I. Call to Order.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - I would like to call this meeting to order.

II. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - You have all received a copy of the minutes. Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes? If not the minutes stand approved.

III. Reports of Officers.

PRESIDENT JOHN M. PALMS:

Thank you, Madam Chairman. Just some other news about our efforts to have people understand what the proposed budget cuts will do. I think we are getting very good press about this all around the state. The business community has continued to support us. We are continuing to talk to some key members of the legislature. If you read this morning, the economy is doing a little bit better than expected as of the 15th of February, and I guess the economic advisors will meet and maybe change the outlook for the revenue collection. We have no further news than that. We have no guidelines as to what Ways and Means will do on the first pass, but we will monitor that very closely and continue to have people give their support. We appreciate Peter Sederberg’s op-ed piece. I think some others are coming in and that is helping a great deal.

In the meantime we had an announcement at the Yale Club in New York about the Hemingway collection. It is a really significant acquisition for the University. It is a great opportunity when you have something of real value; you create support and excitement. We located a donor in a couple of weeks who made it possible to acquire that great collection, and we had really good press about that. It made the front page in the Philadelphia Inquirer and we will probably have some other ones around the country.

Our new distinguished vice president for research is working with the students to help create an incubator program for students. They are very anxious to start businesses, and he was telling me this morning that two groups who were interested in starting businesses were talking to each other, and they are already talking about a merger. Very interesting.

You read the announcement about Secretary of Education Dick Riley and Terry Peterson joining the faculty of the College of Education. It is very, very important. He [Secretary Riley] will also work with the Furman Center there on education, but his
principal involvement will be here with the Nelson, Mullins Law Firm, and we appreciate his commitment here to help our programs in education.

_The Financial Times of London_ has ranked The Darla Moore School of Business in the top 50 in the world. The faculty don’t really believe that, I think. They will take it for what it is because we still have ambition to move that college forward.

You’ve heard about our “Meet in the Middle” program. This is our Bicentennial initiative to be in touch with the middle schools in the state. We have a lot of volunteers but we could use more doing that, and this is an age group that I understand is very, very important. They need all the help they can get. There is information on the Bicentennial web page if you want to reach out and help those schools.

Again what’s on our mind is the budget cuts. We are succeeding with our Bicentennial campaign very aggressively, but the market has affected some of those gifts. We had a very successful December. We may have to extend the campaign a little bit, but so far so good. I will be glad to answer any questions. I appreciate your constant support of what we are trying to accomplish in this budget year. Any questions? Comments? Thank you very much.

PROFESSOR STROBEL - The Provost.

PROVOST JEROME D. ODOM:

Thank you very much, Madam Chair. There are three or four issues I would like to discuss briefly with you.

First has to do with deans’ searches. You probably have read in the newspaper or heard on television that it appears that we may have lost a dean for the College of Journalism and Mass Communications - an excellent candidate who is the sitting dean at the University of Nebraska has said that the situation that he reads about it and hears about in South Carolina in terms of the budget has forced him to decide to stay at Nebraska. However the President has spoken to him and I think that the door, although it is almost closed a small crack and we hope depending upon what happens as we go forward in Spring we will be able to talk to Dr. William Norton again.

The second search that is currently underway, the first meeting of the search committee is tomorrow, is the search for the Dean of Social Work to replace Frank Raymond who will retire on December 31, 2001. We’re moving forward with that.

Another search that is underway, that is an internal search, is a search for an associate provost and dean of the Graduate School. Most of you know that Dr. Marcia Welsh who has held that position since 1997 has left the university to be with her family in New York City. We need to replace her as soon as possible. At some point my feeling is that I will split the two positions - associate provost and dean of the Graduate School - because our Graduate School is so important to us. I think we need to have a full-time
person there. Financially I cannot do that at the moment but I do plan to do it sometime in the future. Applications for that position will be reviewed starting February 15th. So I hope to fill that position in a very short period of time.

Let me turn to another topic that I have discussed and the President discussed with you a couple of years ago and that is our Child Development Center. Many of you may have read in the paper that the University had plans to move forward with a private company to build a child development center and this would be on Blossom Street where the tennis courts are. We thought we covered all the bases in terms of talking to the right people about that. Unfortunately we had not and the Planning Commission basically gave us enough trouble at the meeting that we had to withdraw our proposal. We have not stopped. We will go back to the commission again. I will tell you that I think some of these problems to be political in nature, but we do need your help and I would urge you to help. I met with the PTO of this group last week. They are very concerned. There will be I am sure a number of parents at the next meeting. Based on what happened last time there may be a number of children at that meeting as well with picket signs with “Save Our Schools”. That’s what was done two years ago.

