinated leadership focused on enhancing the university's competitiveness with NIH funding could be helpful.

PROFESSOR ABDUL GHAFFAR (MEDC) - Dr. Pate perhaps did not compare the colleges which received these grants carefully enough. If one looks at the details, most dollars go to the Medical schools. If one compares the Medical School sizes, our whole Basic Sciences is smaller than any one department at those major universities. So, if one compares per capita grants, we are not that far behind. Hence, there is a need not to reorganize departments and schools but to expand the number of faculty and provide an environment in which we can expand rather than shrink to one department. Merging the departments or schools will not make any difference to the collaborative research or increase the total research dollars. Dr. Pate knows that I have been collaborating with the School of Public Health for the last 10 years. Location of the schools (Medicine and Public Health) does make it inconvenient for the students who have to waste hours going back and forth for classes and lab work. Putting the schools under one umbrella is not going to help collaborations, unless they were on one location.

PROFESSOR RUTH RILEY (MEDC) - The other distinction to keep in mind when you are comparing the University of South Carolina with the institutions that you have named is that the School of Medicine at the University of South Carolina is a community-based medical school. We do not own our teaching hospital. We really cannot be compared to those medical schools. Our mission, size, and scope are completely different so if we are talking about comparing medical schools then we have a whole different scenario to look at. If we want to change our mission and we want to become a full blown research medical school, that is a different scenario than what you are proposing.

CHAIR WILCOX - Any additional comments on that? Let's move along in the agenda to some discussion of admission issues. The Admissions Committee of the Senate had undertaken a review of several of these proposals. Professor Burns, I would ask if you could, to summarize several of them.

PROFESSOR JIM BURNS (HRSM) - I am from the Committee on Admissions and the program formerly known as the Transition Year. We met on February 1st to consider 3 of the admissions related recommendation from the SDI program. I am going to report to you about 2 of those. The first recommendation: Increased enrollment of the South Carolina Honors College by a minimum of 25 per year until an enrollment of 1,500 is reached. The Committee on Admissions endorses this recommendation with reservations, many of these reservations have already been discussed by this body. Including: Where are new funding resources? How will VCM affect the South Carolina Honors College? What plans are there for new and/or additional housing for a larger class? But the Committee on Admissions feels very strongly that the Honors College should not grow at the expense of regularly admitted students.

The second recommendation: In spring, admit freshmen transfers who have been successful elsewhere that is 2.25 GPA over 15 hours. The Committee on Admissions does not endorse this recommendation. Students who do not meet freshmen admission
requirements should provide and continue to provide a minimum of 30 hours of transfer work to clearly demonstrate their ability to be successful at USC-Columbia. The Committee feels that 15 hours is not sufficient evidence of future academic success at USC-Columbia.

Dr. Linney will present the third report.

CHAIR WILCOX - Could you address the transition year issue for us please?

PROFESSOR JEAN ANN LINNEY (PSYC) - I am also a member of the Committee on Admissions. The reason that I am reporting on this is that Jim is the director of the Transition Year and so recussed himself from the discussion. The Committee supports the recommendation to eliminate the Transition Year Program. There is uniform agreement that this has been a very successful program providing access to USC-Columbia for students with potential who may not fit the regular admissions profile. At the same time the Committee felt that this program may have run its course. Access and opportunity to higher education for students who have been served by the Transition Year can be provided through the Regional Campuses of USC. There was some concern that Transition Year may detract from our overall first year retention figures. There was also a sense that the concept of the Transition Year may be inconsistent with the model of a major flagship research university. There were some members of the Committee though who were opposed to this recommendation arguing that access and opportunity to USC-Columbia for a broad segment of the student population was sufficiently important in and of itself to justify continuation of the program.

CHAIR WILCOX - You have heard the Committee on Admissions recommendations on the Transition Year is there any additional discussion on that issue? Do people feel the need to add to the report?

PROFESSOR ELDON WEDLOCK (LAW) - I don't want to add anything to the report but I would like to ask. If somebody from the SDI Committee if they think there was a linkage between the dropping of the Transitional Year and the 15 hours of transfer? Did that come up in the discussions?

ASSOCIATE VICE PROVOST CAROLYN WEST (Regional Campuses) - I think they were separate decisions.

CHAIR WILCOX - Other comments.

PROFESSOR CHARLES MACK (ART) - Just a note, we keep hearing flagship comprehensive research university joined together. We haven't really ascertained whether that is appropriate. So, just a word of caution.

CHAIR WILCOX - Other comments on the Transition Year? Next on the agenda was a discussion of the proposed merger of Journalism with Library and Information Sciences. Does anyone wish to speak to that?
PROFESSOR ERNEST WIGGINS (JOUR) - I am speaking for the College of Journalism and not for our colleagues in Library and Information Sciences who may be here and have some comments to make pursuant to this. My two senate statement is: The faculty’s of the two units have met and are proceeding with plans to merge. We are scheduling to other institutions that have merged similar programs and currently are cooperating on a search for a Director of Graduate Research.

PROFESSOR BOB MOLYNEUX (Library and Information Sciences) - I have something to add to this. We have over the years done an awful lot of things to bring money in and I think that initially we were kind of disappointed with the merger plan. Then we sat around and thought and, well, we are the kind of people who on Christmas morning start looking for the horse.

So, we have started thinking about this. We found out that there were six other universities in which Library Schools and Journalism had joined so other people had seen a logical connection.

