

The official minutes of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees are maintained by the Secretary of the Board. Certified copies of minutes may be requested by contacting the Board of Trustees' Office at trustees@sc.edu. Electronic or other copies of original minutes are not official Board of Trustees' documents.

University of South Carolina

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee

September 15, 2005

The Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees met on Thursday, September 15, 2005, at 1:50 p.m. in the Capstone House Campus Room.

Members present were: Mr. John C. von Lehe, Jr., Chairman; Mr. Samuel R. Foster, II; Mr. William C. Hubbard; Ms. Darla D. Moore; Mr. Mack I. Whittle, Jr.; Mr. Othniel H. Wienges, Jr.; Mr. Herbert C. Adams, Board Chairman; and Mr. Miles Loadholt, Board Vice Chairman. Mr. James Bradley was absent. Other Trustees present were: Mr. Arthur S. Bahnmuller; Mr. Mark W. Buyck, Jr.; Mr. William W. Jones, Jr.; Mr. Toney J. Lister; Ms. Rita M. McKinney; Mr. M. Wayne Staton; and Mr. Eugene P. Warr, Jr.

Faculty Liaison Committee members present were: Dr. C. Eugene Reeder, Chair of the Faculty Senate; Dr. Judith Alexander, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee; Dr. Marja Warehime, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee; and Dr. Noni Bohonak, USC Lancaster, Regional Campuses Representative.

Others present were: President Andrew A. Sorensen; Secretary Thomas L. Stepp; Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost Mark P. Becker; Vice President for Research and Health Affairs Harris Pastides; Vice President for Student Affairs Dennis A. Pruitt; Vice President for Human Resources Jane M. Jameson; Associate Provost for Budget and Operations William T. Moore; Associate Provost for Academic Initiatives Gordon C. Baylis; Associate Provost for Institutional Outreach and Dean of The Graduate School Christine Ebert; University Legal Counsel Walter (Terry) H. Parham; Executive Dean for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education Chris P. Plyler; Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, USC Upstate, Reginald Avery; Dean of the School of Medicine Larry R. Faulkner; Dean of the Moore School of Business Joel A. Smith; Dean of the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management Patricia G. Moody; Interim Dean of the College of Engineering and Information Technology Duncan A. Buell; Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Moore School of Business, Rodney L. Roenfeldt; Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Arnold School of Public Health, Cheryl Addy; Assistant Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, Division of Student Affairs, N. Kip Howard;

Professor and Chair of the Department of Mechanical Engineering, College of Engineering and Information Technology, Abdel Bayoumi; Professor in the Department of Chemical Engineering, College of Engineering and Information Technology, Michael A. Matthews; Director of the Institute for Tourism Research, College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management, Rich Harrill; Public Information Officer, Office of Media Relations, Karen Petit; and Director of University Communications, Division of University Advancement, Russ McKinney, Jr.

Chairman von Lehe called the meeting to order and invited those Board members present to introduce themselves. Mr. McKinney indicated that no members of the media were in attendance.

Chairman von Lehe stated that notice of the meeting had been posted and the press notified as required by the Freedom of Information Act; the agenda and supporting materials had been circulated to the Committee; and a quorum was present to conduct business.

Chairman von Lehe stated that there were personnel matters dealing with recommendations for honorary faculty titles, an appointment with tenure and honorary degree nominations which were appropriate for discussion in Executive Session. Mr. Wienges so moved and Mr. Loadholt seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

The following individuals were invited to remain: President Sorensen, Secretary Stepp, Dr. Becker, Dr. Pastides, Dr. Pruitt, Ms. Jameson, Dr. Plyler, Mr. Parham, Mr. McKinney, Ms. Stone, and Ms. Tweedy.

Return to Open Session

I. Faculty Excellence Initiative and Centenary Plan Faculty Hiring Report:

Chairman von Lehe recognized Provost Becker; excerpts from his presentation follow:

Thank you. As Mr. von Lehe said, I will address the faculty hiring plans with my colleague Harris Pastides, Vice President for Research and Health Sciences. Basically, this is about investing in our future - building the USC faculty of the future.

What are we going to try to accomplish when we hire 600 new faculty in 6 years is to build a modern research university - a university that is recognized for excellence in education; recognized for excellence in research; is constructively partnered; and is globally oriented. As a state university and as the University of South Carolina, we must also be locally engaged and make good on our commitments and obligations to the Midlands, to the state, and to our region.

