FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 6, 2002

I. Call to Order.

CHAIR ROBERT WILCOX - This is the February meeting of the Senate.

II. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR WILCOX - The first order of business is the correction and approval of the minutes of December 5, 2001 meeting. Are there any changes or additions to be made to those minutes as printed? If there are none, is there a motion of their approval? It has been and seconded. All in favor say aye. Opposed. Minutes are approved.

III. Reports of Committees.

CHAIR WILCOX - We have a sort of streamlined agenda today. We will hear from a couple of committees which have some business which needs to be taken care of. The Provost and the President have agreed to delay their monthly reports until next month in order that we can proceed with the business that we are here for. So we will start with a couple of committee reports very quickly.

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

PROFESSOR WISE - Nominations for the vacancy on the Committee on Academic Responsibility may be made at this time. If there are no nominations, we will continue with the committee as it exists since it will only be for the spring semester.

CHAIR WILCOX - It is a relatively short period of time and we have been told that they can function with the bodies they have, rather than appoint somebody for a month and a half before new elections. But if somebody would like to volunteer, we will entertain nominations for that committee. Nominations will be open till the end of the meeting.

B. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Jeffery Persels, Chair:

PROFESSOR PERSELS - Before we pick up the business, I would just like you to take a reminder back to your units that as of the April 4, 2001 Faculty Senate meeting the University Committee on Curricula and Courses no longer has anything to do with May term courses. They do not go through us any more. So May term courses need to be treated either as a topics course that already exists on the books in your unit or it needs to be proposed as a new course and jump through all the hoops and then you may offer it whenever you like. May term is now to be treated like any other academic term. We have been getting requests for May term courses, so if you would remind your units of that, we would appreciate it.
We have 5 items of business for you on pages 26 through 49. Item one from the College of Engineering and Information Technology, the Department of Computer Science and Engineering is an internet delivery for an existing course. And, for the Department of Mechanical Engineering a change in title that is just correcting an error that came up earlier this year.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved the approval of I. College of Engineering and Information Technology. Is there discussion? If there is none, we are ready for a vote. All in favor of the motion. Opposed. They stand approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - In II. College of Liberal Arts I would just like to point out a couple of corrections, typographical errors on page 28 item F. should not read the Department of Anthropology but the Program of African-American Studies and I believe that was the only correction. Item A. Department of Germanic, Slavic and East Asian Languages and Literatures is proposing a new course. Actually that is another correction this should not be on your agenda. This course has already been approved and did not need to come before our body and it somehow slipped and we didn’t get the appropriate sign off on it. So I would like to delete that. From the Department of Sociology there is a new course. The Department of Spanish, Italian and Portuguese a delete. The Department of Religious Studies a new course one that is crosslisted with item F. from the African American Studies Program. And, then the promised designator spread that we mentioned at the last meeting from the Department of Theatre, Speech and Dance. showing how the existing THSP courses are to be turned into THEA, SPCH and DANC. That is it.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved II. And, if I understand, that is parts B through F. II.A is not included but all the other portions of II. have been moved. Is there a discussion of those changes? If there is none. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. II. B through F is approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - III. College of Pharmacy: one minor correction on page 30 on the PHRM 559 becoming a PHRM 559 with a new title and description take out the period at the end of PRACTICE. It should be just PRACTICE EXPERIENCE. Other than that we will move for the change in curriculum in the University Bulletin; the change in title, and description for 559, 560, and 679; and changes in descriptions continuing on page 31.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved III -- changes in curriculum on page 29 and changes in title and description on pages 30 and 31, with the minor typographical changes. Any discussion of those? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. They are approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - IV. College of Science and Mathematics: a change in curriculum from the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and changes in prerequisites and descriptions. There is also a typographical error on the bottom of page 33, those two descriptions should be flipped. CHEM 541L to CHEM 541L the old
description should be in place of the new description and the new description should be in place of the old description. (NOTE: It was discovered on 2-7-2002 that this change should not be done - it was correct as printed.) And, on page 34 there is also another change. I apologize, under the Department of Marine Sciences the cross-listing should say (it is the last item) MSCI 535 MARINE BOTANY should equal BIOL 525 in both instances there.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved IV, with the changes noted, reversing of the descriptions on 541L and the change from MSCI to BIOL on the cross-listing in part C. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Oh - we have a question.

PROFESSOR CHARLES MACK (ART) - Am I on the right page, page 32?

CHAIR WILCOX - Correct.

PROFESSOR MACK - Is there any significance to striking out the foreign language requirements? It is not being struck; out it is just the description is being struck out?

PROFESSOR PERSELS - Right they just did not want to specify German, French, or Russian any more but the language requirement is still handled on the college level.

PROFESSOR MACK - Thank you for the clarification.

CHAIR WILCOX - With that clarification is there any discussion? Ready to vote? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. IV is approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - V. South Carolina Honors College a very length attachment with wording clarification for changes in curriculum.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved V in its entirety which runs from pages 35 to 49 is it? Yes, page 49. I cannot even read the bottom of it because I do not have my glasses, but I am assuming. Is there any discussion?

PROFESSOR DAVID BERUBE (THSP) - Page 36 can we get assurances that we can actually offer them resident hall facilities on the Horseshoe? The entire Honors community?

CHAIR WILCOX - I think the way it reads, and I’ll let others comment, but it says they are offered first to upperclassmen.

PROFESSOR BERUBE - Yet the previous sentence though says .......

CHAIR WILCOX - ....they have the option of applying to available housing. Then it says housing for freshmen is primarily in Maxcy. Obviously Maxcy is not going to be large enough to hold all of them necessarily. I am not sure if it makes a promise.
PROFESSOR BERUBE - The second sentence says "Honors residential communities are available for all four years."

PROFESSOR PERSELS - May we direct the question to the Dean of the Honors College who is here - Peter Sederberg.

PROFESSOR BERUBE - Is that cool? I just want to know.

DEAN PETER SEDERBERG (South Carolina Honors College) - Honors College residential communities are available for all 4 years. That doesn’t guarantee necessarily that every single person will get exactly the particular community that they want. We say they are available, that doesn’t mean they are guaranteed. In fact essentially all of our students who want to live in an Honors residential community for the last 4 or 5 years have been able to find a space.

CHAIR WILCOX - But you are comfortable with the representation as it is written?

DEAN SEDERBERG - Yes, it is accurate.

PROFESSOR NANCY LANE (FREN) - I had a question about the availability of seats in the inquiry minor to non-honors college students particularly in the introductory courses. Do you project having sufficient spaces in those classes for non-honors college students?

DEAN SEDERBERG - Well that is - well let me stand up for that one, that is a good question and a lot more complicated answer than you probably want. The original vision when this minor was approved by Faculty Senate two years ago was that we would operate like the medical humanities. In other words it would be advertised as being available to all qualified students and we establish the same criteria that the medical humanities has. So in a sense that is what we are doing now. Except, that with the award of the Hewlitt Grant last spring, we are now engaged in experiment to develop analogous courses through the freshmen year experience (which will come before this body for approval in the coming months) for a UNIV 201 variant of our fundamentals courses that will build on the UNIV 101 and will serve as a substitute, once they are approved, for the core courses that currently exist in the minor. So we hope actually through that means that we will attract far larger than the 10% non-honors students who are in the medical humanities.

CHAIR WILCOX - Other questions? We are ready to vote. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. Item V is approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - I believe that is it.

CHAIR WILCOX - Thank you.
C. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Professor Marja Warehime, Chair:

PROFESSOR WAREHIME - Scholastic Standards and Petitions has two items of business to bring to the Faculty Senate. The materials related to these two proposals start on page 50. The first is a proposal by the College of Pharmacy to revise its dismissal policy. The committee looked favorably on this proposal because it tightens requirements in the program by preventing students from merely repeating basic program courses until they receive a grade of C or higher. The new policy would allow a student to repeat a course only once and then failure to earn a grade of C or higher would then lead to dismissal rather than a one-semester suspension. So that strikes me as an improvement on the policy and we move the Senate's approval.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee moves I. of the report, that is found on page 50 of your materials from the College of Pharmacy. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. Those changes are approved.