Larry Glickman of the History Department is chair of the PTO and if you would like to be involved or if you would like to help, I would urge you to contact Larry. In my meeting last Friday with the Faculty Welfare Committee we discussed this and this clearly is a welfare issue for parents, for faculty, staff, and student parents at the university.

The new center will be a two-story building. It would house approximately 200 children. The second floor of the building would be a research area that would be occupied by a number of different teams from different parts of the university. If you remember previously we were very concerned about the research that was going on in early childhood development. There didn’t seem to be much of that. We have had a couple of meetings with people from all over campus. There are a lot of people who are very interested in being involved in this center and will be doing so I would ask for your help and that of your colleagues.

Thirdly, let me just remind you that in less than two months we will be visited for a week by 20-25 people sent here from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for a reaffirmation of our accreditation. I can’t tell you how important that week is. We are in the final stages. Dan Barron is here today and I know that he plans to have a session after the Faculty Senate, for those of you who can stay, to talk to you about this. I know that there is also an open session at the Russell House. Is that this week? It is the 14th. Please be aware of the recommendations and the reports of these task forces and our overall report which is being written by the writing and oversight team. It is very, very important to us that we have a successful visit.

One of the things that has come out of that with respect to my conversations with Dan and Fred Roper of the College of Library and Information Science has been the potential need for some undergraduate curriculum whether it be a minor or a major in
informatics or knowledge management. One of the things that I have discovered again in talking to Dan and to Fred and to other people is how much we have in terms of information and knowledge management on our campus in all colleges. It is throughout our university and so I have asked Fred to chair a Task Force that will look at this subject. There are already a number of courses available. I think one could almost put together a very strong curriculum for a major or minor right now in knowledge management. We have put together a task force of about 15 people. They will be asking you and your colleagues for input and I would urge you to work with that task force. Fred hopes to have a report to me by next fall. That's all I have to report. I will be happy to answer questions.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - What are the objections to the child development center?

PROVOST ODOM - There are several - one of them was by the University Neighborhood Association. As I understand it, the objection is that it is just not appropriate location for a child development center. Just so that you understand, that property is owned by the University Development Foundation. Their board is willing to lease it at a very nominal fee to Gateway Academy and the University who would form this partnership. So the location was one. There was a tree situation, Richard, that people did not want trees cut down. We changed the plans basically so that there would be at the most one tree cut down. Another objection was traffic flow on Blossom Street - that clearly was a concern. We changed the driveway situation so that wouldn't be a problem. Another was parking. We have an agreement that parking if need be we furnished enough parking places but if overflow parking was needed the tennis court parking could be used. Another was the land is in a flood way and rather than putting the building up on stilts, David Jacobs of Gateway Academy was going to build up the property to solve that particular problem. There was going to be a retention pond for drainage. People were concerned how that would look so again David Jacobs gave in and at an expense to him, not to us, was willing to put in an entire drainage system on the property so that we wouldn't have a retention pond. So, when I say that we had addressed all the problems those were the problems we felt we were addressing, but that in the end was not good enough.

PROFESSOR ADRIENNE COOPER - ENGINEERING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - With regard to the USC Children’s Development Center again one of the comments from specific zoning board members was the apparent absence of the University in the planning process and there is some concern that the University is not going to be involved in that. Could you just speak briefly to what the University’s involvement will be and with the Children’s Center once the new center is built?

PROVOST ODOM - Sure. There was a conscious effort at that time or a conscious decision made that the University would not appear. David Jacobs had met with the staff of the commission. He was told that he had addressed all their concerns. He is the person who is building the building. His company is paying for this building. The land belongs to the Development Foundation. The University is only going to be involved from a curriculum point of view basically. We have insisted from the beginning that this
will still be a nationally accredited child development center but in terms of the land and
in terms of the building, the terms of any changes to the plans the University is really not
involved in that Adrienne - plus the fact in some of our other dealings at the University
with certain individuals we have run into a lot of opposition that we don't totally
understand, but it seemed to us that it would be better if the University took a back seat
on this particular part of the project.

PROFESSOR JERALD WALLULIS - PHILOSOPHY - One aspect while the University
is not officially involved we in the Welfare Committee have strongly encouraged. We
believe we have an agreement that parents will be involved in the actual governance of
the center and have representation on the board of directors or their operating board. We
consider that to be very important. So the official university involvement may not be
there in that sense but the parental involvement we have assurances for.

PROVOST ODOM - That is correct.

