GENERAL FACULTY MEETING
May 1, 2003

I. Call to Order.

PRESIDENT ANDREW SORESEN – Good afternoon. It is a lovely day today. Yesterday was the one year anniversary of the first time I stood in this auditorium and addressed you as the person who had just been elected as the president of The University of South Carolina. It has been a wonderful year, most of the time, and I’m very flattered and honored to be your president. We’ll be talking about some of the things that have been happening more recently. First of all, I’d like to call the meeting to order.

II. Approval of Minutes.

PRESIDENT SORESEN – I ask for a motion to approve the general faculty minutes of the meeting of September 4, 2002, as distributed. Do I hear a motion? Second? Are there any additions, corrections, or emendations? Hearing none I’ll call for the question. All in favor, say aye. Opposed? Motion is carried unanimously.

III. Report of the President.

PRESIDENT SORESEN – First of all, I want to begin by extending a hearty expression of gratitude to the faculty for the remarkable way in which you have responded to my appeal for increasing external research and grant support. Our budget has been cut by 41 million dollars so far this year and I have been informed by the legislature that our budget will be cut by another 20 million dollars on July 1 with a possibility of yet an additional budget cut during the 2003-04 academic year. In the face of those dramatic cuts, we have to obviously compensate for those reductions in revenue by increasing revenues from other sources. I’ll be talking later about tuition; that is one way that we can increase our revenues, but it far from compensates for the cut of such draconian extent. Giving is another way. But because of what has been happening in the stock market for the last several years, those prospects are not promising.

I have in the past and I will again praise the faculty in Liberal Arts who have defied the stereotype that money is not available in the fields of humanities and social sciences. As of April 22, their year-to-date external research support was up 154% over a year ago or more than 2 _ times what it was last year at this time. Thus, it is extraordinary that such success is mirrored in many other parts of the university. I had an interesting day in Washington yesterday. I met with each member of the South Carolina congressional delegation, one on one. To be honest with you, I think we can do a more effective job of securing what I refer to when I’m in Washington as well-deserved largesse for scientific excellence and what is referred to locally as pork. There are those who suggest that all monies that are distributed federally for universities be restricted to competitive, peer review, such as that used at NIH and NSF. But regrettably not all of our representatives in Congress from all 50 states believe that. So if we don’t act assertively about benefits
for our university and our state, then other states and other congressional delegations will be eager to make up for our deficiencies.

I’m very excited to report that on Saturday evening, at 8:30 p.m., in Drayton Hall, we will have all nine candidates for the Democratic presidential race in a debate hosted by George Stephanopolous. It will be televised at 11:30, Saturday evening, because of a stipulation by ABC that it not be broadcast live. It will also be broadcast at subsequent times on both ABC and PBS. One of my concerns is that there be attention brought to The University of South Carolina in that debate. We have insisted that the logo of The University of South Carolina be displayed throughout Drayton Hall. So that it will be impossible to get a picture of the participants without seeing the logo.

It is rumored that on May 9th we may have President Bush as a commencement speaker. If in fact he does come, that will be announced by the White House. We don’t know when and if that will happen. I have received quite a few e-mails from people protesting the president being invited to come speak at our commencement. I have responded to each e-mail I received, first of all pointing out that every president, since John Kennedy, Republican or Democrat, has been invited to speak. President Clinton and President Carter rejected the invitations. President Reagan and President George Herbert Walker Bush did accept the invitations. I think it is appropriate to continue inviting the presidents to speak. Also I have tried to disabuse people of the notion that there is one commencement ceremony at the University. There are two absolutely isomorphic commencement ceremonies, one at 3:00 Friday, which is the one that the President has been invited to, and one at 10:30 Saturday morning. They have precisely the same number of graduates, precisely the same number of faculty, precisely the same number of people in the audience, precisely the same program. The speaker of Saturday morning will be Jack Valenti, who was a special aide to President Lyndon Johnson. I can assure you that Jack Valenti and George Walker Bush are not at precisely the same point on the political spectrum. There is a considerable distance between the two. The law school commencement speaker will be Robert McCrate, former president of the American Bar Association and the prosecutor in the My Lai massacre in Vietnam. Catherine Ann Bertini, under secretary general of the United Nations and the highest ranking American executive of the United Nations, will also speak at one of our commencements. General Leonard Randolph, an African-American surgeon and health administrator, is another speaker. So we have a variety of people with respect to gender, race, and political perspective. If indeed our country is one that ensures freedom of expression, and the academy after all is a place where a wide variety of views, should and ought to be encouraged to be expressed, then clearly that kind of disparity is represented in our people who are speaking at our commencement ceremonies. So I have said to those who object to one or another commencement speaker, “If you object to the political ideology of any of the commencement speakers, go to another commencement ceremony.” You have a wide variety to choose from.