I know I sent an e-mail to a colleague in Journalism about an idea I had about a joint curriculum and another one about a research idea related to the Newsplex. We have accreditation coming up in the fall. I don’t want to make too big a point of this but you may have noticed in The State a few months ago that they pointed out that the national ranking of the College of Library and Information Science was used in the recruiting in football. Now I don’t want to minimize the contribution of Coach Holtz but I will note that this is the best recruiting year they have had in some time.

For this reason, and others, I am sure that we all want the College of Library and Information Science’s accreditation not to encounter any snags. Now, we were talking about the Rollinson effect. For the purposes of accreditation a Library School must have a separate director/dean so we still maintain our administrative structure. There will be a new dean of the joint program and what has happened is that the dean’s search for Journalism has become the dean search for the combined school. Next Wednesday, the first candidate comes in and we are all involved in that. We are looking forward, I think, to joining with them and see what happens. Thank you.

CHAIR WILCOX - It sounds like news of a happy marriage. Any other comments about that issue? I have an e-mail from at least one person asking that we talk, briefly at least, about the USC Press and the move toward it being a self-sufficient operation. Is there anybody who wishes .... yes, sir.

PROFESSOR EZRA GREENSPAN (ENGL) - I’d like clarification on two points. First, how did the committee come to the judgment that the relationship of the Press to the scholarly and research goals of the university is in the language of the report “tangential.” Secondly, I would like to know what the rationale was that the SDI Committee used in recommending cutting the Press subsidy from the present level of approximately
$523,000 to a level of approximately $348,000 over the next five years. That is roughly a 33% cut.

CHAIR WILCOX - Let me get somebody from the committee to respond.

PROFESSOR GLAD (GINT) - I want to speak to this issue. I think that we've had a director of The Press come in and build a national reputation for USC Press. I'm on the Board and I see that we issue things like cookbooks, motor racing to raise money. So we can publish some academic and scholarly and build research contributions. If The Press has to be self-supporting, those academic items are going to disappear and it is all going to be cookbooks, racing, and things for your coffee table. It is a disastrous thing. The whole idea of a university press. I compared to a commercial press, is that the academic press publishes things that are important and that they may not be self-supporting. I think that what we are moving towards is not a liberal or value based situation but a market based situation. See what it has done to CBS and other news shows -- in order to be self-supporting their news content has deteriorated in terms of the product they give. The Press in particular should not be put on this kind of self-sustaining basis.

CHAIR WILCOX - We have a couple questions to ask the committee. Could somebody from the committee respond to some of the thinking on this?

PROVOST ODOM - I think that is going to be me. Leon Ginsberg was on the committee; he was also chair of the University Press, unfortunately Leon has come down with a fever this afternoon so he is not able to be here. Ezra, first of all to respond to you, that word is probably unfortunate because it is very much tied to scholarly works within the university. Certain parts of the university primarily. I certainly agree with Betty and I think anybody in this room would agree that Catherine Fry has done just a magnificent job with The Press in everything that The Press has done. However, in discussing this with Catherine, with Leon and with a couple of other staff members and faculty - they really felt like that The Press could stand to be a little bit more selective in the academic offerings that it published. As a result of that, the recommendation came forward.

PROFESSOR GREENSPAN - I am happy to hear first of all what I assume was a retraction on the term “tangential.” The term that to turn it around seems to me to be tangential to the proper definition of what a university’s Press’ role in a university is. University Press’ disseminate knowledge. The purpose of research in a university presumably is to disseminate knowledge. I think especially with the regional based pressed like USC’s the connection to the university (I speak by the way as an historian of publishing) is actually tighter to the mission of the university than would be the case of a press like Harvard, Oxford, or Yale that publishes on matters generally unrelated to the institution and the region. USC Press publishes powerfully and primarily on subjects of direct interest to South Carolina. I see Randy Mack sitting in front of me, Randy’s next book is the Diary of Frances Lieber, a name that I assume we all know. You all know Walter Edgar’s work as well as Robert Rosen’s book on Civil War Jews. This is what The Press has done best and what it is positioned better than any other press in the United States to do. So tangential seems to me really the wrong term. Secondly, I am concerned
that it is just not a semantic problem but a conceptual one. That is to say, the role of the University Press is not tangential but ought to be central to the function of a research university. And, cutting the budget by a third is very substantial. I spoke about this proposed cut to the directors of the university presses of Massachusetts, Penn State, our acting director here, and the executive director of the American Association of University Presses. All of them were very concerned about this particular initiative. Not that it is unprecedented in the United States, but it undoubtedly is going to detract from the ability of the press to perform what I think and I hope most of us think is a central role in the university. There is a direct linkage between the way one defines a press and the way one subsidizes it. Cutting it by a third will probably cut the number of books, which is currently at about 50 a year since Ken Scott and Catherine Fry in effect upgraded the quality of the press, to approximately 35, maybe 38. That is a very substantial cut and I do think that the SDI committee’s report is extremely problematic on this particular issue.

PROFESSOR MACK (ART) - I happen to be on the search committee for the new director of the USC Press and before coming here I just stopped by to read some of the files of people we are going to start interviewing. And, I think that this initiative would be extremely detrimental to us in achieving our goal in obtaining a truly fine university press director.

CHAIR WILCOX - Other comments regarding The Press?

PROFESSOR PHILLIP ROLLINSON (ENGL) - I would like to ask the Provost what and how and why and what selective means that you just used that you decided, that your committee decided The Press needs to be more selective? And, what exactly does that mean? I quote you.