PROFESSOR BOB LYON - ART - Both you and President Palms have been very vocal
about the increase in tuition that would be necessary should certain types of cuts come
across to the University and, from what I'm reading, it appears that those levels
may be very limited perhaps 4% or so. How does that now complicate our overall
thinking about adjusting of the university budget and so forth should major cuts come
across?

PROVOST ODOM - Well clearly if any cut comes across we are going to have some
hard decisions to make. I can tell you that yesterday the Higher Education Subcommittee
of the House Ways and Means proposed a proviso for this year that would, as I
understand it, allow any institution of higher education to set a tuition rate where they
wanted it but that then this 3.7% higher education price index, the HEPI, would have to
be cumulative over the number of years that you set it. So that if you set it at 10 or 12%
you know that you are not going to be able to increase tuition again for three years. Now
that is just a proposal to the House Way and Means and it would have to pass and go to
the House. I don't know what will happen. I do think that it is a good sign that at least
the Higher Education Subcommittee recognizes our problem and is trying in some way to
give us some relief. But again higher tuition is going to cause a real problem for
students. We are just going to have to see how things work out.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN - CSCE - I have a couple of questions related to
the task force on information technology professions. First a couple comments. We have
a minor in computer science. We have had for years but it doesn't fit together too well
this year because of changes in the curriculum as a result of Computer Science merging
with Computer Engineering. We are in the process of formulating two different minors
which will fit together and will be available. We will have trouble offering courses to
accommodate any reasonable number of minors possibly because of the budget problem.
And the second background comment is that informatics means computer science in
much of the world. It is a little fuzzier in this country but from an international
perspective it is perhaps not a term we necessarily want to use. My main question is I
would like to know who is on this task force at this time. The last time I talked with our
department chair, Dr. Duncan Buell, he was not aware of anything going on but he may
be now but he did not this morning but we in the department are a bit concerned having
been left out of the loop throughout much of this and having been left out of the
deliberations and process of the task force that came up with this recommendation. Quite
frankly, we think we should have been included. We don't see any reason why we are
not included. We have been working really to cooperate with units across campus. We
have had a lot of meetings with them. We are meeting with Business next week and I
would just like to make sure that we are in the loop and we are included in this process.

PROVOST ODOM - I would like to make several comments. The task force has just
been appointed. Your chairman is a member of the task force and has accepted to be a
member. Secondly, my charge to this task force is a very broad wide-ranging one - look
at what is available on campus; look at what the needs of our students might be and come
back with recommendations for me. So they haven't been charged with anything
specifically. I would assume that your chairman can represent your department very
well. At the same time any other faculty member who has concerns or input they would
like to make is welcome to do so.

PROFESSOR WALTER PIEGORSCH - STAT - To whom should we make that input?

PROVOST ODOM - Fred Roper.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - As I said I have not had a chance to check with Dr. Buell
about what he knew about what was going on with the task force.

PROFESSOR MARCO VALTORTA - CSCE - I hope that you noted the observation
about the possible misuse of the word “informatic”.

PROVOST ODOM - If you heard me when I said it before I said “informatics.” I said
“knowledge management”. I don’t care what it’s called all I want is to let me get some
recommendations.

PROFESSOR VALTORTA - It is not good to start with a confusion.

PROVOST ODOM - No, I would point out that Indiana has a School of Informatics. I
know informatics in Europe means computer science but we are in the United States.

III. Reports of Committees.

A. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Sarah Wise, Secretary:
   No report.

B. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor David Berube:

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Have you had a chance to get the handouts?
CHAIRMAN STROBEL - There is an addendum that is being passed out. Please make sure that you get this addendum because this is the last opportunity that we will have to deal with Curricula and Courses before the deadline for the fall schedule of classes. That is why we have an addendum. We had a number of additions at the last minute to try to get in before the fall schedule of classes. I hope all the senators are sitting here in the middle and make sure you are getting a handout now, because we will not only be going through your regular material but also the addendum.

PROFESSOR BERUBE - Roman numeral I. is for your information. It is part of a section that eventually will be on the UCCC web page. The information relates to the May semester. On Friday, at 1 o’clock we are going to have our next meeting at the Faculty House we are going to discuss the May semester in great detail. I will have some quantitative data put together. I have been through the grade distributions. Then we will have a final report on May semester and we will submit it to this body. We will make recommendations probably to the Provost’s office. Also at that meeting on Friday, we are going to spend some time talking about Internet courses. And that being the case, I want to remind everybody that Thursday from 2:00 to 4:30 at the DEIS conference room there will be a teleconference on copyright and legal issues associated with web-based publishing and internet courses. If you are interested, you might want to come to that meeting and learn what is happening in the internet course world.