We have submitted a bid to host one of the presidential debates in the fall of 2004, after the Democratic primary. I’m assuming that George Walker Bush will win the Republican primary. After the Democratic primary, there will be a series of presidential
debates nationwide. They’ve selected 14 places that will receive site visits and we are one of the 14 places. If you are selected for one of these, you have to come up with $750,000 to pay for the cast of thousands that come to organize. It would be held in the Koger Theater and we would use the Carolina Coliseum to accommodate something like 2000 press people who would be here. I pledge to you that 100% of that money will come from private sources. We will not use one dollar of state money or one dollar of university money. We will use money from people who see the debate as a way of generating revenues through hotel bills and restaurants and parking and other kinds of expenses. Thus, the team from the presidential debate commission will be here all day, the 21st. In all of these activities, I’m trying to promote the University of South Carolina, to give us some publicity nationally. It is not a substitute for scholarly productivity, I’m acutely aware of that. But it is a way of calling attention to our state and I hope to some good things that our happening in our state, because some of the legislation that’s been introduced in the past week or two does not have that effect. I’m hopeful that we will receive some positive publicity as a result of these events.

I met this morning with the Tenure and Promotion Committee for the University and I commended them for the enormous amount of work that they have done. They’re obviously very thorough and very meticulous in their review of the proposals for tenure and promotion. Provost Odom and I reviewed each proposal carefully, thoughtfully. I disagreed with them on only two of the candidates. They expressed reasons why they hoped that I would reverse my judgment. We had a very interesting and informative conversation. Out of, what was the total number? 50? 65. So we agreed on 63 out of 65 and on two cases, we had some disagreement, not dramatic disagreement, but disagreement nonetheless. They gave me some additional information. That committee has a huge role in establishing the academic standards of the institution, and I’m very much indebted to them for the quality of their work. They made some extremely interesting and helpful suggestions as to how we may improve both the process and the clarity of the regulations regarding tenure and promotion. I especially commend Marcia Synnott, professor of history, who served as the chair. She did a terrific job. Marcia, thank you so much. I thanked her this morning, but I want to thank her again in public for the very conscientious and principled review that she led.

We continue to attract very bright students. We had students receive the Goldwater national competition and the Truman Scholar competition, USA Today Academic All-American team. Our applications for this coming fall are at an all time high. They are higher than they’ve ever been in the history of the university. There are nearly 14,000 applicants for approximately 3,400 places in the freshman class. That’s more than four applicants for every opening. It is most gratifying to see the level of interest throughout the state. I’m delighted that our various efforts that we’ve made to reach out to the people of the state and to the students are beginning to pay off.

One percent increase in tuition will raise approximately $840,000 in revenues. Our budget will have been cut $61 million, effective July 1. To offset a cut in the budget of that magnitude would require a 70% increase in tuition, seven-zero. Clearly, were not going to do that. It is also clear that we can’t take cuts of this magnitude and not have a
modest tuition increase. So Provost Odom and Mr. Kelly, our Chief Financial Officer, and I will be meeting with the members of the Board of Trustees as we learn more about the legislative budget, which has not been determined yet and determine the degree of tuition increase. While it is certain there will be a tuition increase, we will try to keep it as modest as we possibly can. We are also proposing to the Board of Trustees that there be a bracket in which students who take from 12 to 16 hours will not have any differential in the amount of tuition they pay. Thus, there is a fiscal incentive that if you are enrolled for 12 hours, you may take 13, 14, 15, or 16 hours because you don’t pay anything extra. And if you take over 16 hours, then you pay 80 dollars per credit hour.

Again, I want to thank you faculty profoundly for all that you do. These are not the best of times with respect to support from the legislature. I’m working feverishly to do everything I possibly can to inform them of our needs, to badger, to wheedle, to cajole, and use every arrow in my quiver to convince them of the need to invest in the young people of this state. And I’m also going to all over the country, attempting to raise money from alumni and friends of the university to offset some of those dramatic cuts. Are there any questions regarding my report? Yes ma’am.

PROFESSOR DOROTHY DISTERHEFT (ENGLISH) – One thing you said about the Committee on Tenure and Promotions activity this semester, this year, caused a little red flag to go up. And that was your comment about the fact that there was some information that was not in the file that, in the tenure and promotion file, that influenced the committee’s decision. And I was wondering how…

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Let me be more precise. I was imprecise and I apologize for that. There was a case of two professors from the same department whom a couple of the committee members thought had been treated differently. When I review the files, they are given to me in huge boxes. I just go from file to file, I don’t know how they are arranged. They pointed out to me that there was a file, let’s say that I reviewed file #3, that I responded to differently than file #58. So they said, please compare #3 and #58.