PROFESSOR WAREHIME - The second proposal came to the committee from the Associate and Assistant Deans Council rather than the Deans College. There isn’t any Deans College at the moment any way. It represents an effort to clarify, a very laudable effort I think to clarify the language in the current bulletin regarding second majors and second degrees. As an advisor I very much welcome this clarification as it answered a number of questions that I run into from time to time. The committee felt the new language was really a valuable change and would again like to move its approval.

CHAIR WILCOX - We are considering II found on pages 51 and 52 regarding the Second Baccalaureate Degree and Second Major. Discussion?

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (CSCE) - I have a question on some of the wording on page 52 where it says "A second major eliminates the cognate requirement..." what about programs in which a student has a minor or other cognate substitute such as we have? We have an application area instead of a cognate. It is not clear whether or not this would apply to a minor or application area as well as a cognate.

PROFESSOR WAREHIME - I think the spirit of it would mean that it would indeed. I don’t know whether Mary Ann Byrnes is here she had offered to clarify further things if I ran into issues that I didn’t feel I had come across in discussing on this proposal. I think the language would apply to where there was something that was a cognate substitute.

ASSISTANT DEAN MARY ANN BYRNES (Liberal Arts) - I apologize I couldn’t hear a word back there.

PROFESSOR WAREHIME - Could you repeat this then.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - My question had to do with the wording of the paragraph on page 52 where: "A second major eliminates the cognate requirement; however, special
departmental requirements normally completed as part of the cognate are not waived.”
What about programs in which students have a minor or some cognate substitute but not a cognate.

ASSISTANT DEAN BYRNES - Well I think the intention was that where departments in their major program require that students take courses outside of their discipline in order to do that major. Let me give you an example of the theatre major. In addition to the 30 hours of theatre those students have to have 6 hours of dramatic literature somewhere in their program. Normally they are done in the cognate but if the student is doing a second major they would still have to do the dramatic literature although it might not be done as a cognate since they wouldn’t have one. Does that answer the question?

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - So you are saying that the intent here includes minors and application areas. Why not include that in the wording as well? We may be the only program with an application area in which case maybe it shouldn’t be here. But I think there are others which would allow minors.

ASSISTANT DEAN BYRNES - Would that not be included under “special departmental requirements?” That was as general as we could make that to describe any other thing you want students to do.

CHAIR WILCOX - Does that resolve the problem enough for you?

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - I am glad to see this making into the bulletin - hopefully.

CHAIR WILCOX - If there are further improvements we will take them up at another time if you have some. Other discussion? All in favor of these changes signify by saying aye. Opposed. They are approved. Thank you very much.

Is Dean Moody here? Dean Moody is the chair of the NCAA Reaccredidation Committee that we have and needs to address us this month regarding her duties for our information. So we will allow her a few minutes.

DEAN PATRICIA MOODY (HRSM) - Thank you Mr. Chairman for giving me just a moment to bring this report to you. I am chairing NCAA Athletic Certification Program and this study is ongoing at the moment. It will last most of this year. One of my duties is to inform the faculty that this study is taking place and to share information about the scope of the study. One of the things that we gain as we serve on these committees is an appreciation for all aspects of the athletics program are the rules and regulations that the Athletic Department operates under. All of this is being studied by different subcommittees. All of these committees are appointed by the President. The Steering Committee includes Dr. Palms, Dr. Odom, Mr. Lister from the Board of Trustees, Mike McGee-Director of Athletics, Susie VanHuss-NCAA Representative, Laura Massa-Senior Women’s Administrator, Terry Parham-University Counsel, Craig Curry-NCAA Compliance Officer, as well as all the chairs of the subcommittees. There are four subcommittees:
1. Governance is being chaired by Dr. Roger Sawyer, Associate Dean from Science and Math.
2. Equity Welfare and Sportsmanship is chaired by Dr. John Montgomery who is Dean of the Law School.
3. Fiscal Integrity chaired by Dr. Tom Regan who is the Chair of Sport and Entertainment Management.
4. Athletic Integrity chaired by Dr. Fred Medway who is chair of the Department of Psychology.

We anticipate that the first draft will be completed in April and the final draft we hope in August. The NCAA visiting team will be on campus in November. Also would like to add that all these committees are comprised of faculty members, administrators, students, athletes, and coaches. Thank you very much.

CHAIR WILCOX - We don't want to lose our NCAA accreditation right before the national championship football game next year.

IV. Report of the Secretary
None.

V. Old Business

CHAIR WILCOX - Let's proceed to old business at this point then if there are no other reports of committees. We began our discussion of the strategic directives and initiatives report last week with a rather broad discussion of academic qualities that we felt needed to be preserved and nurtured in the university.

Our work today begins discussing the specific recommendations of the report. We are going to discuss them in the context of their potential impact, whether that impact is positive or negative, upon the quality of the university academic program. This is an opportunity to ask questions of the SDI committee. You will notice that many of them are sitting together. They have circled their wagons over here together. They are ready for us. But they are here to share information with us today. So this is our chance to ask questions of them as to what data, what reasoning, they used in reaching the recommendations that they have put forth in their report. It is also an opportunity to identify the specific academic qualities of the institution that we may foresee as faculty members being affected by these various recommendations. Again they could be affected positively or negatively. I think we need to identify those concerns.

Last week at the end of the meeting you got a two-page listing of topics, groupings of the topics for discussion. I think it is quite possible as we go through these discussions that we will stray a little bit. It may be practical at times to talk about a different recommendation at the time we are talking about an earlier one. To the extent that that facilitates our discussion and to the extent it is not unfair to the body or to the members of the SDI committee, to discuss one of those related topics, even though it is a
little bit later on our agenda, I will allow the discussion to go that direction. But if there is a sense that its sort of surprise notice, we will delay the discussion till a later time. There is common theme to the first category of topics that you received, but there are a lot of different issues there. In some ways they seem very unrelated, but one of the common themes is they do contemplate something of a list of spending priorities. They are all recommendations that contemplate the university putting additional resources, into these areas. And, when we talk about putting additional resources we all know that means prioritizing resources. I thought that might be a good place for us to start our discussion. Particularly in light of our discussion of qualities of the university last week. I think the Honors College is a particularly good place to start our discussion. It is at the heart of much of the undergraduate mission of the university in terms of looking at excellence. I think it is an area that offers good opportunity for constructive discussion. So we will start there. I do ask the body, as we proceed this afternoon, to keep in mind our purpose is to discuss the merits of these issues. Try not to stray too much and digress into other flights of fancy as we go along. I will try to gavel you back to the topic at hand if that becomes a problem. So keep that in mind as you make your comments.

Let me start with the Honors College recommendation. I am not going to read them all to you but I’ll start with this one to get things going because it has multiple parts. It is a recommendation to increase the enrollment by a minimum of 25 per year to an ultimate enrollment of 1,500 in the Honors College -- with 3 conditions. It is to be done while maintaining the level of services required to ensure a high quality educational experience for Honors College scholars. The second condition is that it be done while maintaining the caliber of those Honors College scholars. And third that it be done in a way that substantially increases the level of diversity among Honors College students. So those aspects were all raised in that recommendation. I put that forward for you and ask the body if they have any questions or observations on that particularly recommendation to start off our discussion. Don’t be shy.

PROFESSOR NANCY LANE (FREN) - I’m from French for the time being. My question is a result of Dr. Sederberg’s remarks to this body last semester about the availability of scholarship monies to attract the kind of student that the Honors College seeks. He spoke to the difficulties they have in offering sufficiently large scholarships to attract the numbers of non-South Carolina students that are necessary to achieve this goal. So I guess my question is, did the committee consider this factor in making this recommendation and does it have ideas about the sources of these scholarship funds? And particularly, ways of attracting students not from South Carolina.