So Roman numeral I. is just for information. No action taken whatsoever. It is just material for your information.

So we start with II. COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY. We have some new courses, changes in title and number, changes in prerequisites. There’s also - let’s just do the A. part. I want to do some editing on page 15. The middle of page 15, change in title, number and prerequisites for ECIV 360 change to ECIV 362, it is quite clear that ENGINEERING should have one less E. Take out one of the E’s and we will be fine. Change in title and number referring to ECIV 362L, which is the change, at the end of that title you need to add (1) and the coreq change will be ECIV 362. So I am moving II. A.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Is there any discussion? All in favor. Ayes. Opposed. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR BERUBE - Now, II.B., starts on page 16, 17, 18 and the top of page 19. It is a series of changes for the Department of Chemical Engineering - new courses, change in number, prerequisites and description, prerequisites, and again at the end change in curriculum to accommodate these changes. So I want to move II. B. which are the changes for the Department of Mechanical Engineering.
CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Is there any discussion? All in favor. Ayes. Opposed. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR DAVID BERUBE - Roman numeral III. is a series of changes for the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management. It starts on 19 and it goes to the bottom of page 20 and incorporated "numerical and analytical reasoning" according to the question that came up at the last meeting. So moved.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - All in favor. Aye. Opposed. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR BERUBE - Roman numeral IV.. A. is for Economics and B. is for History a series of changes in curriculum and changes in the Bulletin. I would like to move IV.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Any discussion? All in favor. Aye. Opposed. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR BERUBE - Roman numeral V. College of Science and Mathematics, changes in curriculum for the Marine Science Program. So moved.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Is there any discussion? All in favor. Ayes. Opposed. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR BERUBE - Roman numeral VI. are the May semester courses. A. is for the College of Journalism and Mass Communications there is one there. Then on the back page there are four from the College of Liberal Arts. We need to correct 'NATIONS ' in c. Department of Government and International Studies. So moved.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Do we vote on May semester?

PROFESSOR BERUBE - We agreed to do that two meetings ago. The committee was going to submit them to the Faculty Senate for approval.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Oh, okay you have changed the procedure. Any discussion? All in favor. Ayes. Opposed. The ayes have it.

PROFESSOR BERUBE - Addendum. I. College of Liberal Arts., new course and a new cross-listing. So moved.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Any discussion? All in favor. Ayes. Opposed. Ayes have it.

PROFESSOR BERUBE - Roman numeral II. School of Music, new course, MUSC 500 A-Z. So moved.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Any discussion? All in favor. Ayes. Opposed. Ayes have it.
PROFESSOR BERUBE - Roman numeral III. School of Public Health, Department of Exercise Science we have a new course. If you start turning the page you begin to see there are changes in curriculum associated with the Department of Exercise all the way through to the end of the addendum.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - It needs to be moved before discussion. Any discussion?

PROFESSOR WALLULIS - It appears that in the degree requirements in Exercise Science there is a lessening of the requirement in Foreign Languages. If I understand that correctly I was wondering what the rationale was to lessen that requirement. That is on the third to last page.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Is there someone here from Exercise Science who can speak to this? Is there anyone here from the Foreign Languages who has consulted with Exercise Science on this issue? I hate for an entire curriculum to not make the Fall catalog because of this issue.

PROFESSOR BERUBE - What we are discussing is the line that says passing grade on the 110 course correct?

PROFESSOR WALLULIS - As opposed to 122.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Have you all been paying attention to the issue at hand? I am going to go ahead and call for a vote but I wanted you to be sure you realize that the question has been raised.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR -

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - You are absolutely right. There should be a requirement here.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - there is no response

PROFESSOR BERUBE - We sent the information out to language arts to have them comment on this and we have had no response. That is pretty much what happened. You know so I am not sure what else we are required to do.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Are you all familiar then with the issue that they are apparently in this particular curriculum lowering the language requirement beyond what it normally is? I am going to go ahead and call for a vote on it. The reason is the deadline. We will not have another meeting before then.

PROFESSOR ROBERT CARLSSON - BADM - I would like to make an amendment that we substitute the current foreign language for the one requirement from the one proposed and leave everything else in the proposal the same.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Is there a second?
CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Alright is there discussion on this amendment to the change? I have a question that I would like to ask since no one else is willing to ask it. What will that do to the total number of hours? Will that make a change in the requirements for that degree with regard to the number of hours a student would have to take?