PROVOST ODOM - I would simply say that we need to look very carefully at the 50 to 52 books we publish a year and decide if we need to publish all those books.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - You personally don’t think some of those are any good - is that correct?

CHAIR WILCOX - I am also on The Press Committee. There certainly are views that the number of books could be cut in terms of carrying out the mission.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - Why?

CHAIR WILCOX - The sense is simply that while obviously you may cut the amount of knowledge spread, the press could publish a number of significant works - continue to publish them. Some that might be viewed as less significant would not come to publication. I think it can be argued either way, but that is not a decision that I see as having come solely from the mind of the Provost here. That is one that has been discussed back and forth, I think, with different viewpoints quite frankly.
PROFESSOR MACK - Curiously, the written comments of some of the candidates have expressed surprise that the number of books being published by The Press has diminished over the years. They feel this is detrimental to The Press’ role.

CHAIR WILCOX - One of the members of the SDI committee, as the Provost says, is a former chair of The Press Committee. There have been some discussions here from people who are very familiar with The Press. There is disagreement -- I can assure you that there is. Betty’s on the committee and you have heard from her. There are certainly disagreements on that point, but it is not totally out of whole cloth as was suggested. Other questions?

Is there any interest in discussing the impact of the report on the various centers? Again there has been a discussion there of self-sufficiency. I didn’t know if anyone felt the need to raise and discuss those issues at all. If not, we can pass along.

Finally there was at one point a public outcry during the SDI process regarding plans with McKissick. I suspect that might lead to some need to comment here. I am looking for other hands, but I know I will see Professor Mack’s when I get to him. Randy, go ahead.

PROFESSOR MACK - I had prepared one of my usual Wednesday afternoon six-minute discourses but in interest of time I will reframe from reading it. I will simply point to a couple of key sentences. I have given the complete text to the Senate Office (Attachment).

First sentence: these are organized by paragraph and theme -- to formally recommend in the SDI report that the museum enhance its focus on academics is meaningless and demonstrates the committees failure to understand the museum’s role and its history. A focus on academics is at the very core of the museum’s existence and has been central to everything it has done since its creation.

Secondly, the recommendation to reallocate storage space in the museum for some other purpose indicates a failure to understand the physical realities of the building that houses it. Storage for the museum is presently located in the former stack area of the old McKissick library, an area constructed with low ceilings, solid concrete flooring, and closely-spaced steel supports integral to its very structure. In short this space can only be used for storage. If excellence really is the goal of this institution then our museum warrants increased attention, support, space, and funding. And, one final comment, I find it curious that the SDI committee did not take this opportunity to reexamine the museum’s administration affiliation. The university’s first holdings, by the way, were scientific specimens. And, since the museum supports the academic programs of an entire university, it would seem to me that the interests of the museum and the community it serves would benefit if it were to be administratively placed in a position parallel to that of the library. Reporting to the provost as it did in the past. Thank you.

CHAIR WILCOX - Other comments on the McKissick recommendations?
PROFESSOR ANN KINGSOLVER (ANTH) - I would just like to note the museum certificate program is significant in attracting graduate students to a number of other programs at the university.

CHAIR WILCOX - She points out the museum’s certificate program attracts a number of the graduate students in the university. (For those of you who may have had trouble hearing.) Other comments on that?

I want to thank you for the discussion. Did we have a comment that you are pointing out to me?

DEAN JOAN HINDE STEWART (LIBERAL ARTS) - I just wanted to say, apropos to the McKissick Museum, that the committee did indeed receive a great deal of response to its deliberations. And a great deal of support from many, many quarters. And, it is acutely aware of the space considerations having to do with what is actually located in the building and the location of the building with proximity or lack of proximity to parking. All of those things entered into a complicated discussion about it. At this point in the College of Liberal Arts we have initiated discussions with the museum director and with various deans and department heads about the kinds of things we could do to increase academic collaborations with the museum. We are also undertaking discussions about the museum management program. I am hopeful and optimistic about the outcome of these discussions. I think that they will lead to stronger collaborations across the campus with the museum.

CHAIR WILCOX - I would like to thank you all very much for what I consider to have been a very collegial tenor to these conversations we have had over the last few weeks. I would disagree somewhat with the characterization I read in the paper this morning of the tone. I think they have been far more productive in many respects than that suggested.

We had said when we got to the end of the discussion we would entertain resolutions of the body. Two major motions have been circulated to you for review. There are copies of them down in front if you have not got a copy. They are significant in the number of clauses that they have, which I think will generate much of the conversation today. We will discuss these. It looks like we should have enough time for a sufficient discussion of them. Professor Rosati would you like to begin for us?

PROFESSOR JEREL ROSATI (GINT) - Over the past few days I and a large number of colleagues have worked together to come up with a joint resolution. (For full text see Attachment C.) It has been circulated I believe rather widely so I don’t really think that I need to regurgitate or to repeat what has already been communicated. But to make a long story short, we began by saying we have read the report and appendixes closely, we attended the Special Faculty Senate sessions, and we listened very closely to the questions and comments made by the Faculty, as well as the responses by the administration and the SDI committee members. We would like to offer a single motion that lays out all or most of the questions and concerns that have been raised by the faculty
in these sessions that appear to have been either vaguely or inadequately addressed without demeaning or antagonizing anyone. The motion lays out a number of whereas’s many of which I think reflect what has also been stated today and then comes up with its ultimate recommendation which is:

“We, therefore, the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina, resolve that the Strategic Directions Report remains incomplete and does not set forth with adequate clarity an appropriate and sufficient long-term vision and strategic plan for the university and urge Dr. Palms and the Board of Trustees that it not be acted upon. Furthermore, we urge that the Report be considered a starting point for more thorough study and dialogue throughout the University community concerning the problems, challenges, and opportunities which the University faces that should begin with the appointment of a new permanent president.”