A modern research university is built upon an outstanding faculty. By an outstanding faculty, I mean a faculty who are outstanding educators, extraordinary in what they can do in the classroom with students, extraordinary scholars, and engaged university citizens. They are engaged locally in the life of the campus and the development of our students and our community. They are engaged professionally and they are engaged globally whether it is in their scholarship or professional development.

It is also a coherent faculty. A faculty is not a collection of individuals, but it is actually a collection of people who come together to conduct noteworthy education and research programs.

In a modern university really outstanding faculty blur the boundaries - they blur the boundaries between education and research. And the research feeds the education which is one of the advantages of a research university. Our students have the advantage of learning from the people who are pushing back the frontiers of knowledge.

At the same time, that educational experience where you as a scholar are challenged to explain your discipline, your material to the student, you are constantly coming up with new questions and thinking of your area in new ways and being challenged by your students to articulate what you do in terms of your scholarship differently; therefore, the education drives the research.

But we also blur the boundaries between the disciplines and the professions. The students whom we graduate today are going to be challenged to draw on many different areas of expertise, many different types of experiences, many different ways of thinking and producing knowledge and innovation. So, we are purposely, as you will see, going through this program trying to blur the boundaries between disciplines and professions by building constructive partnerships.

Building a new USC faculty - 600 hires in 6 years - is not one activity, but rather at a minimum three overlapping coordinated activities.

A good proportion of our faculty (the faculty recruited to educate my generation) are at a stage of their careers where they are TERI (Teacher and Employee Retention) Program eligible in the state of South Carolina. They are eligible to retire and they are retiring. Part of this hiring, therefore, is called replacement hiring.

In addition to recruiting faculty to keep us at the current level, we will have 150 new tenure track faculty hired under the Faculty Excellence Initiative (FEI) and 100 new research faculty under the Centenary Plan (CP). The Faculty Excellence Initiative will grow the core group involved in education, scholarship and outreach. The Centenary Plan, on the other hand, led by the Vice President for Research and Health Sciences, will grow the University's research profile. It will, quite frankly, increase sponsored research activity as its main goal and objective.

The three hiring plans are funded from different sources. The replacement hires are positions which are already allocated and funded in the various schools and colleges through their individual base budgets. The Faculty Excellence Initiative comes through the Office of the Provost and the Board of Trustees has graciously approved the tuition increases which have made this program possible for the last two years.

In the Centenary Plan, the 100 new faculty are largely funded from indirect cost recovery through sponsored research. As we use the resources that we bring in today and increase the number of faculty, we

will increase the amount of research and therefore generating significantly more indirect cost recovery in the future years as a result.

The replacement hires are not necessarily one for one. Rather, the object is to be strategic and to work with the other programs. As part of the annual budgeting process, the various deans present their individual school's collegiate strategic hiring plan. In other words, how are they going to use the resources that they have from retiring faculty along with the opportunities of the Centenary Plan and the Faculty Excellence Initiative to make quantum leaps rather than just incremental steps.

The Faculty Excellence Initiative, for which I am responsible, entails recruitment in a very strategic manner to promote excellence in research and excellence in education.

Three different methods are being used within the FEI framework; the largest mechanism is the use of the concept of clusters which is part of the quantum leap concept. Rather than hiring faculty one at a time in particularly focused areas with proposals developed by faculty, we are approving positions under this initiative for groups of faculty. There will be a theme area around every proposal. A very clear priority under this program is to build bridges and blur boundaries; they have to be innovative clusters to be approved.

In addition, even though the state of South Carolina has been very generous with lottery funds for endowed chairs, the resources there are still not adequate to really get the quantum leaps we want out of that program. The Faculty Excellence Initiative helps support hires under the lottery endowed chairs program. It is a very important part of making that lottery endowed chairs program successful.

When we approve a cluster, we do not conduct several searches. Rather, we have a simple concept of a lead dean who coordinates all of those searches and because this is building bridges, the search committees come from a variety of departments, schools, colleges, centers or programs.