PROFESSOR BERUBE - We are discussing the sequence I would assume?

PROFESSOR CARLSSON - That would be my presumption too. It depends on where you start with the language. It could result in three more hours than what is proposed if they started at the beginning,

PROFESSOR BERUBE - They are required to have six hours of language arts and they end up having to take nine. That is three of their electives.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - So there may be no change then in the overall number of hours required. Alright. Are there any other questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - There appears to be enough elective hours in all of the program to absorb this change.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - We will vote now.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN - CSCE - I think they are making this change for much the same reason that we did in the Computer Science and Engineering requirement moving from 145 to a more appropriate course for the program. My guess is they just want more people to spend time on Exercise Science, which is not unreasonable.

PROFESSOR HANNO zur LOYE - CHEM - I am just curious to find out whether, once we vote to retain the old language requirement, students would be bound by it. That is, would a student entering the program now be bound by this requirement or, could the student subsequently opt for the new language requirement if it is voted-in at some point in the future?

PROFESSOR BERUBE - If a student enters with this catalog in effect, they have to abide by it.

PROFESSOR CARLSSON - Unless things have changed drastically in recent years, students can graduate under the catalog they entered or any subsequent catalog but they can't take mix and match. So the only thing that would change in following year's catalog would be this language requirement, and the students could go with the change.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Is there any other discussion?
PROFESSOR BRIAN HELMUTH - BIOL - I also note on the last page that there is an increase in the requirement in biology. And, as far as I know, I don’t think Biology was made aware of this. So my only concern is how many more students is this going to add to our course load. Does any one have any idea how large this program is?

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Does any one in that college know about the Department of Exercise Science? Is there anyone here from that college? No, I know you are not from the college.

PROFESSOR DANIEL FELDMAN - BADM - As a general rule, in making decisions like this, I’m uncomfortable with so much missing data and presumptions of what people may or may not think. It sounds like more than one piece of data is missing. As much as you want to meet the catalog deadline and that is reasonable goal. I think frankly that there is just too much missing data now and maybe it would be better to just hold it.

PROFESSOR BERUBE - The underlining is that if there is a change in curriculum which would affect the department, we have always demanded that they check with other departments.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - We have a motion on the floor to amend to go back to the existing level of language requirement in Exercise Science. The point has been brought up that if a student comes in and there is a catalog change in the interim after they are entering the program that they could opt for the new catalog change and go with that one as opposed to the new one. I am going to go ahead and let us vote on this. Again simply because of the deadline and I am sure Exercise Science wanted to try and get this under the deadline. The reason we haven’t had this sooner is there has been a big hold up in all the 500-600 level courses that were in the Graduate School. All the courses that have received both graduate and undergraduate credit have to be approved by not only the Curriculum and Courses Committee and also a special committee of the Graduate School. They were very late in getting this back over here. I am loath to not have people go ahead and vote because this is not the fault of the Exercise Science Department. So I am going to go ahead. First we will vote on the amendment which is to go back to the original requirement for languages which will apparently not increase the number of hours required to graduate. All in favor. Ayes. Opposed - No. It is close enough I think we better have a count. Sarah, would you count and will someone over here count? Who do we have to count? Randy Mack will count. Please raise your hands all in favor. This is just the senators voting. All opposed. 33-25.

Now we will vote on the motion. The motion is to require someone be present when there is going to be a curriculum change go through for a particular area so that they can answer any questions. All in favor. Ayes. Opposed - No. We will have a count. All in favor raise your hands. All opposed. Okay the motion failed.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - We will move to the next committee report.

C. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Robert Wilcox, Chair:
PROFESSOR ROB WILCOX - LAW - I am scared to stand up. David is doing so well until all of a sudden...I will only report that the Advisory Committee is in the process of teaching agreement on the decision-making process for retention of untenured faculty. I expect we will have a draft of proposed changes for UCTP and Grievance Committees to review after we meet this week. As we reach an agreement I will let you know what it looks like. But right now I am a little bit uncertain of the prospects, so I may hold off until the next month.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - That will of course be for the General Faculty meeting in May to be voted on.

D. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Jerald Wallulis, Chair:

PROFESSOR WALLULIS - I too want to abide by Caroline’s imperative that we keep this short. However, I have a long report today and in some sense I am happy to make this report. This is a report that summarizes the results of our faculty survey that was given at the beginning of this year.