And, there are eight official public sponsors from Government and International Studies Department; Germanic, Slavic and East Asian Languages Department; School of Music; French and Classics Department; Art History Department; English Department; and Chemical Engineering Department. And, numerous other people who also wanted to co-sponsor it but I was told that unless you are officially a Faculty Senator you cannot officially co-sponsor a faculty resolution. Thank you.

CHAIR WILCOX - There is a motion before the body that is printed as: Motion for the Faculty Senate Relative to the Strategic Directions and Initiatives (SDI) Report. It is a three-page motion. Is there a second to that motion? The motion has been seconded. Discussion? Are we thoroughly discussed? Professor Adams.

PROFESSOR GREG ADAMS (LAW) - I agree completely with Professor Rosati’s goal in adopting this resolution. I am troubled though with the wording of it. I am frankly thinking about beyond this body what the impact is going to be and I’m thinking the most important impact of this relates to what Professor Wilcox can do with it with the Board of Trustees. It has been interesting to listen to reports of the discussions of our deliberations and what has been told to the Trustees as we have been discussing the SDI report. And, part of what they are hearing is that it is just the same handful of negative people in the faculty who don’t ever want change, who are always opposed to everything. And, that is one of the reasons why it is so important for us to adopt a resolution today. Because we need to speak with a unified voice and to say that although it is true that a number of people have spoken repeatedly, they are leaders in this university. And, the sentiments they are expressing are sentiments that are widely shared but it is important that what we adopt be seen as progressive and not merely reactive. If you have looked at the resolution that I have prepared (For full text see Attachment D.) and you have looked at Professor Rosati’s I think you see there are some differences in emphasis, some differences in style, and some differences in tone. It is my belief that the positive tone that I tried to adopt in my resolution will make it easier for Professor Wilcox to get the Board of Trustees to do what we want them to do. And, that there is a danger in the other resolution that they will simply see it as obstructionist, as negative and as a result will ignore it. Because the truth is there are some problems and there are some opportunities
in the university. The Board of Trustees are concerned about it. They understand the immense amount of work and thought that the Strategic Directives and Initiatives Committee has put into this. This train is about to pull out. Something is going to happen. The Board of Trustees is going to take some action in regard to this report. If we think that we as a faculty can stand in front of that train and say stop, nothing should ever happen as a result of this that is fantasy. We are not going to accomplish that.

I see two problems with the report. One is the undertaking Mr. Provost that you all took is monumental and the work you have done is amazing for the short time you had. Six or seven months was not enough to do more than raise to the surface the questions that this undertaking has produced. Sitting here these past Wednesdays has been fascinating. I have learned more about the university in the last month than I learned in the first 20 years I was here. But what is obvious is the process has just started. It is not time to take definitive action and both resolutions say that. It is not time to take definitive action.

The second problem is, in the history of the university this is a crazy time to be making dramatic changes. Dr. Palms’ was able to come in and provide leadership to this university because his hands were not tied before he took the job. Our new president should have the same opportunity.

I am going to move to amend the motion that is on the floor. To substitute my resolution for the one that is on the floor. Give the body a choice between tone and style. And, which ever one the body prefers, I am going to support it because we need to adopt a firm unified statement that identifies the problems in the SDI report and the problems in the point that we are at in the life of the university. So that we give Professor Wilcox the tools to be able to work with the Board of Trustees and get them to understand the immense wisdom that has been expressed in this body over the last few weeks. So Mr. Chairman I move to amend the resolution by substituting the one page resolution I have prepared. The effective part of which is:

“THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate urge the President and the Board of Trustees to accept the Report of the Strategic Directions and Initiatives Committee as a thoughtful introduction to the problems, challenges, and opportunities which the University faces, forming the basis for an in-depth dialog of the University community lead by its new President prior to the adoption by the President and Trustees of sweeping changes.”

CHAIR WILCOX - A motion to amend the original motion by substituting a single page motion titled: Resolution of the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina. Is there a second to that motion. That motion is now seconded. We will now discuss the substitute motion. That would be my understanding of the priority. What we will do here is we will consider this latest motion. We will then take a vote as to whether to substitute it. In essence a favorable vote at that point would be to put Professor Adams’ motion on the floor and a negative vote would be to keep Professor Rosati’s motion on
the floor then. So what we are discussing right now is the substitute. Yes, sir Professor Rollinson?

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON (ENGL) - May I ask Professor Adams what you refer to in describing your substitute motion as “getting the University Board of Trustees to do what we want them to do.” What do we want them to do?

PROFESSOR ADAMS - Well, that is a good question. Because we ought to be sure that we are all on the same page in that regard. What I would like to see them do is to defer taking any action at all at this point. And, to continue the process of looking at the issues raised by the SDI report. We have heard time and time again, I think the Medical School report today, the question of USC Press, all of these are issues that I think we all know understand. As we suspected the first time we looked at the SDI report that it was not ready for action. So in answer to your question I think we need to get the Board of Trustees to agree not to take precipitous action. To appoint a new president, allow that new president to provide leadership as to how to continue the dialogue about this report and the issues it raises and the process for making decisions.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - Can I continue my question while you are up there? Would that include all the specifics we understand from the Provost and Dean Stewart that the value blank management process has already been started without any regard as to what it will cost? Does your motion include in total all 28, whatever the number of things in the SDI - is that correct?