CHAIR WILCOX - The question was raised as to the identified need by the dean for additional scholarship money to attract high quality students. And the question is to what extent did the committee address that issue. Is there someone - Martin do you want to address that.

PROFESSOR MARTIN MCWILLIAMS (LAW) - I’ll tell you that what the SDI committee has done is designate some of us to be the designated sort of victims. And, I am the Honors College person, but I want to encourage my colleagues on the committee
to chip in as well if they have ideas that are additional to mine. I think that that question is one we did talk about substantially in the committee. Where is the money going to come from? But what we always fell back on was what we deemed to be the purpose of the committee and that is to identify opportunities to make the university better. I am not going to stand here and tell you that we have a magic wand that we have thought of some way to raise scholarship money that nobody else has thought of and I’m going to break this news to you now. Clearly we do need more money. The trustees if they adopt this recommendation are going to be the ones who have to find out how to get the money. The State Legislature if it is in accord with this recommendation is going to have to come up with some of the money. There will have to be private funds. But we did not consider that the SDI committee’s job was to figure out how to execute the details of all of these recommendations. We didn’t have the time and we didn’t consider that was in our mission but we think that the money needs to come from somewhere. To us a great university is great students and great faculty. You will notice in this report we named them in that order - great students and great faculty. The Honors College is where our great students are. To us on the committee is seemed evident that every student who qualifies for a space at the Honors College should be admitted to the Honors College. And, that we should go looking for them and find them and bring them here. If that takes more money we need to find the money. I can’t tell you where it is going to be found. Any follow-up to that?

CHAIR WILCOX - One additional question I might ask is, to what extent did the committee look into the prospect -- if the goal is to attract top flight students, if that is the ultimate goal - the ability to attract them outside of the Honors College into undergraduate programs beyond simply inside the Honors College?

PROFESSOR MCWILLIAMS - In a sense there Mr. Chairman you are setting yourself up to fulfill a prophesy you just made and that is straying from the particular topic you raised.

CHAIR WILCOX - That is why I said it earlier, so I could do it.

PROFESSOR MCWILLIAMS - Another one of our recommendations is that there be a comprehensive scheme of enrollment management towards exactly these same goals. Raising the quality level of the student body and enhancing the diversity of the student body. Gene Luna is here and that is his topic and you can address that question to Gene if you’d like. The Honors College is in a sense a detail of a much broader or comprehensive plan or recommendation of enrollment management. You want to ask Gene or want to wait....

CHAIR WILCOX - If Gene has comments, feel free to volunteer.

GENE LUNA (Student Development and University Housing) - It does move us into the second part of your agenda but I do think as Martin said they are related. In the report, which I think you have all had a chance to see, if you look in the appendixes we actually detailed some of the amounts we think it is going to take to achieve the kind of national
stature that is going to recruit those best students in South Carolina, as well as an appropriate proportion of out-of-state students, as well as an appropriate diversity within that freshmen class both for the Honors College and the student body at large. And, just as importantly, for us to reach the aspirations of the Board of Trustees, the committee, and I think really the faculty (as we have heard) to have the best student body we could we will need a targeted focused enrollment management plan at students who are scoring in say the 1,200 to 1,350 area of the SAT's currently. A lot of the scholarship money as well as supporting the Honors College is going to be targeted at those folks. Often times some of those folks will be the top students in their high schools. There are about 2,000 students in South Carolina who are scoring in that range. We are not getting as many of those from South Carolina as we think we could if we were able to offer the right kinds of accruements to them, those being scholarships as well as other complementary educational amenities on campus. But we must recruit also good out-of-state students. We know that in order to reach the ultimate goal set by the Board of Trustees of an 1,175 SAT average, it is going to take an infusion of out-of-state students in addition to our best South Carolina students. To recruit some of the best students from around the country we need to make sure we have the competitive scholarships. Not necessarily the best, but at least a competitive scholarship program to attract those. The numbers are in the report, we are talking significant dollars $13.5 to $14 million on a 4-year cycle. Because once you bring them in as freshmen you have to continue that scholarship program throughout their undergraduate years. There are some sources where they will come. Martin has mentioned private provision of those, capital campaigns for scholarships and certainly the latest one has done some good things for us in that realm. Our auxiliary services, particularly bookstore revenues, that can contribute. The extent to which we can strengthen our bookstore, and we are working aggressively with our bookstore partners to strengthen their service to you, so that you will make them the bookstore of choice for yourself. We know that hasn’t been in the case in the past. We are going to put some efforts in that area and that can produce a sizeable amount of funds for scholarships. But it is really going to come from a variety of locations. As Martin said we did not have the time nor the where with all to identify all the sources it would come from.

PROFESSOR MCWILLIAMS - Could I just add one little thing. One thing I don’t want to slip away in this discussion in the quality of the student body is the diversity issue. The SDI committee spent a lot of time talking about this. We know that in South Carolina there are highly qualified students of all backgrounds. We strongly believe that they need to be recruited hard and brought here to the Honors College and the other parts of the undergraduate institution. We absolutely do not believe that a high quality student body is achieved at the expense of diversity. We believe just the opposite.

CHAIR WILCOX - Other comments or observations.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (CSCE) - I have a question in reference to Appendix J where you estimate cost for enhancing student body quality in general giving the academic rankings for everything except the Honors College. And, I am just curious as to why is was not possible to come up with an estimate for that when you know what the average support is now and what the numbers are going to be which you have
specified. I am surprised that that number isn’t there and I’d like to know why you could estimate the others but not this one.

PROFESSOR MCWILLIAMS - I am going to defer to Gene on this one.

GENE LUNA - From an enrollment management standpoint the Honors College is nested within that. Now that is on a scholarship basis and on investment in recruitment activities. Let me underscore and remind you that there is a specific focus on recruitment of students from diverse backgrounds. And the Honors College is also embedded in that. What isn’t embedded in the recommendation is what we might estimate the cost for the support of the Honors College: The extra classes that are going to have to be taught, the extra faculty that it will take to teach those classes, the other kinds of support services that Dean Sederberg has done an excellent job I think of analyzing and quantifying for us. We didn’t consider ourselves necessarily a budget committee. In fact we did not consider ourselves a budget committee at all. We happen to have some good figures on scholarships and wanted to put those out for you but the actual figures and costs and how those things will be realized is beyond the scope of this committee I think. But from the scholarship standpoint, that is within the numbers you find in the report.

CHAIR WILCOX - One of the (I’ll come to you Randy) questions we may come back to here as we talk about value centered management a little bit later is going to be the relationship between that concept and some of these issues of building this college. And some of the implications. It may be something we will come back to a little bit as we discuss the budget issues. Randy do you have a question?

CHARLES MACK (ART) - Art Department within the College of Liberal Arts. I have a comment and then a question. The comment is that I have been teaching Honors College courses on a reasonably frequent basis, have enjoyed it and I am teaching one now. And, indeed the students are great students. I should add though that I have great students who are not Honors College students and they should not be forgotten. I have a question about percentages and I am just curious if we have any figures on what percentage of Honors College students are Liberal Arts majors, what percentage are Science and Mathematics majors, what percentage are Business School majors and so forth.

CHAIR WILCOX - Dean Sederberg would you have this information - roughly at least for us?

DEAN SEDERBERG - Now if I were Bill Clinton I would be able to give you those percentages but they might not be accurate. But I will tell you that the largest college in terms of enrollment is the College of Science and Math followed by the College of Liberal Arts, followed by the College of Business Administration, followed by the College of Engineering. Those are the big four. Roughly in terms of incoming class last fall, I shared those figures I believe in that spring report so I am going from memory here. But the incoming freshmen class was about 80 in the College of Science and Math - no low 70’s in the College of Science and Math. Mid 60’s in the College of Liberal Arts, and roughly 35 to 45 in Business Administration and Engineering respectively.
Now those figures can’t be projected for because students shift. I would expect that actually the College of Liberal Arts trends upward with students who transfer in as does the College of Business Administration. I could produce those figures exactly.