Now I want first of all to thank many people who worked hard on this project. Jane Jameson and her staff with the addresses for getting out the survey. Caroline Strobel supported the funding for the focus group meetings. John Greco, Holmes Finch, Philip Moore and others led the focus groups and also developed questions for the questionnaire. I would thank 50 faculty who attended the focus group meetings and gave us the material from which we grew the survey questions. Jeanna Luker and Peggy Pickels then processed the results and printed the surveys and collected the results. Kathryn Lynn and Bob Oldendick then compiled the results and formulated the findings in a way we could understand. Finally, the past and present members of the Faculty Welfare Committee worked hard in getting these results so that we could present them to you.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Jerald, we have someone from Exercise Science.

LARRY DURSTINE - EXSC - Actually someone called and said I needed to get on the speakerphone. I have no idea what is going on other than there is some kind of proposal that was tabled from Exercise Science with regards to the undergraduate program.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Yes, your new Exercise Program was defeated because no one was here to answer any questions concerning why the language requirements has been lessened. There was a query from biology whether or not you have gone through Biology since you have upped the biology requirements to tell how many more students they might expect.

PROFESSOR DURSTINE - Okay. Being a new department chair, the proposal was actually brought forward some time ago I don’t have a response to either of those
questions right now. With regards to a representative left here about an hour ago for that meeting. So I don’t have a response.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Either they have not arrived or they are being very quiet.

PROFESSOR DURSTINE - I am glad this is humorous because quite frankly I’m caught with ankles tied together, that’s better than saying my shorts are down. The first question was in regard or the second question really was talked with the people in Biology.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - To tell them that you were upping the Biology requirements and how many students could they expect? They are concerned about how many students you have in Exercise Science.

PROFESSOR DURSTINE - No, I don’t believe we’ve contacted them with regards to the number of students. I think we had some conversation with regards to a change in our requirements but I don’t think we have informed them with the specifics that we are going to do nor the number of students. So the answer to that is no we have not given the data.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - And the other one was the foreign language requirement. Have you gotten approval on reducing the language requirement from the appropriate language department?

PROFESSOR DURSTINE - My understanding standing with regard to the language requirement was that we were above the University language requirement and that we were bringing it back into line with the University’s requirement.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - That is not correct.

PROFESSOR DURSTINE - That’s incorrect. Okay. I misunderstood. Our understanding was that we were above the University’s requirement. I believe our overall thought was to be in line with what the university requirement. Again our intent was to be in line with the University’s standard.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Those were the two issues. Would you be willing for us to amend your proposal to up your language requirements to the university standards?

PROFESSOR DURSTINE - Yes, we would permit that. We thought that’s what we were doing. We are trying to MEET that standard. We thought we were above it so please make that amendment.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN - 122 is above the university standard.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Oh, I’m sorry you are going down to the University standard. I was misinformed. I’m sorry.
PROFESSOR DURSTINE - That was our intent to be at the university standard.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - There is another question.

PROFESSOR JEFF PERSELS - FRENCH AND CLASSICS - I serve on the University Committee on Curricula and Courses where this came through and yes he was correct about the university requirement 110 being acceptable and we did not need to approve this.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Thank you. I guess the only real issue then is the biology. They were not aware of your changes. The problem is the deadline for the catalog for next year is the end of this month.

PROFESSOR DURSTINE - So that I know exactly what I need to do is contact the chair of the Biology Department and discuss with them and inform with them that our plan is to up our requirement and give them an estimate of the number of students to be coming that way to meet those requirements.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - That is correct.

PROFESSOR DURSTINE - I will be happy to do that.

CHAIRMAN STROBLE - We will get back to this. I am going to bring it up for a vote again in view of what we just heard from the chair of Exercise Science with the proviso that there is an agreement with Biology before it goes into the catalog.

PROFFESSOR WALLULIS - Okay, I want to thank all those parties who helped and assisted in this project. Briefly the procedures for interpreting the survey were that they were on a scale of a strongly agreed, disagreed, strongly disagreed. What was done to interpret these results is that the pairs were added together—the percentages of those that strongly agree on one side and strongly disagree on the other side. The highest percentages of responses one way or the other were taken as indication of significant results. The purpose of the survey is as initially designed by the Welfare Committee to get at a picture of the faculty needs and issues with regards to welfare. And, I think with this survey we will be better able to represent you. But there is another important usage. That usage is that it will be used as resource material and this resource material will be used to develop a set of faculty goals. We have been charged by Caroline to develop a set of faculty goals for the academic year 2005. What we want to do is to take that set of goals to add and compare with the list of goals that was given by the Board of Trustees that you are probably familiar with. We are aiming for a smaller list of goals, about 6 goals or thereabouts. And this is again for the year 2005 so this is with regard to our future goals in mind. Both of these purposes influence the overview I am giving you today.
First of all I am very proud of the rate of response. We distributed 1,395 surveys. Sixteen were returned as undelivered. 612 responded. This provided a response rate of 44.38%. In a survey, which was not nearly as detailed, that was given in 1994, the response rate was 17.15%.