PROFESSOR ADAMS - Absolutely.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - You have not made any exceptions in this then?

PROFESSOR ADAMS - No.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - Thank you.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK (LAW) - Point of order Mr. Chair. I think the suggested procedure for a substitute is to entertain amendments to the substitute to perfect it and then entertain amendments to the main motion, to perfect it, before an election between them is voted on.

CHAIR WILCOX - I will defer to your parliamentary expertise. That sounds good to me. I even understand what you said, which is worrying me a little bit.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - That gives everybody a chance to get what they want in the particular motion that they want before they have to pick between them.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON - But we can still have discussion?

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - Oh, yes.
CHAIR WILCOX - We will have discussion. It is simply that, before we take even our first vote, we would entertain amendments to both motions so we knew what we were differentiating between.

PROFESSOR LINNEY (PSYC) - I am not sure if I am allowed to say what I want to say given this.....

CHAIR WILCOX - We will tell you if we don’t want it now.

PROFESSOR LINNEY - I guess I want to speak against the main motion and the substitute motion. I want to speak against stalling. I want to speak against the implication that the SDI report is anything but a set of recommendations. No where does it say this shall be done. There are a number of items that are strongly recommended and there are a number of items that are recommended. I think that the implication that they didn’t have enough information is really ridiculous. If any of you went to those meetings, I went to a couple of the meetings that were in Osborne 107C, and those folks were given hundreds of pages of material every time they met. I mean who knows it’s probably a fire hazard where it is all being stored right now. But there is a great deal of information that I think most of the members of the senate are not even privy to. I think it is also noteworthy that I haven’t counted exactly but it seems to me that about 20 to 25% of these recommendations are already being implemented or are already being adopted. So it has already triggered some interesting conversation and action. And, I think, that if this is not the time to act, when will be the time to act. I would argue that the sentiment in the senate is that it will never be a time to act or a time to change or a time to even have this discussion.

CHAIR WILCOX - Thank you. Other comments? Yes, sir.

PROFESSOR JOHN WEIDNER (ECHE) - The reason I was a supporter of the original resolution was to emphasis that we should move in some sense slowly, emphasize that this is a recommendation and that we don’t want to rush too far ahead and adopt something that we will be sorry for. And, yet I also agree that to make this as positive a tone as possible and so the replacement amendment sounds great. It is the way we should proceed.

PROFESSOR MACK (ART) - A response to Jean Ann’s comments. I cannot pretend to know everything about the university. But for the two areas that I am most closely related to, that is the Art Department and the potential College of Fine and Performing Arts, and McKissick Museum, I found the information, at least the interpretation of whatever information the SDI committee had, to be erroneous. And, I can only assume that other problems might have been apparent in the other areas examined.

DEAN STEWART (LIBERAL ARTS) - Just a quick correction of fact in response to what Professor Rollinson said a few minutes ago. I have not said that VCM has already been adopted. Nor do I believe that to be the case.
PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - Excuse me, I believe you said you were having in March an Indiana Dean down to help you all to do it. Is that not correct?

DEAN STEWART - No. In March we are having the dean of Indiana University here to talk to us about his experience with VCM so we gain a better understanding of it.

PROFESSOR LINNEY - I was just going to respond to Professor Mack’s comments, that it seems to me that given that every word in the senate is reported and all of that information is available to the President and to the Board of Trustees, it seems to me that the issues that people have objections to have been duly recorded. And perhaps the Chair of the Faculty Senate would encourage the Board of Trustees to read those transcripts and to have some understanding of that. But it seems to me that a motion to essentially stall everything is unnecessary and unproductive.

CHAIR WILCOX - And, I will add, we will forward all of that - the minutes and things - will be forwarded as we mentioned before.

PROFESSOR SHAROUGH AKHAVI (GINT) - It has been mentioned that the thrust of the Rosati and even the other proposal would be to stall and that the Faculty Senate would be doing obstructing tactics. If you read the recommendation in the resolution at the very end, it suggests that this is a starting point for discussion. I don’t see that as a stall at all.

CHAIR WILCOX - For those of you in the back here, he is simply saying that he believes these resolutions (again correct me if I paraphrase you incorrectly on any of these) are indicating clearly this is a starting point and he does not see it as a stalling resolution.

PROFESSOR CHARLES ALBER (GERM) - I want to express my appreciation for the process that has gone on in the Senate over the past few weeks. To me it has been one of the most amazing displays of democracy and of dialogue between the administration and the faculty that I have seen in my 30 years here. I suddenly feel very privileged to be part of this body. I don’t see any reason whatsoever why this very orderly and rational process cannot continue. It gives us not only time to process the information but it makes it available to the public and for everybody to see. It puts the university in the spotlight and I think that is the way we should make decisions. The value that we should place behind these extraordinarily difficult decisions. Thank you.

PROFESSOR GREENSPAN (ENGL) - In response to Jean Ann, I would like to invoke the wisdom of Ecclesiastes.

CHAIR WILCOX - Will you stand so you can be heard. We are about to get a Biblical cite here.

PROFESSOR GREENSPAN - I can give it to you in Hebrew or in English.
CHAIR WILCOX - This is for Professor Conant, behind you, who was trying to cite the Bible for something the other day.