PROFESSOR MACK - Thank you, Bill.

CHAIR WILCOX - May I ask the question this way and then we will move on if there is no further discussion. Is there any significant value to pursuing this proposal that any member of the body would like to have on the record as to why this is a particularly desirable proposal? And, I will ask the other question in a moment. But if you are highly in favor of this is there anything you would like to put on the record for the advice of those considering this?

PROFESSOR MACK - I think the Honors College has demonstrated itself over the years as one of our real prime areas and it is a real plus for the university.

CHAIR WILCOX - And, the other side of the question is there any significant concerns that we need to express on this issue.

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT (MUSC) - It was referred to that they weren’t worried about the details of funding. Isn’t there a famous quote “The devil is in the details.”

CHAIR WILCOX - Did you have a particular concern that the details might reveal?

PROFESSOR CONANT - Well in the funding. Not only with this issue the Honors College but a lot of the other propositions.

CHAIR WILCOX - Just the practicalities of the proposal?

PROFESSOR CONANT - Yes. Particularly since this whole SDI situation -- was it not engendered by a current and threatened budget cut/crunch?

CHAIR WILCOX - I think, to be fair to the committee, that was certainly a motivation for taking it up in the timetable they did -- it was to try to create some priorities for responding to those. They have been very clear that they, however, did not look at proposals simply in terms of cutting, but where could we spend additional resources. So I think they go beyond just the budget. I think it is a fair question to ask though. Where is it going to come from in terms of who is going to pay for it. And some of that will come out as we talk about value-centered management -- is this question of ultimately how, assuming the money is there, where is it going to come from.

PROFESSOR BERUBE (THSP) - Maybe because I’m a debate coach I am necessarily contentious but I think when we are talking - I teach organizational communication once in awhile. And, one of the elements of organizational communication that comes up periodically is something called “organizational fog.” Sometimes it is intentional and
sometimes it is unintentional. If an organization is going to try to mandate change and the change may not be completely palatable, what you can do is sort of make all these other recommendations that are incredibly desirable and then put the part that is not so palatable within it. And, it makes it a little bit less subject to scrutiny. These are wonderful things, we need a great Honors College, we have to have better recruitment and scholarships, I think we should have national academic members here. That would be great. And, we need some scholarship and research in addition to what is currently going on in these other areas. But it all comes down to: if you are dealing with the situation where you do not have additional revenue but you are resetting priorities then priorities are going to trade off with other priorities. The alternative is to find a way to generate the money to compensate for that and that brings it all back again to value centered management. I think that is where a lot of the focus needs to be.

CHAIR WILCOX - Was there a sense in the committee that this was something that should go forward even if there are not additional funds, that we should find the money from other aspects of the university to pursue this? Was that a fair assessment or is that not the assessment of the committee?

PROFESSOR MCWILLIAMS - I think that there are a couple of parts to it. And, this goes a little beyond my particularly reason for being on my feet at this moment. So anybody else chip in if you want to. There are several parts to it. One is what are our sources of funds. We have tuition from the students, we have private giving, we have legislative contributions, we have I guess fees from the students, which are a little bit different, and then we have grant funding. Basically those are the only sources of funds that we have. It seems to me that part of what is in this report is to stimulate the General Assembly into understanding that we have a faculty which want to make this university a great engine for growth in the State of South Carolina and, perhaps stimulate from them some extra money. So we hope they will give us some more and maybe this will play part. I don’t know if that will happen or not. Student tuition payments are...you know it is very difficult to wring all this out of the hide of the students. The private giving the administration has done a wonderful job in beating the bushes for private giving. I think we are doing the best we can on that. The place that the committee thought more funding might come from is grant funding and indirect costs thrown off by grant funding. So there is a strong emphasis on grant funding that would create indirect costs that could be allocated for different things. So actually getting more money is one part of it. The spirit of the university being forward looking and encouraging funding from all sources new funding. The other big part of it is taking what we have and investing what we have in what we do best. I think the committee will agree with me on this, but tell me if you don’t, but I believe it was a strong motivating factor underlining this report these recommendations that we should invest in what we do best. The things where we already have momentum, traction is the sort of term of art we came up with. Where we already have traction let’s invest in those things. If that takes internal reallocation, then it is going to take internal reallocation. Not everybody’s department is going to wind up with more than they had if this report is implemented. Some departments are going to wind up with more and some departments are going to wind up with less. A reallocation in order to put our investment where our traction is. A big part of that to me is the Honors
College. It seems to me there is no more evident strong traction college in the university than the Honors College. National known, nationally known model and it is deserving of reallocation of present funds in addition to allocation of any additional funds we can scrape up.

PROFESSOR DANIEL FELDMAN (BADM) - Just in fairness to both the faculty and the committee: if we are going to limit the faculty to relatively short questions that are on point, let’s try and get some answers from the committee that are comparable.

CHAIR WILCOX - I think we are moving along here.

PROFESSOR FREEMAN HENRY (FREN) - Also temporarily of French & Classics. I’ve taught in the Honors program and think it is a wonderful program and look forward to the expansion. Questions have been raised concerning resources which are obviously valid. I am wondering about human resources. If we are going to increase this college by some 500, that is to say one-third, then that would mean one-third more faculty need, I suppose, to be participating in the Honors program. Which would mean a commensurate reduction of one-third in programs that are not Honors programs. Did the committee address any of these consequences in any systematic way and have any enlightening thoughts on the matter?

PROFESSOR MCWILLIAMS - Yes, we did. We spent a good bit of time talking about that. We think there are a couple of aspects to it. One is we believe the university needs to focus on incentives for the academic departments to provide resources such as people to teach courses for them. There are a lot of different ways you can do that and I don’t want to clog us down in details at the risk of being chided by my peers for long answers. But we did think about it and we actually have some specific ideas about ways to provide incentives to make it a good thing. To make it happy thing. To make the departments want to teach Honors College students. The other side of that is we think the administration should also focus the departments on the importance of teaching Honors College students. So two-part answer to the question.

PROFESSOR JERALD WALLULIS (PHIL) - Marti in talking about reallocation the appendix report from WAG says and I quote “...as the Honors College becomes larger and more expensive, the financial and intellectual strain on other undergraduate programs increases, raising serious questions of equity and fairness.” So when you are talking about reallocation how do we also insure that reallocation is fair and equal? And, do you agree with the committee when it says (the advisory group) “This is not a sustainable model for success?”

PROFESSOR MCWILLIAMS - What is not a sustainable model for success?

PROFESSOR WALLULIS - Having the Honors College become larger and more expensive with greater strain on the other undergraduate programs.
PROFESSOR MCWILLIAMS - My understanding of the WAG report is not that they think that this is not a sustainable model for success. They themselves very strongly endorsed the Honors College. As far as equity and fairness in redistribution of resources goes, absolutely. I hope nobody thinks that the committee doesn’t strongly believe that equity and fairness lies at the heart of all of these recommendations. I am sure that folks like Jerry Odom are going to spend a lot of time pondering exactly those details. I fully agree with you Jerry.

PROFESSOR THORNE COMPTON (THSP) - Let me ask the question another way. One of the really nice things about teaching Honors classes is they are small. And, one of the big allures in recruiting Honors students here is being able to work in small classes with outstanding faculty. Unless more faculty are brought in, then either the Honors College classes get larger or all the classes that are not Honors College classes get much larger. Then it becomes very difficult to recruit those outstanding students who are not coming into the Honors program to come into a freshmen program where all of their classes are 100 to 125 students and they never get to meet their teachers.

CHAIR WILCOX - What do we do, assuming we go forward with this recommendation and the university grows, what needs to be done to avoid the problems he described? What needs to accompany the growth of the Honors College to prevent that?