PROFESSOR DISTERHEFT – Oh, thank you for clarifying.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – You’re very welcome. Other questions? Sir?

PROFESSOR CHARLES MACK (ART) – I have a question that’s not directly related to your report, but I’ll ask anyway. There is a rumor afloat that there is a contemplated reorganization of units within the university, particularly, from what I’ve heard, a possibility of a merger of Science and Math with Liberal Arts. Could you address that for me.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Given the fact that we are facing a $61 million cut, I am always looking for efficiencies and economies of scale. You may recall that on my first day in office, I eliminated $600,000 worth of positions in the President’s office. If you begin with the premise that the Provost and I are committed not to cutting faculty positions and say, “Where can we cut things?” then you look at administrators. I surely
did that in the President’s office. I felt we had too many administrators. So I’ve urged the Provost to look throughout the university and see are there ways that we can organize ourselves more efficiently so we would have fewer administrators. He is in fact doing that. Now, there is a very clear-cut mechanism of how mergers are to be presented to the faculty and to the faculty senate. The Provost and I are very sensitive to those procedures. I hope he will recommend some savings, some economies of scale. I don’t know precisely what they will be. But I assure you that after he and I talk about them and if we agree, then we will present them to the faculty through the appropriate mechanism.

PROFESSOR MACK – Thank you.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Are you satisfied with my response?

PROFESSOR MACK – I’m satisfied with your response as it now stands.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – I remember you from my very first faculty meeting. And I’m sure you will have questions for me in the future. I look forward to those questions as well. Other questions or comments?

PROFESSOR NANCY LANE (Languages, Literatures and Cultures) – My question is about your remarks about our tight budget and our desire for publicity at tomorrow’s debate. So my question is how much is the sudden beautification of Wardlaw costing and who is paying for and if the debate starts at 8:30 is the new beautified Wardlaw going to be on television when everyone can see it?

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Now first of all, I have to beg my ignorance. Where is Wardlaw? Is that the College of Education?

PROFESSOR LANE – It is where the debate will take place.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Okay.

PROFESSOR LANE – And suddenly in the space of a morning, it has been the object of costly and frantic beautification activity.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Is somebody from Rick Kelly’s office here? Anybody? I’m going to give you an assignment, Provost Odom, if you will have Professor Lane receive from Mr. Kelly, a description of how much it cost to beautify Wardlaw, I’d appreciate it very much. Okay?

PROFESSOR LANE – Well, I mean that answers part of the question.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – What’s the other part?

PROFESSOR LANE – The other part is who’s paying for it?
PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Well, the university is paying for it.

PROFESSOR LANE – And will it appear on television if the debate starts at 8:30?

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – I don’t know. I’m dedicating several hundred thousand dollars to beautifying this building because I think that this building is in sad shape. We have candidates for the dean of Law School who come here and some of them say, “This is a shabby, seedy looking building.” So we are spending several hundred thousand dollars beautifying this building, which we hope will help us attract a stellar dean for the Law School. I can assure you the amount of money spent on Wardlaw is a pittance compared to what we are going to spend beautifying this building. I think that we need to be sensitive to the aesthetics of our environment. We don’t need to be spendthrifts; we need to be frugal and careful. But I don’t think it is bad to have a campus that people find attractive and pleasant. Other questions?

IV. Reports of Committees.

All right, we have some business to present. We have reports of committees: the Faculty Advisory Committee, there are some proposed changes in the Faculty Manual regarding graduate school faculty membership. This is in response to a SACS initiative and Professor Betty Glad is going to report. She is the chair of...What committee are you chair of?

PROFESSOR BETTY GLAD (Government and International Studies) – Faculty Advisory Committee.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Faculty Advisory Committee, thank you Professor Glad.

PROVOST JERRY ODOM – Mr. President, let me just remind you. We do have a report of the Provost. I will be happy to be taken out of order.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – If you don’t mind, I will. I apologize, Mr. Provost.

PROFESSOR GLAD – Do you want me to step down?

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – No, come here Professor Glad. Please come up here. The Provost is very important. How could I forget you, Mr. Provost? You are very important to the livelihood of this university. Professor Glad…

PROFESSOR GLAD – The Faculty Advisory Committee had a proposal from the Executive Committee of the Graduate College setting standards for the make-up and functions of members of the Graduate College. We worked with Gordon Smith, the Dean, and took the report he had. We worked out some compromises that satisfied us so the Faculty Advisory Committee is recommending your approval of this matter. Gordon has agreed to come up here and explain in detail what is behind all this. May I just say that the Faculty Advisory Committee had an input in making it certain that there would
be the assumption that you would continue to be a member of the Graduate College if your work was satisfactory. We didn’t think you should be reviewed and re-reviewed with any onus of doubt placed upon you.