PROFESSOR GREENSPAN - There is a time to act and a time not to act. And, not acting is not necessarily stalling. It seems to me extraordinary that a university would be undergoing a serious restructuring exercise at the same time it is trying to recruit a new president. This is extremely unusual and to my mind it is extraordinarily problematic. I remember the remark of George Keller, who gave an endowed lecture at the School of Education back in the fall. Keller is probably one of the top two or three students of higher education in the United States. And, in response to a question about the situation at USC he remarked that to bring the university to prominence in this country there has to be some kind of teamwork between boards of trustees and presidents. I think he also mentioned faculty, but two out of three ain’t bad. It seems to me that bringing in a new president under this kind of set of restructuring guidelines is exactly the wrong way to bring a university to a higher degree of prominence. I just find the timing extraordinarily problematic. As a generality, I support both resolutions. I think they are astute, well crafted, and to the point. But I must say I do think that Greg’s is constructed in a slightly more positive tone and, I do think, for public relations purposes as well as to set the right tone for this body it is probably the better of the two.

PROFESSOR ROSATI (GINT) - I would also like to mirror what you said before, I would like to congratulate, in doing an outstanding job in really operating as Chair of the Senate. I have been here for 20 years and this is the first time that I felt a degree of empowerment at this institution. I think Rob Wilcox deserves a round of applause. (Applause.)

CHAIR WILCOX - I am looking out of the corner of my eye to see if there was applause from this corner. (Laughter.) You all have done the hard work - let’s continue.

PROFESSOR ROSATI - Second, Greg and I have been in communication, we have talked on the phone, and we have had e-mails together. The sentiments that he has communicated to you also reflects my sentiments as well. If the sense of the Senate is to support his resolution, I am whole-heartedly in support of it and I will make the recommendation that everybody support that. I would love to see a lot of people officially and publicly co-sponsor that. If the resolution that I and my colleagues offered prevails, I would make the same request. And that others also publicly add their names and co-sponsor it because the more co-sponsors that we have regardless of which resolution goes forward - helps to communicate this to the larger community, the president, and to the Board of Trustees.

Finally and my last point, and then I will be quiet. I had an e-mail earlier today and I was told that I could share this with the larger body because it didn’t get out in time. I will just read it. It is a very short, succinct one and reflects my thinking as well. Although I would prefer my original resolution, I can live with the alternative resolution. It comes from Katherine Reynolds who is Director of Museum of Education from the
College of Education. Unfortunately she can't be here, she has class at the moment. Unless she somehow got out of it and I am not aware of her presence. She wrote me and said, 'As a senator I might want to see a few slight changes in wording in the joint resolution by you and others. But overall I prefer it to the alternative suggested because it is unequivocal. I believe that it would be highly equivocal for the Senate to pass a resolution that supports SDI as a good start and wonderful think piece. I can see the headlines 'Faculty Supports SDI.' If we don't support the conclusions and the suggestions of SDI we should say so in language that is clear and unlikely to be misinterpreted. The joint resolution seems to do that well.' Thank you.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (CSCE) - First I would like to let Jean Ann Linney know that she is not alone in this body as having some reservations about basically putting things on ice. I am concerned about the original resolution because it basically says, "Don't act on it; put it on hold; wait until Prince Charming arrives in the form of a new president." Well, as we all know, there can be delays and hang-ups in the hiring of any administrator. We could go on for quite sometime under an interim president with all of this stuff on hold. Some of these items are much more drastic and controversial than others, and I do not want to see us say, "Put them all on hold. Throw the baby out with the bath water." Because we have some serious concerns, we are going to ask that none of these items be acted upon. So while I have some reservation about Greg Adams' substitute, this at least leaves open the possibility that the beginning of a dialogue could include action on some of the items, which I, personally, really think should be acted upon fairly quickly. And, in fact some of them are already being acted on. So basically that is a comment in support of the substitute motion as opposed to the original motion. Also from a PR point of view I think one page is a whole lot better than four.

PROFESSOR JERALD WALLULIS (PHIL) - I want to take the occasion to chime in and amplify perhaps what Caroline is saying with specific language that the first resolution uses in recommending we not act on the resolution. It was pointed out by several speakers, and I can understand the motivation, that this whole timing with the presidential search is problematic but I think we should also see the context out of which, I think, the original report also originated. I think that the report originated from a general budget crisis which led to a strategy where every part of the institution had to take cross-the-board budget cuts. If we were to somehow construe this that we wouldn't act on a program like the SDI report and simply face another budget crisis, which of course we are not now in but could be - because we cannot anticipate things, if we were simply to institute a policy once again of cross-the-board budget cuts, I would consider that to be worse. So I again I would try and amplify what Caroline is saying - that the language of the first proposal ties us too much with regards to future strategic planning.

CHAIR WILCOX - Hold on one second. Professor Rollinson and then Professor Wedlock.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON (ENGL) - I have two comments. First of all the problem with the SDI report is that even though it is economically driven it does not address
economics at all. There are no comments about whether this recommendation is going to add revenue, it is going to be cost saving, it is going to add cost - at all. I think this is an underlying comment to this resolution. There are no practical comments. How can you vote for something that we don’t know what it is going to cost - more or less or whatever. Even though all of this has occurred because we have economic duress. My second comment would be that, I believe, we should as a body decide on one or other of these resolutions and then I believe it is in our power to decide to recommend them. This one takes care of the problem of endorsers or co-sponsors - I think we ought to endorse it unanimously. I suggest that to you - that is within your power to decree that. And, I want to recommend that you do that.