PROFESSOR CAROLINE STROBEL (BADM) - I’ll try maybe to answer that question for you. It goes back again to the value centered management which we are not discussing yet.

CHAIR WILCOX - Go ahead and touch on it.

PROFESSOR STROBEL - Hopefully as our grant money grows whether we receive more funding from the state or not, as Martin mentioned, we will have additional available funds. I do not know how much more you can wring out of tuition. But as we get more money in for scholarships and as our grant money grows, which is the big hope, then we have more money available that can be reallocated. We have a bigger pot and under the value centered management there will be more money available that could be reallocated to add faculty to teach Honors College. Where the demand is going to be we don’t know. We don’t know what the enrollments are going to be but that is something that the administration is going to have to look at and handle on the reallocation.

CHAIR WILCOX - Let me take one more, and then we are about ready to move. We will push it along a little bit.

PROFESSOR LANE (FREN) - This is a comment in response to your call for what might be the other side of this in the light of our discussion last week as to what this university is in the minds of the citizens of South Carolina. With the mandate to reduce the size of the student body to raise the SAT scores, and to bring in a greater percentage of out-of-state students, what does the university say to those South Carolina high school graduates
who are no longer able to be admitted here and who do not have a well-developed system of four-year campuses around the state to go to?

CHAIR WILCOX - This is somewhat a question of enrollment management. But to what extent do these changes have an impact on the ones who aren’t at the very top in their scores.

GENE LUNA - I think that gets to one of the questions that you discussed last week and that is: What is a comprehensive university? One of the difficult things that the committee wrestled with is what we can be and for whom can we be it. And, we can’t be everything to all people in the state [that is clear] so we are going to have to look to other parts of the state to provide and to continue to provide it. It is really is being done quite well in some other venues of educational opportunities. This is not a new step. The enrollment management is in step with the Board of Trustees goal to increase SAT scores. That has already happened with your support twice at least in the last 7 or 8 years. Every time we have done that we have had to face the issue that some of our South Carolina high school students might not be able to have the University of South Carolina as their freshmen place for beginning their higher education. But we have always had the opportunity once proving themselves somewhere else that they might have the opportunity to transfer in. Previously 30 hours and a reasonable GPA 2.5 projected. We have included in this enrollment management recommendation, one of the action plans, that we also consider that we allow that transferring to occur after 15 hours of proving oneself. So that there will still be a doorway for just those students who might have been precluded at the entry level to become part of the University of South Carolina’s family. Maybe earlier and maybe in their second semester of their freshmen year as opposed to their first. But clearly there will be some for whom the University of South Carolina perhaps won’t be their first step in higher education.

CHAIR WILCOX - Let me move this to a different subject - one that we need to move to. Certainly in reading the newspapers and to some extent talking to the Provost, my sense is that the recommendation regarding increasing research through the hiring targeting of top researchers is a top priority. The report describes them on page 15 as NIH/NSF/DOD qualified investigators. We see the discussion of using lottery monies to reach out and grab some top flight research people. It strikes me that is certainly one of the more important or fundamental recommendations this report promotes. What comments and inquiries does it raise among the faculty? If any. Are we unanimous in our agreement, are we unanimous in our disagreement, are we unanimous in our indifference?

PROFESSOR MACK (ART) - We talked last time about a comprehensive university addressing issues of balance and breath. When we are talking about the national academy we are talking about the sciences, engineering, and the medical school. When we are talking about using lottery money to bring in researchers, we are talking about bringing in certain types of researchers. Following the university’s definition now of research, I think we need to be, as I mentioned last time, up front with the state and with ourselves with how we use the word research. What we mean by it now. I think that
needs perhaps some clarification from the SDI committee members. How they saw the use of the word research. As I read through this report I see it used in certain ways generally in most places and then maybe in slightly different and in more universally accepted ways in other places. And, I am not quite sure as I read this whether it is a problem of semantics and I am not quite sure if I am on the same page with you all. Could someone address how they used the word research?

PROFESSOR RUSS PATE (HEAL) - I’ll try. I think SDI’s intention is to see the level of research and scholarship across the campus elevated. The specific recommendation that is being focused on right now is one of a number within the report that I think addressed the overall issue. This specific recommendation is one component of a multipart recommendation that addresses retention of outstanding research faculty as well as recruitment of new outstanding research faculty. And, this specific recommendation is targeted at those that are likely to achieve funding from NIH/NSF/DOD are the three that were specifically mentioned in this sub-recommendation. The thinking there I think had several premises. One is that if you compare our current external research profile with that of peer aspire institutions, I think you will find that we are not currently receiving the funding from those specific sources that would be desirable. I don’t think the intention of that recommendation was in anyway to suggest that external funding or bringing to the university investigators, faculty that would seek funding from other external sources are to be devalued in anyway. I think it was simply an attempt to focus this specific sub-recommendation on faculty that might seek funding from those agencies. Related to the point Caroline mentioned earlier, those are of course federal agencies that pay the full indirect cost recovery. If the university is to substantially increase its external research funding from those sources and not only would its research productivity go up do to the direct costs provided by those grants but there would be a substantial increase in the university’s recovery of indirect cost funds which can be distributed at the discretion of the university administration.

PROFESSOR MACK - Follow-up, point of clarification, I still don’t have an answer to how you all are using the word “research.” Or do I understand you are using the word research as equaling monies brought into the institution?

PROFESSOR PATE - Yes. I believe that the intention of SDI was to support enhancement of the university’s productivity in scholarship in the broadest sense of that term.

PROFESSOR MACK - By productivity to you mean the production of knowledge or do you mean the production of money?

PROFESSOR PATE - I can tell you what I mean and I will tell you what I think the committee meant. It is the production knowledge. Now I personally think, and I think the committee would agree with me, that the correlation between those two is not zero. That there is a relationship in at least many disciplines between the availability of external funding to support scholarly activity and the overall productivity of an institution in that area. I think at the same time the committee recognizes that that correlation is by
no means consistent across disciplines. And, I believe that the committee’s intention was to bring forward recommendations that would have the net effect of enhancing the university’s scholarly activity across the board.

PROFESSOR SUZANNE MCDERMOTT (MEDC) - I find it a little worrisome that the SDI report ties research and grant funding to the maintenance of some fundamental components of our university. In other words you listed all the sources of money and said the only one that the SDI group felt had the greatest potential to grow is grant funded resources. I think it is a little tricky to recruit people to our university who have potential to generate grant funds to tell them that the money is actually going to be used to support some of the core functions of the university. Do you see what I mean? I think that is not people’s expectations.

CHAIR WILCOX - One of the, I think, inevitable conflicts, that I’ve heard some good expression on last week, is the idea of when finally the rubber hits the road, it is going to become a question of “its fine to say we will use these indirect costs to support other things, but, by gosh, that is my money. Why are you spending my money on them?” And the other side of the coin is if you leave their money there and put an increased amount of the state monies into the non-support disciplines they are going to turn around and say…”How come I don’t get my fair share of the state money too?” And, that is a tension that I think people are sensing. How do we deal with that tension?

PROFESSOR STROBEL (BADM) - Let me provide a little bit of information for you: We are funded right now by the state at about 36-37% level of our total budget. We can hopefully aspire to be somewhere at the 20% level. A very good research university will be somewhere in the neighborhood of 10-15% state supported. Where are they getting the rest of their money? It is not from outrageously high tuition. It is from the overhead funds which are obviously used to support the entire university.

PROFESSOR BERUBE - Yes, I have two questions. The first question I have and I haven’t been able to discover this on my own so you probably have the answer to this, is there a correlation between the universities who use things like value centered management and responsibility centered management and the recruitment levels with regards to these high prestige faculty members who engage in research? The second question is a follow-up to Randy’s because I like where he was going. Which is that there is obviously not a zero relationship between research and productivity but the question becomes in the situation where there is a higher relationship between the two, does that make you one of those areas that has traction? Because I think that is what people are thinking. Right? And that is the answer they are looking for right now.