An advantage of this mechanism is that it has an instant impact. When you bring in a core group of people in a new area, immediately you are off and running in that area; it doesn't take 5-10 years to build. In addition, we get immediate national recognition; when you bring in several people in a particular area from not having anything before, the nation stands up and takes notice. This is a very intentional goal of this program.

For the Centenary Plan, when you go out and hire an endowed chair, for example, you might put an FEI position in there to support that position. But when you are recruiting at the senior levels, i.e., National Academy of Science, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine level people, they may say that in order for their research to be successful they will need a research team. The Centenary Plan has the mechanism to help recruit researchers into that research team.

Legislative assistance helps with some of these proposals in terms of earmarked dollars as well as private fundraising. Strategic partnerships, like Health Sciences South Carolina, figure into some of these clusters. In addition, there is actual grant funding. The idea is that we have all of these tools available to us and we are coordinating them in a clear and steadfast vision to recruit core groups of faculty to allow us to innovate and to make quantum leaps.

An example of one of these proposals which has been successful is in the area of Biomedical Engineering. This field is a rapid emerging area of translational research. The basic idea is simple: to use engineering principles to greatly advance medical technology. One of the simplest examples of an early breakthrough in this area is the heart pacemaker developed by a university researcher in cardiology working with engineers. Further developments include stents and stimulators for certain neurodegenerative diseases. This is research that will have an enormous potential impact (i.e., Medtronic, the first pacemaker company, changed the landscape of the Twin Cities area in Minnesota. There are now four medical device companies in that area).

What are some of the components which are making this particular initiative possible? There are the research facilities in the InnoVista which will provide the University the opportunity to build new research facilities as well the opportunity for private companies to partner with the faculty in this area.

Another component is the research infrastructure funds. Professor Michael Amiridis and his colleagues have secured a significant National Science Foundation grant for us to recruit and build in this area. So, we have some significant start up funds to help with the recruiting of these faculty.

We are planning to submit an endowed chair proposal through the lottery to recruit a senior faculty leader to help us make important progress quickly with this program.

As a faculty member approaches retirement in the College of Engineering and Information Technology, it is an opportunity to recruit a new faculty member in this particular area. It is also an excellent example of how we are blurring boundaries. If you look at that curriculum and the people who will be involved in the research as well as in the education, the College of Arts and Sciences - Biology, Chemistry and Biochemistry - are important partners in this initiative as well as the mathematical sciences. And, a basic medical scientist in the School of Medicine also sees this as an important development for their research and partnerships.

Plus, we are working on a very constructive partnership in the biomedical engineering field with Clemson University and also MUSC with the opportunity to share resources and partner. We hope someday in partnership with the two sister institutions to build a biomedical engineering research facility in Charleston that would take advantage of the substantial health sciences research infrastructure in that area and partner with our biomedical engineers and those from Clemson University.

The FEI is critical here because six new faculty positions are being allocated over a period of years into this area. In less than three years, we will go from having very little to actually having a very real, very robust program.

Last year we approved 31 positions and 31 positions this year, most of which we are now in the process of recruiting, necessarily bridging across departments and colleges.

Seven of those 62 positions have been in the area of the arts. As an example, one of the clusters I approved this fall is New Media/Media Arts, a partnership that brings together art, theatre and other parts of the campus. It's a rapidly emerging area of artistic endeavor as new technologies become available and is extremely popular at the undergraduate level.

In the Humanities, so far we have funded 11 new faculty positions. As an example of building bridges and crossing boundaries, we have authorized a group of hires in history, but not isolated to that area. One is related to the history of medicine and biomedicine, another in history is related to African American studies and others related to southern studies - building bridges between the History Department and the College of Medicine; building bridges with other programs on the campus. On a national level we are building a very strong History Department - an area with tremendous undergraduate interest and increasing enrollment. So, we are meeting the teaching needs as well as building our scholarly needs at the same time.

In the area of Social Sciences, eight new faculty have been authorized. One of the proposals we approved this year is a cluster hiring in Islamic Cultural Studies to build on the unique strengths of the University in cultural research. It is a globally oriented program and it is of national importance. It is important that our students have the opportunity to understand Islamic culture and how it has developed over time as well as its position in the world today. It is a very popular area with our undergraduates as well.