The first results deal with the last topics, which concern administration. We are not doing that to highlight the results, it is more that the other results will be more important for us for our second goal (coming up with a set of faculty goals that we wish to record). As a negative result 96% of the faculty either agreed or strongly agreed the administration should improve its efforts to get support from the legislature. Now this can be interpreted in a couple of ways. (By the way our questions were simply developed from the focus group meetings. So we took the wording from the focus group meetings.) It can be used as a reflection on the administration or it can be used as a reflection on the need for financial support. Because there are other positive results with regards to the fundraising efforts, we think it is a strong expression of the latter. It is the strongest result of the entire survey in terms of percentages of a strong need for having funds from the legislature. I think that indicates again the great implications of the budget crisis. If 96% of us think we need more money from the legislature, how happy will we be with any cuts in our budget. Another result was that 89.2% of the faculty either agreed or strongly agreed that the accounting system is difficult to understand. And, 85.7% of the faculty agreed that dean searches take too long.

Positive: 72.2% agreed or strongly agreed that AAU membership is an appropriate goal for the university. And, 65.1% agreed that the administration is doing a good job in its fundraising efforts.

Flat results with regards to the satisfaction of academic leadership, was an exact 50-50 split between those that agreed or disagreed. I don’t think that is a significant result but it is a significant key for interpreting the other responses. Probably more crucially even than that is an answer to an earlier question in faculty morale. There the split is 43.2% the agree side and 56.8% on the disagree side that faculty morale is good. So that is probably an indication of the feeling of the faculty at the time the survey was taken the beginning of the fall semester. Now the other results and then I will also try to indicate how they may help lead us to come to a formulation of faculty goals. In the negative side concerning physical environment 94.6% agreed or strongly agreed that building conditions need improvement. This result than is strengthened by responses to other questions. 61.6% disagree that the classrooms are clean and well kept. 62% disagree that restrooms are clean and well kept. 75.9% would like to control their office and classroom temperatures. 59.6% want more classroom space. 67% believe that more needs to be done for the disabled. A conclusion I believe that we can certainly draw from the survey is that physical environment must be a priority and it should be included in a statement of faculty goals.

The second result involves graduate student support. 86.9% either disagree or strongly disagree that graduate stipends are adequate. If we also take some of the verbal comments, I believe the conclusion is that the present level of funding impedes the
competitiveness of graduate programs and in some cases embarrasses graduate faculty. And, I conclude that we should also include this in our goals in a general statement about graduate education.

A third result concerns childcare and dual careers. 84.3% (a slightly higher percentage of that for women) disagree that there is sufficient childcare facilities. This again is a very strong result. I also strongly urge what the Provost said about our child development center - that we support these efforts. And, we will try to support them in the Welfare committee and if you want to support them through Larry Glickman or any other avenue I strongly recommend that. 72%, a higher percentage for women, agree that there should be more assistance for dual career couples. A conclusion, which we draw, is that a statement about work life transition should also be included as a goal. There maybe other issues in this area but they were not addressed in the survey.

All right, item 4 is the area of salaries. 78.7% either disagree or strongly disagree that our salaries are competitive with other state universities. 70.5% disagree that USC does a good job in maintaining quality faculty. Again we are concluding this important issue. We will include it in a statement of goals perhaps in combination with the result on benefits. That one is harder to understand.

5. Parking - 74.7% either disagree or strongly disagree that parking is adequate. 62.2% say more parking is needed for the disabled. Conclusion: That we can include this as part of the goal of physical environment if we choose.

With regards to the research, 73.6% agreed that we need a greater voice in selecting software and technology; 71.6% say we need more travel funds; 67.6% want better computer support; 61.7% want more research funds for junior faculty; 61% have trouble balancing research and teaching.

Again we conclude that this is important and should be included in the statement. We will also point out that there are positive results concerning research in the library of which I will be reporting very soon.