PROVOST JEROME ODOM - May I respond to that? First of all, Randy, when this says national academy, it doesn’t mean national academy of science only. There are other national academies. We are more than happy to have any national academy member. There is a national academy of Arts and Sciences. We would love to have those people here. Secondly, David, Indiana University - I went to Indiana University for my PhD in Chemistry but the thing that I enjoyed most about that university was their school of
music. And, it has a wonderful reputation. So I want to say that there are other areas at these universities that are getting traction.

CHAIR WILCOX - Other questions on this point?

PROFESSOR JAN OPSOMER (PHIL) - When in the report research is discussed I see two focuses. One is on funding: “Where does the money come from.” And another point that always comes back is prestige and prestige is always linked to academy. Now I would say that prestige in the first place is how you are evaluated by your peers. I don’t see anything about that in the report, about where you publish, what people think of your publications. So maybe we could add this to the report so that some kind of balance would be restored?

CHAIR WILCOX - You are suggesting measures other than membership in academics.

PROFESSOR OPSOMER - So prestige could be measured by publications as well. Now I think that I know why there is nothing in the report about it. Because in the WAG report it says and I quote: “The faculty’s publication record is adequate, but prestigious honors such as academy memberships lag.” So because it was already okay there was nothing about that in the SDI report maybe.

CHAIR WILCOX - One of the things that I have heard said, and let me ask it back to some of you, is that certain honors attract -- they do give this level of prestige where they put you on the map and attract. It is this critical mass that you are trying to build. To the extent that the committee has looked at that as national academy memberships, that is what people count. It is an easy counting kind of thing. Do we disagree with that? Can we build a critical mass and a national reputation that will attract in other people without focusing solely on that particular measure? Would your types of measurements be the same as saying “South Carolina is a place where I’ve got to go, because there are two Nobel laureates there?” Is that a sense of what the committee was looking at? Trying to create a sort of external reputation?

PROVOST ODOM - One of the points that we reference here is the Lombardi report. John Lombardi, who was a former president at the University of Florida uses 9 indicators as he measures research universities. And, he sees how many of these indicators universities meet. One of those is national academy members. Another one of one of those is SAT of students, one is endowment, one is the number of post-docs (interestingly enough) at a university. But he ranks based on these. In terms of peer data I have more information on peer institutions than I can swallow. Last summer when Stony Brook and Texas A&M got into the AAU I did a very detailed analysis of how we stack up with those 2 universities. We stack up very, very favorably with State University of New York at Stony Brook except in two areas. Funded research and national academy members. Those are the two places we fall down. We look very similar to that institution every where else. We look similar to Texas A&M in some respects. They have an incredibly large endowment because it is a system. We don’t look good there. But in many of these indicators we look very well except funded research and national
academy members. And, these are the nationally recognized research universities. I have a copy of that report that I would be more than happy to share that with anybody that would like to look at it.

Mr. Chairman, if I could just make one statement. All of the information that was presented to the committee in the presentations by deans, vice-presidents, and others is organized, is in my office and I would be more than happy to share that as well with anybody that would like to look at it.

PROFESSOR MACK - I am confused now. Now we are hearing research university. Now since last time we haven’t really made up our minds have we? Whether we are to be comprehensive, flagship, research - the relationships between? Now we have heard reasons that we need to do certain things to be a major player among research universities. Does that make us a comprehensive university? I thought we discussed last time that might or might not. I am just confused.

PROFESSOR MCWILLIAMS (LAW) - I might be able to make you personally more comfortable and might make the group more comfortable to if I refer you a definition that is included in the report as referenced at the being of the report back to the back. This is basically a definition of research and scholarly productivity. We say that our objectives are to increase dramatically research and scholarly productivity as the number of doctoral degrees awarded; extramural research funds (from federal and other sources); scholarly publications; the recognition of faculty by national and international professional organizations such as National Academy membership, national boards, fellowships, and other general accepted measures specific to the disciplines represented. Now these words “specific to the disciplines represented” and the reference to scholarly publications were purposefully included in this study. To include scholarship that was not science, that was not research in the sense that you are referring to it. It did not mean only math, engineering, and federally funded awards. This was meant purposefully to gather into the sort meritocracy here the art department and the philosophy department. The very first meeting that the committee had was spent discussing two values in a university. What you refer to the scholarship as intrinsic values which means the reasons we have a university, the aggregation of knowledge. And, instrumental values which are ways that we obtain assets in order to make the university run. Every department in a university has both of those aspects. It has instrumental aspects and intrinsic aspects. Some are much more heavily weighted towards intrinsic aspects. They don’t pay their own way. This report was very carefully reviewed to assure that the high intrinsic value aspects of the university were not ignored. I hope that through all of the rest of these meetings we will keep that in mind. Intrinsic values are if anything more highly valued by the SDI committee than instrumental values. It is just from somewhere you have to get the money to run the railroad. Is that helpful?

PROFESSOR MACK - Thank you. I read that definition and was gratified to see it. My concern was whether or not that definition was being followed in the rest of the report.

PROFESSOR MCWILLIAMS - In absolute good faith to the best of our ability - you bet.
PROFESSOR MACK - Thank you for the reassurance.

CHAIR WILCOX - Any comments to that?

PROFESSOR GREG ADAMS (LAW) - I think that the kind of thing that is engendering concern is the statement in this first recommendation we are talking about now, where it talks about, “Reallocating within and among units faculty positions and funds to support the hiring of 50 or more new NIH/NSF/DOD-competent investigators.” It is the answer to the question of “where are we going to get money to run the railroad?” We are going to take it out of the colleges and the departments that don’t have people who raise those sorts of funds. And, the concern, I think, in this faculty generally is whether that means that 50 faculty slots are coming out of art and theatre and music and philosophy and foreign languages so we can have 50 research professors raising grant funds. And, what does that do, not only to the departments that lose those positions and funds, but in a broader sense what does that do to us as a comprehensive university and what does that do to our students? Are we talking about a massive movement of resources out of teaching into raising grant funds -- as well as a substantial shift of funds from some colleges and departments into others?

CHAIR WILCOX - Let us keep plugging along here, and again I encourage you if you have additional comments let’s submit them and we will get them in the record as we go along. One of the recommendations I’ll put out -- if there is any discussion -- one of the points of emphasis in terms of research opportunity, if you will, that the committee saw, was due to the unique location of this state and its history. The relationship of the African American Studies and the Women’s Studies programs, and the opportunity to focus some research in those areas and really build a reputation in those fields. Because, particularly in the African American Studies, we were at a place with information and some of the people on hand to do some things here that other people wouldn’t be in a position to do. Is there any comment on that proposal that we need to add to the record?

PROFESSOR LANE - I would just like to speak very strongly in support of such a proposal. I would like to point out that implementation of responsibility centered management - value centered management, on whatever you choose to call it, will tend to discourage or prohibit cross-disciplinary programs such as both of these. Because if a particular college or unit gets to retain the revenue stream from enrollments, that is a very strong disincentive to promoting inter-disciplinary and cross-disciplinary kinds of programs. So that is my comment with regard to this recommendation.

CHAIR WILCOX - Shall we note that comment here and perhaps revisit it with VCM?

PROFESSOR LANE - Indeed.