In the Natural Sciences, we have authorized 17 new faculty positions at this time. An example of a cluster is in the area of Condensed Matter Physics; two new Physics faculty members will be hired - one a theoretician and the other an experimentalist. Both were strategically recruited to help the development of our nanocenter.

Gene Expression and Cancer is another area. In both cases, the FEI hires build on the University's areas of research strength. We are linking across departments and leveraging our research to enrich the teaching mission and create new educational opportunities for the students.

In the Health Sciences, 13 new faculty positions were approved. In addition to the cluster in Biomedical Engineering, there will be one in the Neurodegenerative Disorders and Brain Imaging. It is related to a lottery endowed chair in the McCausland Center and brain imaging at Palmetto Richland and has a long range impact for improved health in the region.

For the professional schools, a total of five new faculty positions have been approved. Again, these positions are strategically chosen to cross fertilize the professional school with other parts of campus. For example, we approved a position this year in the area of public health law (building a bridge between the Law School and the School of Public Health). It is an area of emerging scholarship in the law and very important as we ponder issues such as Avian influenza and

having pandemics of a proportion that we have not seen since 1918 in the world.

Public Communication of Science is another example of building bridges between the College of Journalism and Mass Communications and our science faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences. In addition, Quantitative Finance is trying to build a bridge between the Finance Department and Mathematics and Statistics.

In summary, the Faculty Excellence Initiative provides us with the unique opportunity to integrate, innovate and leverage. We are able to innovate in education and research across disciplines by making quantum leaps instead of baby steps. We are able to integrate, as we grow these programs, from not only growing in teaching but also in research as well as in outreach. We are also looking at integration across departments, colleges and centers. And we are leveraging every opportunity we have whether it's the lottery endowed chairs program, the InnoVista campus, or the opportunity to have additional hires as faculty retire through the TERI program.

This is going to be a key piece of recruiting the next generation of faculty leaders. The positions are authorized, the researches are gearing up, but we have not hired a lot of people yet because we only started this initiative one year ago.

At this time, Provost Becker asked Vice President Pastides to address the Centenary Plan.

Thank you very much, Mr. Provost and good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen of the Board, Mr. von Lehe, and colleagues.

Simply put, the Centenary Plan is about depth. It's about adding depth to the qualitative areas that we believe will lead to greatness for the University of South Carolina. Simply put, you cannot achieve the path to greatness by being a 'mile wide and an inch thin.' So, we have committed to our four focus areas at the University and the Centenary Plan will provide significant matching dollars for base salary and for the start of expenses that are needed to recruit faculty whom we expect to be stars in the area of research. I will be clear from the outset. This is not a philanthropic program. This is an investment in USC faculty.

The expertise of the perfect candidates for the Centenary Plan are those who add, again, depth to the four areas, that is, in nanoscience; in our next energy and in particular our field cell area where we believe USC can be top 10; in the health sciences; and in environmental research.

For the most part, we expect that these faculty will be recruited into non-tenure track positions. Quite simply, the reason is because the money will run out in three years. So I, as Vice President for Research, will cost share with a dean, with a department chair. It will be the joint responsibility of the department, the college and the faculty member to bring in research dollars so that the central University recovers its funds and replaces the endowment, if you will. This is an endowment for junior faculty, and if we have done well in the first three years, we can continue this program beyond that.

The specifics are as follows: I as Vice President will pay for half of the salary and half of the reasonable start up package for a faculty member for the first two years. In the third year, my contribution is reduced to 25 percent of the salary for the Centenary Plan Assistant Professor and, by year four, my contribution expires. So, this program will only work for department chairs and deans who are not risk adverse and who have money.

So far, we have made 47 awards. Our program is a three year program and our goals was to recruit 50 new hires in the last academic year; 25 hires in the academic year we are in; and the final 25 in the next academic year. We actually made 47 awards of the 50 that we anticipated last year.

My funding for this program essentially will expire after the 5th year because an assistant professor who is hired in the 2006-2007 academic year will continue to draw funds from my office for three years. In conjunction with what the departments and what the colleges will spend is a \$45 million investment in University of South Carolina faculty. I think that's unprecedented.

When I tour the country and talk to my colleagues from other fine universities across the country, they find it remarkable that the University, through indirect cost recovery and through responsibility based budgeting, is able to find the money to invest in these 100 net new faculty hires at USC.