DEAN GORDON SMITH (Graduate School) – Just briefly, the origin of this came out of the SACS review. The SACS review team made a recommendation (which of course in their language means a mandate) to revisit our definition of grad faculty and better define who is on the grad faculty and then they strongly suggested that we institute some sort of periodic review of that. For clarity sake, the motion is coming forward from Faculty Advisory Committee because it does entail a change to the section of the Faculty Manual dealing with the Graduate School. This has gone through extensive discussion and analysis and has the support of the grad council committee on Policy and Procedures, the full grad council and then went forward to Faculty Advisory and has their support as well. Just to clarify, it would involve some changing of wording in the Faculty Manual dealing with the membership status, which is currently defined as continuing membership and annual membership and some revisions to the paragraph on functions but it leaves the paragraph on grad council as is. So, the wording was distributed with the agenda. I don’t want to belabor it too much. But basically, the document defines two kinds of membership in the graduate faculty: regular membership, which is identified for people in tenured or tenure-track positions on the Columbia campus most involved with graduate training and for those people, the presumption as Dr. Glad said is a continual or renewal of their status in grad faculty and that would only change if the faculty member was deemed by the colleagues in the department as performing unsatisfactorily in research or in graduate teaching. And there is appeals process for that decision. The other category of membership is term appointments. We currently have something called annual appointments. There are a number of categories of people that are not currently eligible for grad faculty that nevertheless routinely sit on dissertation committees and comp committees and that sort of thing. People such as research professors, emeritus professors, professors in the law school or the medical school that are not regular parts of the grad faculty and this would enable departments to appoint those people to the grad faculty for a term up to a maximum of three years and then that can be renewed. So, with that as an explanation, I’d be happy to field any questions if you have any or to ask for a vote on this motion.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Any questions for Professor Smith?

PROFESSOR GLAD – May I just add also that this review process is tied to other evaluation processes.

DEAN SMITH – Right, the review cycle is in conjunction with third year reviews, tenure and promotion reviews, or post-tenure reviews with the theory that while you have your file together, and it has to go before your department for one decision, the department can also make a recommendation on the grad faculty status.
PROFESSOR DISTERHEFT – I was wondering why is it necessary to have graduate faculty that are designated as such separate from the rest of the faculty. There are many other universities that, to my knowledge, don’t do this.

DEAN SMITH – I don’t know of a single major research university that doesn’t define graduate faculty differently than general faculty. And certainly a university like ours that has regional campuses, whose mission is not graduate education, certainly requires some sort of special designation.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Are there other questions for Professor Smith? Are your parliamentary procedure rules such that the committee’s recommendation is the motion or do I need to entertain a motion to approve the committee’s recommendation.

PROFESSOR GLAD – I think the committee’s motion puts it on the floor.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – We’ll assume that the committee’s recommendation is in fact the motion to approve this. Do I hear a second? Is there further discussion? All in favor say aye. Opposed? Now you have another matter to bring, don’t you? I have a tenure and promotion in cases of reorganization proposal. Peter Graham, are you going to introduce that?

PROFESSOR PETER GRAHAM (HRSM) – Betty Glad is.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Professor Glad.

PROFESSOR GLAD – This is an endeavor to deal with the fact that we are reorganizing so many departments, smaller, bigger, putting together, pulling them apart. And that it is an attempt to say that during a transition period you have the choice between the old standards and the new ones. The old people who advised and evaluated you or the new ones. So it is an attempt to be flexible and adaptable and not put people in peril when their department is reorganized in some way. This is an addition to the faculty manual. We all agreed to this unanimously after spending a great deal of time on the matter! If any of you like…did we distribute this? So if any of you want to read the proposal it is here. And so I guess we are placing this before the body as a committee report.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – There is a motion to approve. Is there a second? Further questions? Yes, Professor Lane.

PROFESSOR LANE – Yes, I have two questions. One is about the effective date of this policy. In other words…

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Betty, why don’t you come over here so you can be recorded please.
PROFESSOR LANE – If this policy is approved, henceforth can faculty who feel they have been prejudiced by shuffling of departments in the current decision year use it as grounds for appeal?

PROFESSOR GLAD – Well, I think the policy would have to be approved by the Senate and then approved by the Board of Trustees as I understand it. But I hope that in the interim, in the spirit of comity, we would follow these procedures and I impress this upon the administration to do that. I would see no reason not to in this interim period. Maybe you could refine this issue for us?