PROFESSOR ELDON WEDLOCK (LAW) - I don’t think we got an answer to Greg’s [Adams] question and I’d like to hear one because I thought it was a pretty good question.
PROFESSOR PATE (HEAL) - I’ll take a shot at it. I think on the one hand it would be naive, and I think the committee would agree with me that it would be unrealistic to think that the package of SDI recommendations could be acted upon without new revenue. I think certainly some of that is going to be required but I think we tried very hard to operate in what we saw as the current reality of the university’s situation. Which is probably one in which there is not likely to be a large infusion of new revenue in the short term. I think that if are going to put a small number of key words on this whole document one of them would be “reallocate.” And, the committee simply did not feel that it was in a position to appropriately and accurately identify the myriad corners of the university from which resources perhaps could be appropriately moved to areas of emerging high priority. Now I hope and I think the committee hopes that the various recommendations in the package make clear that that reallocation is going to have to be managed by the leadership of the university at its various levels, in a manner that is prudent and consistent with the philosophy of the report. When you ran through a number of areas, my response would be “could be.” It is possible that resources could be moved from any corner of the university to any other corner of the university. I think it is important to note that the report does clearly call on the deans to be integrally involved in this process and there are specific recommendations here that call upon the deans to develop plans to move resources from certain areas to other areas in an effort to act upon the recommendations in the report.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - Can I follow up with that a little bit? I don’t mean to put you on the spot but I am seeing this as kind of a process. The process starts out, we need more money, where is there more money? More money is in research areas. How do we get that? Well, you need to get these research competent faculty in. Well, we need to have money to do that, so where is the money? Well, the money is in the rest of the university. So we are going to now take money from the grant-getting ones of the university to get these research people to get the research money which will then spread back out to the aspects of the university that had to sacrifice up front. Is that a fair approximation of where we are going with this?

PROFESSOR PATE - My response to that is that I think the scenario you just described would be one mechanism by which the SDI recommendations might be pursued. But not the only one.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - Okay, I didn’t mean to suggest it was exclusive but that is one pattern of thinking that could lead to this.

PROFESSOR PATE - I think it is obvious that the challenge before the committee was to try to figure out how we can get from where we are now to where we think we would like to be. In an environment in which you cannot count on a large infusion of new funds from outside sources.

CHAIR WILCOX - But have you not left a large question unanswered -- the one that sort of hangs over this body? It is the question of what happens while you are getting there?
PROFESSOR PATE - Yes and no. I think Eldon kind of said it. I hope what the report lays out is a process, hopefully a prudent process whereby those many decisions will be made. So I hope we have addressed the process that we think could be used to answer the question. But we did not feel that we were in a position, to provide the answer because it is not an answer. It would be a very, very long list of answers to the question of where within the institution can the resources be found to move into areas of high priority.

PROFESSOR STROBEL (BADM) - I think one other thing too as we look at these researchers that have a high probability of getting grants many of the ones we would hire already have grants and will be coming in with them, with that money. So in sense they are funding themselves if you will. That is another source of funds. Reallocation from other places is not the only way of hiring these people. So there are a number of ways of doing it. If you hire a fairly senior person they will already have money of their own.

PROFESSOR JEREL ROSATI (GINT) - There has been a lot of reference to the university and reallocating resources from one part of the university to another part of the university. But it seems to me that there is a huge portion of this university excluded from the SDI report and that is the Athletic Department. My knowledge of most universities is that the president is the head of the entire university including the Athletic Department. Our Athletic Department is virtually semi-autonomous. Has the SDI committee addressed this question at all and given any consideration to restructuring the authority in the budgetary situation between the academic and the athletic side?

CHAIR WILCOX - I think we are getting a little far afield here. Is there a quick answer to that? “No” is the quick answer to this. There are a lot budgeting issues we need to discuss and I'm not sure if it works as well here but..

PROVOST ODOM - Let me just very briefly say that we did mention this a little bit. In terms of the Athletics Department and that actually lead me to look at the department and to see what they had done for the university last year. It turns out that they had given academics in the university over $3 million last year. They have had a good commitment to academics. Their money is not state money. It is not A funds, it is not coming from agencies but they have been pretty good to the university. And, I think that that will continue. So that is about as far as it went.

PROFESSOR WALT HANCLOSKY (ART) - It seems that the big trepidation is how budgets are going to be developed. Under the VCM approach there seem to be 3 ways that we can get money. One is through state appropriated funds, another is through FDE through our tuition, and the third is going to be through E funds. It seems like those people who are going to be successful in raising E funds might be able to support themselves. Others who have a large number of students can get their money from there. Also on page 17 of the SDI report it states: “Within the context of value-centered management, allocate state appropriated funds in a manner that provides the resources needed to support high priority initiatives.” So it seems like money can be transferred
from anyone of these areas into another to support various programs. My question to the committee is: Are there any formulas that units can follow in attempting to determine their budgets? Or will each department or unit have a unique process involved in determining their budget?

CHAIR WILCOX - I know there is some discomfort, but we are going to come back at this when we talk about the value centered management stuff in great detail. To talk about the process of allocating and things and I think we need to get more of that on the table. One of the reasons for pushing some of that back was the idea that we needed to talk about some of the specific proposals so when we get to the value centered management stuff we can have some context to put it in. And, say you know those are things we talked about. So I am not trying to ignore it, but I think if we maybe save some of these questions we will get at them as we get to that issue it might work a little bit to keep us on this one.

PROFESSOR HANCLOSKY - It just seems to be part of it.

CHAIR WILCOX - I know. There is no doubt that value centered management is a key aspect. And, one of the great debates "is do we take it up first or do we take it up last" -- or take it up all through it. We are going to see how it works taking it up toward the end a little bit. Once we have some of these specific issues fleshed out a little bit so we can say how does that effect it.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN (CSCE) - I have a specific question related to improving scholarly activities and funded research. Or perhaps they should have been listed in the reverse order. There is a mention of providing the university's current top researchers and scholars with enough resources. I am a bit concerned based on previous history that what might be meant here by top researchers are senior full professors who already have some awards and honors and excellent track records. And, not necessarily people who the university has sort of grown who may be at the beginning associate professor level who have the potential in 10 to 15 years to be at that level. Many of these folks decide to go for that level some place else. I’ve seen quite a few of them leave. I am a bit concerned that the focus is going to be on the more senior people and not on mid-level people. Could someone comment on that?

CHAIR WILCOX - In baseball terms, should we have a good farm system or go free agency?

PROFESSOR PATE - It think this is one of many areas in which SDI did not attempt to prescribe exactly how a recommendation would be operationalized. But I can tell you that I think the intention that lead to this recommendation was to address the concern that we had about losing faculty who are rising rapidly through the ranks within their discipline to other institutions. I think the intention here is to try to prevent that or at least reduce the rate at which that happens in the future by making this as attractive a place as possible for those people to pursue their careers.
CHAIR WILCOX - Let me ask -- and Randy I may come back to some of what you were talking about -- but one of the issues I’m hearing is the concern of those we might call the researchers who don’t have large income producing research. What is needed to retain those people. What sort of support is needed in those areas to retain those people.

UNKNOWN PERSON - Is it large amounts of money?

CHAIR WILCOX - What are we going to do to do some of the things you talk about. What would we like to see? If we are asking the administration to support all forms of research here what is it we need to do to support the people who aren’t the big grant producers. What can they do to help?

PROFESSOR RUTH RILEY (MEDC) - There is little mention in the report about the library resources at the university. And, the library as you know is a core infrastructure piece that supports all of the research of the university. I think it would behoove the administration to consider taking some of the indirect costs and directing those back into the library to support the entire research infrastructure in that particular area.

CHAIR WILCOX - Thank you. The library is something that affects other than just income producers.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK - Travel grants to conferences or to esoteric places where research could be conducted. Graduate assistantships that would assist people in producing research. These might not be able to be necessarily funded but I think they would go along way to retaining people if some of our younger faculty got some accommodation in those senses. I mean it sounds perhaps fairly pedestrian but then so did the library example.

CHAIR WILCOX - Did the committee say or discuss whether we provided adequate support in those areas? How does the committee see its report addressing those needs? Is that a priority?

PROVOST ODOM - I will certainly speak to the library. I think everybody knows that right now we are ranked 47th in the country in libraries and 31st in the country in public libraries in the Association of Research Libraries. You don’t get there without supporting the library. The library has been very well supported and its absolutely crucial to everything that we do in terms of research and productive scholarship. In many cases probably more so for the folks in Liberal Arts and other colleges than the sciences.