CHAIR WILCOX - If I had known that, we wouldn’t have been here for four weeks.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - That is not true. I wanted to unanimously recommend whatever we are going to recommend.

CHAIR WILCOX - There can be a motion from the floor at the appropriate time.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK (LAW) - Before the congratulatory mood leaves us, I know this may sound unpopular, but I would like to congratulate the SDI committee because they put in a tremendous amount of work.

Now it is true that we came to this juncture because of budgetary considerations and economic crisis. That is a reality that is not going to go away. It is not going to go away. We are not going to see any benefits coming down main street in our direction any time soon. In point of fact, if this university is going to run like it has been run it is going to have to find a new way to finance itself. And, that was the task that the Strategic Directives and Initiatives Committee was doing. And I think they did a pretty good job of identifying sources of income. The question that we are all talking about now is, “Well, what is this going to do the rest of us?” But the first problem, the first issue, is where are we going to get the money. We need it now and we need it on a fairly stable basis. The suggestion, that I put out a couple of weeks ago - that this sounds like we are going to rob Peter to pay Paul in the hope that Paul will repay Peter when Paul gets rich again - is not too far off the mark, and it also has a barb in it. It has a barb in it that I haven’t heard addressed in any of the discussions, and that is - what do the scientists think about this? We haven’t heard from them. How they are going to feel when the provost reallocates money from the state funds that is currently going to Math and Science and Engineering to College of Liberal Arts or to the Art Department - wherever it may end up? There is a long-term concern there. In the short term it looks good for the sciences but in the long-term it may not be so good for the sciences. I just haven’t heard that.

One of the criticisms of the SDI report is it is inconsistent in the sense that we don’t know what a comprehensive, flagship, research university is. Well let me try - I have read it a couple of times and I’ve been listening here - we are a flagship university. We are a comprehensive flagship university in the sense we have been discussing here.
What the SDI proposes to do is to increase our research profile, and I think that is all it really says. To increase our research profile in order to maintain the comprehensive quality of the flagship university. As I understood the provost last week, he said that when the research colleges - those that are targeted for the grantsmanship - bring in more money, they will keep the overhead. But I presume that will mean that they will be running on that money and that the state funds will be reallocated where they are needed. That is always going to be a controversial decision. Where are funds most needed, in the Art Department, in English, in Foreign Languages, you name it. But those decisions are going to get made and they are going to be made by the administration, whoever they happen to be. And, I assume that the faculty and the Faculty Senate will have something to say about those things as well.

For those reasons I would like to congratulate the SDI committee. I would support Greg Adams’ proposal over the Rosati proposal on the grounds that there are too many negative clauses that are directed at what the SDI report does not do. I think there is insufficient attention to what it does do and that (if not recognized) at least is not negated by Greg Adams’ resolution. That is why I would support that one. I would wish it would be a little more specific in the sense that it would include this dialogue explicitly to be conducted through the regular university and the faculty governing system, but that is a minor point. I wouldn’t hold anything up on that. Thank you very much.

PROFESSOR CARL EVANS (RELG) - A couple of comments before my question. I am in a dilemma. Frankly I am in a dilemma with this. I do want to express appreciation for the SDI report. I think they have done a tremendous amount of work in bringing this report to us and there is much of great value in it. I recognize that there are still some questions that still need to be answered and those questions have been put on the table here and I would like to see the conversation continued in much the same fashion as it has over the last several months. I also recognize the importance of the observation made by Professor Wallulis that we are faced with some very real budget realities this coming year. And, if we are realistic about how we are going to operate as a university, we must find ways to do things differently then we have been doing. We just cannot continue as we have been working and expect to accomplish our mission. So I guess the question I have is whether a recommendation such as Professor Adams has proposed - and I’d like to amend that perhaps if I get a certain answer to the question - but whether a recommendation similar to Professor Adams would indeed mean that we would be back to across the board cuts as Professor Wallulis suggested. My impression has been that during this past year even though we had across the board cuts at the beginning of the year mid-year we had cuts that were differentially applied. It seems to me that the administration is already at liberty to do in terms of budget reallocation the essential points that this plan tries to get at. And, at the same time I think it would be very valuable for the process of discussion on many of these points to continue. Am I correct in my perception that differential cuts would be the principle that would be followed? I guess I am addressing this to the Provost.

PROVOST ODOM - I would suspect that you are correct. We would have to see, Carl, clearly what kind of cut we would have, how big it would be, and where we could cut
without hurting anybody any more than possible. I wouldn’t want to say today that no we will not cut across the board, but we would certainly, I think, try not to do that.

PROFESSOR EVANS - In that case I would like to offer the following amendment to Professor Adams’ resolution. The amendment would be to strike the last clause of the first whereas paragraph, to strike the next three whereas paragraphs (because each of them has negative language in it and for other reasons too), but then begin with the second whereas with what is now the fifth whereas paragraph. This is confusing isn’t it. So that the second whereas in the amended proposal would read: Whereas, the Faculty Senate joins the SDI report in expressing concern that long range plans must identify the core values, etc., etc., etc. And, the rest of it would be as printed in the resolution.

CHAIR WILCOX - There is a motion to delete from the first “Whereas” of the substitute motion the words “but which makes available little factual information in justification of many of its recommendations;” to delete paragraphs 2, 3, and 4; and to begin the 5th paragraph, which would then become the second, “Whereas the Faculty Senate joins the SDI Committee in expressing concern that long-range…..” That is a motion to amend the substitute motion. Is there a second to the motion to amend? It is has been seconded. Discussion of the amendment; that is what we are discussing now the proposed amendment.