Again, this program is an investment which will be paid back with interest. We believe that over a five year period we will be able to garner \$39 million more in sponsored research, mainly from the federal government, but also from industry. That is nearly a \$40 million increase to our sponsored award totals that would not have been possible by simply squeezing the current faculty even harder. I know that you are as equally delighted as I and the President when you heard the report that the University had an 11 percent increase from last year to \$166 million. But, that is not enough. We are targeting \$200 million and beyond and this is a major factor for what's going to help us to get there.

I mentioned that 47 positions had been awarded. We received 83 proposals, 47 were awarded, 19 we have not made a final determination about and 17 were declined or withdrawn. We were very eager in jumpstarting this program. To be honest with you, I didn't know what the demand would be. I knew that if the funding formula was 100 percent from my office, the demand would be high. But, actually the funding formula is 50 percent year one; 50 percent in year two; 25 percent in year three; and then the entire carrying cost for that faculty member, be they tenure track or non tenure track, is on the department and on the college. I was humbled, I would say, however, by the interest expressed by the department chairs and by the deans. So, this is a very active program.

The awards were made as follows: 32 have been in the health sciences, 3 to the nanocenter, 1 in the area of fuel cell and next energy (but we are expecting quite a few more), 5 in the environmental research theme, and 6 in the arts, College of Education and a couple of other areas.

Don't be surprised that there are 32 in health sciences. That is where the money is. The National Institutes of Health has a \$30 billion budget with approximately \$20 billion spent in universities around the United States. We are transforming the USC School of Medicine with this program. The dean, the associate deans have been very aggressive at buying in to this Centenary Plan. And, quite frankly as the result of the Practice Plan, the service income that's generated by the Clinical Faculty, they have the money to co-invest. So, they have been very aggressive. We have an entire new cadre of research minded faculty at the USC School of Medicine and we are going to be adding significant numbers in nursing, in pharmacy, in public health, in biology, in biochemistry and in the other biomedical areas.

Let me close quickly by putting a personal face on the Centenary Plan. Ben Twinning, Travis Knight, and Susanne Lessner are three examples of Centenary Plan assistant professors. We treat these hires as an honor.

I have with me today a draft brochure that is made as a public relations statement for every single junior faculty member whom we bring to the University. The one I am holding reflects the appointment of Dr. Melissa Moss. She was hired as an Assistant Professor of Chemical Engineering and is on the tenure track. She earned a Ph.D from Kentucky; her thesis was on cancer metastasis. Dr. Moss's previous position was as a post doctoral fellow at the Mayo Clinic. She says in the brochure, 'I was aware that the University had a pretty big biomedical initiative and was promoting research and interaction between the medical school and the main campus particularly engineering. All of that was right up my alley. Right away you get your lab set up, you start generating data so you begin to write grants. I've already written several and found out in July one was funded by a beginning grant-in-aid program for junior faculty. That's the first step toward getting independent funding. I have a lot further to go but I guess in any academic position, you anticipate needing to bring in research dollars.'

That's the kind of junior faculty member we want to recruit more of to the University. We also will give Dr. Moss a plaque signed by myself, the Provost, and the President, implying that this really is an honor. We expect that one day Dr. Moss, along with her other accomplishments and credentials, will say that for three years she was the Centenary Assistant Professor in the Department of Chemical Engineering at the University of South Carolina. It is a wonderful program. As Mark said, we have a long way to go. The dividends that we expect to reap as a result of these investments are a few years down the road, but the plan seems to be working.

Mr. Whittle asked whether the marketing materials will be used in other ways.

He also suggested that a list of newly hired faculty members with snippets of

pertinent information about each one be distributed to alumni and Board members so that "they know the quality of faculty and we all begin to see what is going on and the transformation that is taking place at the University."

Provost Becker indicated that distribution of such a list to the alumni was planned. In addition, it was hoped to place strategically timed ads in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (main organ of communication between higher education institutions); and, a website containing this information will be available. Also planned was an entire issue devoted to the hiring plans at the University linked to websites which will discuss in depth the various hiring initiatives. Vice President Pastides further remarked that this plan had been named "Carolina's Bright Idea." Every faculty member hired will receive a plexiglass desk piece with a lightbulb embedded inside.