PROFESSOR RILEY - I would tend to agree and I think if you want to recruit 50 NIH competent investigators you will need to make an additional investment because the scientific, technical, and medical literature is much more costly. The School of Medicine Library has traditionally supported limited research activity and you are asking us to increase it. I think you will need to make an additional investment in the School of Medicine Library and in the Science area of Thomas Cooper Library.
PROVOST ODOM - I absolutely agree with that.

PROFESSOR DUANE YOCH (BIOL) - It is also true in Biology.

PROFESSOR RILEY - We don't even have Biological Abstracts at the University of South Carolina. That is disgraceful. We could not come up with the money for SciFinder Scholar. The College of Science and Math had to fund the whole thing out of their pocket one-time money this year. We don't have the money to renew it in July unless somebody else coughs it up.

PROVOST ODOM - I understand, I understand. We do have a small portion on the libraries on page 46 just so that you can look at that. I will also tell you that when we took a 4% budget cut in the fall the journals and periodicals part of the library budget was not cut at all. For the very reason that you just stated. We realize that is very important to us.

CHAIR WILCOX - Randy do you have a question on this?

PROFESSOR MACK (ART) - Well not necessarily. Would I be in error to return to Eldon Wedlock scenario in which he outlined, which although it seemed frightening to me, seems to be acceptable as one path for the SDI committee. Let me ask if that scenario is acceptable? Is that consistent with a comprehensive university?

CHAIR WILCOX - That is I guess is one of the big questions from last time. What is a comprehensive university and how do we define it and do we have one afterwards?

PROFESSOR LANE (FREN) - One aspect of the focus on research that is somewhat troubling is the suggestion of increasing divergence between teaching and research that is you reward your top researchers who bring in these extramural funds by releasing them from teaching. One danger from my perspective is not just the diminution of contact between undergraduate students and the top researchers in the fields but the fact that graduate education stands to be severely jeopardized by such an agenda. I know that sounds sort of ironic when we think of research scholars as funding graduate assistants and research particularly in the sciences. But the teaching particularly at the graduate level is not the same thing as doing research at the graduate level. So one concern that I have is this disjunction between research and teaching that we see in several spots in the recommendations, including the suggestion that top researchers be rewarded by released time from teaching.

CHAIR WILCOX - One of the obvious things, looking at the clock, is we are going to have to make some priority decisions as to what we are going to cover first and really spend some time on. And, what we are going to leave to other times. I may ask the body to give that some thought rather than discuss it now and try to hammer it out as a group here. I would ask that you send me your thoughts by e-mail and see if we may need to adjust some things to bring some things up because we could be here a long time if we are going to discuss everything at this length. And, none of us really want to do that and
time does not allow us to do all of that. So before we gather again I think we do need to give some though as to what are the critical issues that you feel we must discuss as a body and let’s see if we can find a way to get them on the table first.

We do have a little bit of time here today, I think before we completely wear out. One of the faculty concerns had been graduate stipends and the improvement of graduate stipends has been mentioned as one of the ways of encouraging research. Reactions to the report regarding graduate stipends.

PROFESSOR WALLULIS (PHIL) - First of all just to echo this, I reported to the Faculty Senate last year about our faculty survey and maybe the most remarkable result of it is that we gave a higher priority to raising graduate stipends than our own salaries. I think that might give us a view of how much we perceive a need here. I think also comments show that there were quality concerns. That we are concerned about the quality of graduate education that we were providing. That we are concerned about the quality of undergraduate that we were providing. Also our research is impacted and maybe even the national rankings our departments and the university as a whole. So with this in mind you asked earlier for each of these proposals about their desirability and I would urge the Senate that we give this our highest desirability given results from our own survey and our own reflections. If there is any ordering in this which I don’t know that there is. I would think there would be strong reason to change the ordering if it was at all necessary to make this evident of what an important priority this should be in terms of important measures to undertake.

CHAIR WILCOX - Is that a sentiment shared generally by the body -- that this is a critical concern of the faculty? (Faculty responded yes.) Let me ask this on the particulars of this proposal does the body agree with the direction the committee has proposed we move in dealing with graduate stipends? Are there concerns or are we comfortable with it?

PROFESSOR ROBERT YOUNG (MEDC) - I am the Director of the Genetic Counseling Master’s Degree Program. I have an unusual problem affecting a small number of students, but I feel the responsibility of making it known. When we started the Program some 15 years ago, we thought it would be useful to integrate the students into the Division of Genetics as soon as possible. We had work that had to be done and they could get integrated while working. The Program is quite rigorous, but we thought that requiring them to work 10 hours a week would give them a chance to work and learn while working. The students are paid $2,000 per year. With this brings reduced tuition, which is more appealing and allows us to be competitive in drawing the best students we can get. It is recommended that the stipend be raised to $4,000. I realized that if we kept the stipend at this rate, our students would be paid more than our senior genetic counselors -- 10 hours a week and $4,000 for 17 weeks work.

PROFESSOR PATE (HEAL) - Afraid I drew this one also. This is, I would agree, one of the more important recommendations in this set. It is also one of the more complicated ones in some ways, I think, but your situation is by no means isolated. The committee
discussed that situation at great length. I think what we learned by looking across the university is there are quite a large number of graduate assistantships being awarded each year that pay relatively low stipends and which the university heavily subsidizes by the tuition reduction. And, I think one of the intentions of the committee was to address that for more than one reason. One is to benefit the student by increasing the wage. The other is to structure all of this in a way that the university can receive funds from external awards to cover the kind of the full cost of not only the stipend but the tuition which the graduate assistant pays as well. Currently we are not structuring this in a way that allows us to capture those funds from external agencies that by and large are perfectly happy to pay for that if the university system accommodates it in an appropriate manner. We listened at great length to reports from Gordon Smith and Tony Boccanfuso who had studied this very carefully and investigated how it is handled at some other institutions and brought to the committee a recommendation that is fairly similar to the one that you see in the report.

PROFESSOR MACK (ART) - If value centered management is instituted and if this essentially largely means that the units themselves continue control over most of that funding that they bring in (it seems fair) and we go ahead with this and graduate stipends are raised, what happens to those units that do not have the money flowing in from grants - what happens to their graduate programs and their stipends? They would go up too? And, where does that money come from?

PROFESSOR PATE - I think we recognized that that is a likely consequence in some units. I think that was the basis for the committee’s recommendation that this be phased in, I think it says, over a 3-year period. The hope being that that would give units that would experience some stress because of this action an opportunity to adapt to it.

PROFESSOR MACK - How? Whether it is 3 years or 30 years or 300 years I don’t see how that would affect my unit.

PROFESSOR PATE - It may not be something that some units can fully adapt to but it seemed at least appropriate to phase this in rather than to do it in an immediate sense. In the end it may well be that the size of the graduate enrollment in some units where that is now being heavily subsidized by graduate assistantships that are paying modest stipends could be reduced.

PROFESSOR MACK - Thank you for the clarification.

PROFESSOR BERUBE (THSP) - It might be useful to mention how the word units is used in VCM versus how we use it. Because we think of units as our departments but if you look at the VCM model it talks about units as colleges. So the reallocation strategies are a little more flexible than our natural parlance here in this group.

CHAIR WILCOX - Let me - I sense a tiring of the spirit. We are still in the meeting we do have an opportunity for new business.
VI. New Business

CHAIR WILCOX - I will ask you then if you have something you absolutely feel must be discussed please e-mail me and let me know so that we arrange things we don’t skip something that the body really feels important. So you have the opportunity it is: robbie@law.law.sc.edu. E-mail me I’ll send you the address if you didn’t get it.

VII. Good of the Order.
None.

VIII. Announcements.
None.

CHAIR WILCOX - We are leaving. Is there a motion to adjourn? We are adjourned until next Wednesday.