Then in the area of benefits we have 64.7% either disagree or strongly disagree that the benefits package is competitive. The conclusion can be brought together with the salaries issues. For the sake of history not anything else, I would point out if I could now find it that this survey stands maybe in the remarkable relationship to the survey and the last survey much shorter in form was given in the end of the spring semester of 1994 and at that time the primary result of the survey concerns salaries and benefits and it was directed by the Chair of the Faculty Senate Marcia Welsh and she was reacting to a time of budget crisis. She said at the time in short, none of us think we are overpaid. Sitting around complaining about it will accomplish nothing. Obviously, we have salary compression, we have inequity but we need to fight overall for higher education to make significant progress. This is also my response to the general funding issues. It says here, again, we cannot afford to live on our laurels. We have to regain our credibility and
campaign for what we as faculty believe. So again the survey comes in exactly the same situation that we are in now and the results echo one another.

Then with positive results briefly 86.3% agree about the value of the electronic holding in the library. 70.8% note an improvement in the library. We think this is a very important result and we will incorporate that in the goal statement possibly as a positive result in relation to research. 76.8% perceive the campus as safe as in both genders. Again we incorporate that as a positive result possibly in regard to environment. With regards to sexual harassment 68.8% are positive that this is a positive environment but the result is not supported by the responses for the women members of the faculty. With the sensitivity to race 62% agree but there are insufficient survey responses by minorities with various sensitivity to women’s issues - 60.5% agree but not supported by female responses; with response to cultural and religious diversity—67.1% agree but we don’t have the base I think to fully accept that result from the faculty responses.

Then with the regard to Health/Retirement - 65.8% agree that retirement options are adequate; and 61.8% approve of health care options. This is after 64% said that our benefits package was not competitive. It is hard to square those results.

Flat results. 55.8% only say that paperwork is excessive. 51.6% disagree that Russell House Bookstore meets orders in a timely way. 53.3% fear the long term consequences of post-tenure review, 51% approve the use of adjunct faculty. and 58.5% disagree with about the level of graduate school support. We don’t think these issues should be priorities given the results of the survey. This gives you an idea of the survey results. We can give you a more detailed picture if you would also request.

I hope this also informs you of the basis that we will have for going on in our project. We hope to report to you in our next meeting and with a set of faculty goals with a justification that would be based on the survey. Thank you. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Thank you, Jerry, and I want to thank the Welfare Committee for working very hard on this. I think the results are significant and they will be presented to the Board of Trustees.

D. Committee on Admissions, Professor Manton Matthews, Chair:
   No report.

E. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Professor Gary Reeves, Chair:
   No report.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - We have a report from the Athletics Advisory Committee.

F. Athletic Advisory Committee, Professor Peter Graham, Chair:
PROFESSOR GRAHAM - I do have a report today. Some of you may know the Athletic Advisory Committee among their charges is to overview the academic progress of our athletes on campus. I have been pleased to do it for the past three semesters coming back with encouraging reports. Overall the athletes on campus this past semester their grade point average was 2.874 which is quite well. This is an increase last spring from 2.83. The football team, which many people look and do not believe sometimes they are academicians. While in season they had a 2.459 increase over last spring when they are out of season. The men’s basketball team had a 2.648. There were 211 out of 447 athletes that had 3.0 or higher. 24 of those had 4.0. 112 had 3.5 or higher. I really believe that these young men and women have not only performed well on the playing fields but they are also performing well in the classroom and deserve our accolades when you have a chance to pass it on to them.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Thank you very much. Those are encouraging results and I hope that you take them back with you to your other faculty members.

IV. Report of Secretary.

No report.

V. Unfinished Business.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - I was going to vote again on Exercise Science. In discussing this again with the chair of Curriculum and Courses there still seems to be some issues there and so we will wait until next time to deal with that.

VI. New Business.

VII. Good of the Order.

CHAIRMAN STROBEL - I would like to again reiterate what the Provost said that there would be a session immediately following. I hope you all will be able to stay. Dan Barron will be conducting this having to do with the SACS reaccreditation. Many of you will without notice be involved. They will come and talk to you or you will be summoned to talk to a committee. They will be here only over a period of two days. We will not know until they are here who has to speak with them. Therefore I behooves us all to go to one of these sessions and become apprised of the SACS report. This is going to continue to be televised. Those of you at the Regional Campuses stay on the line to get broadcast and to look at the report that Dan Barron has because you are part of SACS reaccreditation process and you will also have to meet the reaccreditation team.

There is a phone call.

PROFESSOR DURSTINE - I looked up this biology change. It is actually a chemistry class 550 and 550L and the number of students just for your record would be approximately ten a year.
CHAIRMAN STROBEL - Ten per year. Thank you. We'll table it since there is still an issue about the foreign language. Is there a motion to adjourn? So moved. Seconded. This Faculty Senate meeting is adjourned.