President Sorensen commented that his fellow presidents were astounded when he explained to them that the University intended to hire 600 new faculty (100 per year) during the next 6 years. Recently, Johns Hopkins University had hired 100 new faculty in one year, which had drawn national attention. He was confident that handled properly, the story of the University's goal would create a large national impact.

Ms. Moore asked the manner in which the clusters had been determined. Provost Becker responded that clusters had been largely generated from faculty proposals recommending hiring needs submitted to him and Dr. Pastides. As these proposals were reviewed, consideration was given to whether the particular recommendations would result in "quantum leaps forward rather than incremental advances"; likelihood of success; coherence (do they fit with the University's image and where it was headed).

In response to Ms. Moore's inquiry about increasing the effectiveness of the endowed chair program, Provost Becker commented that he, President Sorensen and Vice President Pastides continually discussed this topic of conversation. Although the program offered a generous start, it alone would not achieve the University's goal of becoming an outstanding research institution. Therefore, the two hiring programs were providing leverage toward that achievement.

In addition, it was hoped that President Sorensen, with the support of community leaders, would approach the legislature for additional assistance; with appropriate alliances, success was anticipated. Mr. Whittle indicated that President Sorensen was scheduled to speak at the November meeting of the statewide Chamber of Commerce; this meeting would offer an ideal opportunity to present an overview of the various pieces of the University's future plans to the business community. Further, President Sorensen assured Board members that the other two

research institutions' presidents and their respective boards were committed; a united legislative campaign would most assuredly have a far-reaching effect.

Provost Becker added that it was the "startup costs" which were especially prohibitive; individuals recruited through the FEI and the CP will be required, as he explained earlier, to "stand on their own two feet" within a relatively short period of time.

Chairman von Lehe thanked Provost Becker and Vice President Pastides for their outstanding presentations. "This has been something long awaited by us and we are not disappointed."

II. Name Changes:

A. Finance Department - Moore School of Business: Chairman von Lehe called on Dean Joel Smith who explained that the Business School was requesting to change the name of the "Banking, Finance, Insurance and Real Estate Department" to the "Finance Department." He believed that this name change more fully reflected the department and lessened confusion. The financial services industry had, for the most part, combined the different activities under the umbrella of "finance."

Mr. Foster moved approval to change the name of the "Banking, Finance, Insurance and Real Estate Department" to the "Finance Department" as described in the materials distributed for the meeting. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

B. International Tourism Research Institute - College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management: Chairman von Lehe called on Dean Patricia Moody who indicated that the college was requesting this particular name change in order to reflect better the institute's scope of activities. She noted that tourism was the first largest industry in the world, third largest in the country and first largest in the state.

It was anticipated that the institute would engage in international research. Relationships had been formed with several major international universities in China, Mexico, Australia, and others. Dean Moody noted that Chinese professors will travel to the University in October to work with various professors on international research projects.

Mr. Adams moved approval to change the name of the "Institute for Tourism Research" in the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management to the "International Tourism Research Institute" as described in the materials distributed for the meeting. Mr. Foster seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

III. New Program Proposals:

A. Undergraduate Degree in Biomedical Engineering: Chairman von Lehe called on Dean Ebert who stated that the proposed undergraduate and graduate degree programs were related to the report which Provost Becker had presented earlier. She further iterated his comments that biomedical engineering was an emerging interdisciplinary field.

Mr. Hubbard moved approval of the Bachelor of Science in Biomedical Engineering, College of Engineering and Information Technology, as described in the materials distributed for the meeting. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

B. Graduate Degrees in Biomedical Engineering: Chairman von Lehe called for a motion to approve the proposed graduate degree programs in Biomedical Engineering.

Mr. Hubbard moved approval of the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy in Biomedical Engineering, College of Engineering and Information Technology, as described in the materials distributed for the meeting. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

IV. Report on NCAA Academic Progress Rate: Chairman von Lehe stated that this agenda item will be postponed until the November 17th meeting of the Committee; Dr. Pate, who will report on the topic, was unable to attend today's session.

V. Status Report on Holistic Admissions Procedures: Chairman von Lehe called on Dr. Pruitt who initially listed three goals of prime importance in the admissions area: (1) to accomplish the enrollment management plan that the Board had approved; (2) to permeate every college with enrollment management activities so that they would have ownership and involvement in all recruitment and retention efforts; and, (3) to introduce an individualized application review as part of the admissions process for the fall 2006 freshman class. The latter goal was an ever evolving process requiring careful consideration.