PROFESSOR MACK - “Headline, Faculty Senate endorses SDI report.”

CHAIR WILCOX - Other comments. If there are none…yes, Caroline.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN (CSCE) - A half page is even better than a page.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON - I call the question.

CHAIR WILCOX - I would ask, are there any senators not in these middle two sections? If you could all come down to the front it would help us as far as counting votes - when we get into votes. Is anyone in the middle who is not a senator? Please don’t vote if you are sitting there. I’ll let you sit there, but please don’t vote.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - Mr. Chairman was that seconded by a faculty senator?

CHAIR WILCOX - Was that seconded by a senator, I heard a second?

PROFESSOR ROBERT CARLSSON (ECON) - Yes it was.

CHAIR WILCOX - Thank you. The amendment has been proposed. Do I need to repeat it or do we comfortably understand it? It has been seconded. There has been a motion to call the question. If there is no further discussion can we just withdraw the motion and go ahead and vote? Okay.
Let us vote on the amendment then. All in favor of adopting the amended deletions and one rewording signify by saying aye. Opposed. Let's have a show of hands. All raise a hand, one hand, either hand. If you would help me count Sarah. We have 19 in favor. All opposed. I think we have more than 19. Yes. Okay the motion fails.

We are now back to the discussion of the substitute in its original form.

PROFESSOR MACK - Question of clarification. Could the Provost confirm Professor Wedlock’s interpretation of the application of the VCM?

PROVOST ODOM - I have to now remember what Professor Wedlock said. If I understood what Professor Wedlock said. He said that those colleges that can basically generate their own budget through tuition and fees and research monies, would they in fact lose some state appropriated funds that would go to other places like the Law School? The answer to that is yes. That is the way it works.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON - Call for the question.

CHAIR WILCOX - There has been a call of the question. All in favor of cutting off debate signify by saying aye. Opposed. We will now vote on the motion to amend the original resolution by substituting the Adams’ resolution, if you will. So an affirmative vote here is a vote in favor of the Adams’ resolution. If there is an affirmative vote, we will then consider whether to adopt that resolution at all. There are going to be two votes. There will be a vote as to whether to substitute, if it is approved, we would then vote whether to approve it. If it is rejected, we would then vote whether to approve the original resolution, the Rosati resolution.

PROFESSOR DAVID BERUBE (THSP) - I have a point of parliamentary information. Does it require a two-thirds vote on a substitute amendment.

PROFESSOR ADAMS (LAW) - No - pejorative.

CHAIR WILCOX - All in favor of the Adam’s resolution signify by saying aye. Opposed. I hear it as being approved.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - Call for a count.

CHAIR WILCOX - There is a call for a count. If you are in favor, please raise your hand. We have 54 in favor. All opposed please raise your hand. We have 14 opposed. The substitute motion is approved as a substitute for the original motion. We know open the floor for discussion of the motion as substituted.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - I have a motion. Mr. Chairman I move that we adopt the Adams’ substitute motion unanimously.
CHAIR WILCOX - I would like to ask if you would defer until we take the vote. If it is approved, I think it is then appropriate to make that motion.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - Very good, I defer to you sir.

CHAIR WILCOX - If it is first approved, I think it is appropriate to make that motion.

PROFESSOR MACK - As an original sponsor of the initial motion, I would like to suggest that we all endorse the Adams' substitute motion.

PROFESSOR ROSATI (GINT) - I second that. I would like to co-sponsor it as well.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON - Let's vote.

CHAIR WILCOX - Is there any further discussion? I think it important to make sure we have had discussion. Alright. All in favor of cutting off debate signify by saying aye. Opposed. Debate is cut off.

We will now vote on the motion which is the "Resolution of the Faculty Senate of the University of South Carolina" as submitted by Professor Adams and seconded from the floor. All in favor of the motion signify by saying aye. Opposed.

PROFESSOR ROSATI - Why don't we take another count so we have official numbers?

CHAIR WILCOX - There is a request for a count from the floor so if you will raise your hand please. All in favor. It is 66 in favor. All opposed, please raise your hand. The motion carries by a vote 66 to 9. Now if you would like to make your motion you may.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - Mr. Chairman I would like to move that we unanimously adopt this.

CHAIR WILCOX - This motion would require a unanimously approval - obviously. Is there any objection to the Senate going on record as unanimously adopting this? There is objection. The vote will stand 66 to 9 in favor of the resolution as proposed.

Is there further business to come before us today?

PROFESSOR MACK - I would like to compliment the primary authors of both motions on their efforts in phrasing our viewpoints.

CHAIR WILCOX - We will meet in regular session March 6th. If there are additional matters to be discussed.....before we adjourn there is one more thing on the floor. Please, if you will give us one second.
PROFESSOR CONANT (MUSC) - For the good of the order I also want to thank the SDI committee. They were given an impossible task, within an impossible time frame. I would trust any of them with my life. I just think this all needs some more study.

CHAIR WILCOX - Let me mention one other thing. I neglected this. The Regional Campuses people have been having some communications problems. They are voting by telephone. There are not enough of them to change the outcome even if they all voted no, but the final vote may differ because we will count their votes in the final vote count. I neglected to mention that. They are voting by phone. If there is no further business, is there a motion that we adjourn until March 6th. So moved. All in favor - aye. Let’s go.

NOTE: Final Vote was: 68 in favor and 9 opposed.