Dr. Pruitt was confident that the University would attract students who reflected a variety of characteristics while ensuring that they would achieve a high level of academic success. He introduced Kip Howard who supervised the enrollment management area at Carolina (Admissions, Financial Aid, Career Services, International Student Program, Orientation and Testing, Visitors Center); Mr. Howard presented an overview of the new admissions process which was in print and on the web.

He initially thanked the Committee for the opportunity to share information about a holistic admissions process at the University. Mr. Howard commented that everyone in the admissions area was very excited about this concept as they

considered the very difficult task of selecting students who would best contribute to the life of the University of South Carolina.

In 2003, Dr. Sorensen had asked the Admissions Committee to include the consideration of nonacademic variables in the freshman application review process. Prior to that time, a review was made almost exclusively on the basis of high school performance, grade point average, class rank and standardized admissions tests.

As they began the process of drafting a plan, the notion of being in line with what was happening nationally, particularly in light of the Supreme Court decision in the Michigan case, mandated the early involvement of the legal affairs staff. Therefore, Terry Parham and his staff had thoroughly reviewed the proposed admissions process to ensure that the University was in agreement with that Supreme Court ruling.

Mr. Howard commented that current literature in the admissions and enrollment field confirmed that it was the high school performance record in combination with standardized tests (ACT or SAT) that provided the best predictor of academic success. Research on the nonacademic variables provided no definitive evidence that such factors adequately replaced academic variables.

Concerned about the perception of this process by high school guidance counselors, a very important constituent group, the Admissions Office assembled a group of counselors from across the state to review the proposed process; they overwhelmingly endorsed the direction that the University was taking and were pleased that the University of South Carolina considered individual characteristics in the application process.

As in the past, the modified application process will continue to examine the students' high school grade point average. They must complete the academic core program as prescribed by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education.

In addition, students' highest SAT score will be used. The College Board permitted institutions to choose the best critical reasoning score and the best mathematical score and combine those even if they were not from the same test administration; the ACT, however, mandated the use of scores from one test only.

Mr. Howard explained that the University will not consider the new writing test which was inaugurated this past year by both ACT and SAT pending further research and analysis of the validity of this instrument in the admissions process; most other institutions will follow this tact.

Various new questions had been added to the application form. Of particular note was the one which requested demographic information about the parents. Specifically, the University was asking for the parents' educational level to

determine the background of the family and their knowledge of and involvement in higher education. In addition, as in the past, this question also asked whether the student was a son or daughter of a University alumni and whether their parents may be employed at the University.

Other questions requested information about the following: activities in high school including contributions the student had made; out-of-school activities also including their contributions; special talents, honors and awards; work experience; and the optional essay which allowed the student to expound on anything they believed would help the University better understand their record.

For the actual review process, it was anticipated that approximately 25 percent of the total pool will be sent to an admissions officer for individual consideration; for the others, decisions will be rendered primarily based on the traditional academic measures. The Admissions staff readers will be asked to give particular emphasis to academics including the trend of the grades and the depth of the curriculum.

The review process will not be used as a rating system, but rather as an opportunity to understand better the students' strengths and weaknesses. The clear cut admission decisions will be sent through; however, for those questionable applications, the readers will be instructed to send them to a more senior member for review; the Director of Admissions will be the 'judge and jury' for those files. Any appeals will be forwarded to the Faculty Admissions Committee for the final decision.

Mr. Howard also discussed legacy programs at the University. Last year, he noted, 14.9 percent of the freshman class were legacies (sons and daughters or grandchildren of alumni); this year that figure had increased to 16.3 percent. There were 1504 legacy admissions applications; of that total, 1148 were admitted (almost 80 percent). The admit rate for all students was slightly under 68 percent. Mr. Howard commented that the differential between these two figures was quite significant. "We are very pleased to welcome 595 freshmen this fall who are legacies at the University of South Carolina."

Mr. Wienges asked about class standing as an indicator for admissions. Mr. Howard replied that it was not specifically designated as a variable; rather, the overall high school performance was viewed as significant. Within the context of a particular cohort of students, class ranking was considered important. Mr. Howard noted that there was an increasing national trend for schools, particularly ones with large college bound populations, to withhold rank because they believed that such information hampered their students' abilities to compete.

Responding to Mr. Hubbard's inquiry about the *U.S. News and World Report* magazine's college issue which used class ranking as an indicator, Mr. Howard explained that ranking data was collected and provided. The annual freshman profile from the University detailed standing in deciles.

Mr. Hubbard commended President Sorensen, Provost Becker, Dr. Pruitt, Mr. Howard and his staff for their outstanding achievements in the area of enrollment management and admissions. "I think this sends an entirely new and improved signal to our applicant pool that we are operating at a different level. It indicates that we are looking for a well-rounded student body and that we are taking a more personal view of each application."

Mr. Howard further advised the Committee that a numeric weighting system would not be used. The required public knowledge of that information carried an inherent risk of individuals manipulating the application in order to optimize the scoring; the spirit of considering the "whole student" would ultimately be jeopardized.

VI. Reports from Faculty Liaison Representatives: Chairman von Lehe called on Faculty Liaison representatives to update the Committee regarding various activities in their respective areas.

Dr. Gene Reeder, Chair of the Faculty Senate, stated that the Columbia Faculty Senate had met last Wednesday; the major action taken was the endorsement of the biomedical engineering program proposals which had been approved by this Committee today.

One of the topics faculty committees will deliberate in the future will involve the creation of an ombudsman's position within the University to handle faculty issues. Another area of concern was the TERI program and recent changes. The University Athletic Advisory Committee was in the process of discussing principles which the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics had brought forward; it was hoped to incorporate those best principles into the academic athletic interface. Also anticipated were minor changes to the *Faculty Manual*.

Dr. Marjorie Warehime, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, stated that the committee would hold its first meeting on September 19th. During that initial meeting, a tentative agenda will be established for the year.

Notable issues carried over from the previous academic year included the resumption of a proposal process to request that a preventive care benefit be added to faculty health insurance. The committee will also continue to examine issues regarding the University's Parental Leave policy. And, as faculty concerns were brought forward, the committee will respond to the various issues in a timely manner; the first one received for the year involved parking concerns. President

Sorensen indicated that within the next three years, the University planned to add 3,400 parking spaces.

Dr. Warhime also thanked President Sorensen for allowing a member of the Human Resources Division to discuss changes in benefits during the first general faculty meeting of the academic year. She hoped that this topic would become an established item for that meeting in order to help faculty members with decisions about their benefits package for the upcoming year.

Dr. Judith Alexander, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee, stated that the committee will be meeting in the near future; she had been consulting with Provost Becker to determine an agenda for the upcoming year.

Dr. Noni Bohonak, Regional Campuses Representative from USC Lancaster, remarked that faculty from those campuses had met this past Friday. Most of the discussion had focused on revision of the Regional Campuses *Faculty Manual*.

A major problem that these campuses were facing was the loss of retiring faculty members; it will be difficult to hire new faculty at the appropriate academic level with salaries which were not competitive on a national scale. Dr. Bohonak hoped that the University will address this concern in the future.

Chairman von Lehe thanked the Faculty Liaison representatives for their reports.

VII. Other Matters: Contract with Medical and Dental Educational Institute, Seoul, Korea: Chairman von Lehe called on Provost Becker who was requesting approval of a contract between the Health Services Policy and Management Department in the Arnold School of Public Health and the Medical and Dental Educational Institute in Seoul, Korea, to establish a Doctor of Public Health Program (DrPH) at that institution. The program will train public health professionals in Seoul; students will be taught and supervised by University faculty and adjunct faculty in Korea.

Provost Becker indicated that students in this program will pay tuition and graduates will earn a degree from the University of South Carolina. It was anticipated that the program would be revenue neutral at a minimum. Mr. Adams requested cost information for the proposed contract; it will be distributed to Board members in the mailout one week prior to the October Board meeting.

Mr. Adams moved to recommend to the Board of Trustees approval of the proposed contract with the Medical and Dental Educational Institute in Seoul, Korea, subject to his request that the cost information be supplied to Board members prior to the October meeting. Mr. Foster seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

Since there were no other matters to come before the Committee, Chairman von
Lehe declared the meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Stepp
Secretary