PROVOST JERRY ODOM – First of all this is a faculty manual change; this has to do with the faculty manual. If the general faculty approves this, then it will go to the Board of Trustees for their approval. I think it would become effective as soon as it is approved by the Board of Trustees.

PROFESSOR LANE – But it would have nothing, no validity retroactively.

PROVOST ODOM – No.

PROFESSOR LANE – That was my first question. The second question was about this particular wording. “These faculty members may elect to have their file considered by the tenure and promotion committee of their prior unit as it existed before reorganization or by the tenure and promotion committee of their new or reorganized unit.” That statement…it’s not clear whether that means the choice of the structure of the committee or the choice of the people who were on the committee.

PROFESSOR GLAD – Well, I think it means the choice of the structures.

PROFESSOR LANE – As it existed does not…

PROFESSOR GLAD – As it existed, yes. Because, you know, with reorganization, some people may have left. I don’t see how they possibly could require the same personnel. And we also put the word “ordinarily” in there because sometimes it just may be impossible to do these things. So, if it is possible, then, the policy should be followed. Any other questions?

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Are you ready for the question? All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion is unanimous and carried. Now, it is my turn to introduce Provost Jerry Odom. Links to the revisions are available on the web at http://www.sc.edu/faculty/ Thank you.

V. Report of Provost.

PROVOST ODOM – See, one of the jobs of the provost is to give the bad news. And when I get the chance to give good news, the president is trying to take that away from
me. Let me make just a couple of very brief comments, first before I get to the main event.

First of all, I would like to personally express my appreciation to Marcia and the members of the UCTP. This year, the files were as good as I have seen in my six years as provost and the level of agreement as the president indicated was very, very high. The committee worked very hard, did an excellent job, and we sincerely appreciate the work of that committee.

Another committee has recently been formed that is a search committee for the vice-president for research and health sciences. We will be looking for a new vice-president that will replace two other vice presidents, the vice president for medical affairs and the vice president for research. Both of those will be combined into a vice president for research and health sciences. That was a recommendation of the SDI committee. I need the help of the faculty in recruiting. I am chairing that committee and we need to recruit the best possible person. This will be, of course, a national search. I wanted to tell you very briefly who was on the committee and if you have any suggestions for candidates, if you will talk to me or to any of the search committee members: Beth Mayer Davis from School of Public Health, Gwen Felton from Nursing, Stan Fowler from Medicine, Miriam Freeman from the College of Social Work, John Richards from the Department of Psychology, Roger Sawyer from College of Science and Mathematics, Teresa Smith from the College of Pharmacy, Diane Stevens from the College of Education, Mike Sutton from the College of Engineering and Information Technology, and Doug Williams from the South Carolina Honors College, are the members of that committee. We’ve had our first meeting. We will shortly place an advertisement in the Chronicle. We are hoping to have this on a very fast track. We would like very much to have applications in by July 1 and have candidates in early in September, when the faculty return. So please give us your help on that.

Let me turn now to recognition of our colleagues for many different area of endeavor. First of all, I’d like to talk about or just recognize faculty who were awarded emeritus status since May 2002. I’d like to ask them to stand if they are here and remain standing until I’ve called all the names and we can then recognize and express our appreciation to them. Many of these have expressed their regret that they cannot attend today but many hopefully have. Bob Bowman, College of Education, I know was not able to attend. Wolfgang Elfe was able to attend, Wolfgang. Jerry Euster is here from Social Work, Jerry. Carol Flake from Education. Carol Kay from English was not able to attend. Ian Lerch from Geological Sciences was not able to attend. Kay McFarland from the School of Medicine. Lisle Mitchell is here, Lisle. Joel Meyerson from English was not able to attend. Carol Myers-Scotton from English. Jerry Randolph from Social Work. Phil Rollinson from English could not attend. Paul Sperry from Mathematics. Ted Steinke from Geography was here, Ted. Nancy Thompson from English. Charlie Tyer from Government and International Studies. Jim Underwood from Law was here, Jim. Linda Walling, Library and Information Science. Lois Wright from Social Work was not able to be here. Churchill Curtis from Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management was not able to be here. Horatio
Farach is here, Horatio. And Fred Roper from Library and Information Science was not able to be here. These folks represent a lot of institutional memory and a lot of hard work over a long period of time. Thank you very much. Thank you.

In turning to awards, to the faculty first of all I’d like to announce that there were three Carolina Distinguished Professorships open this year and those were awarded to Janette Turner Hospital in English. Janette, will you stand? Asif Khan in Engineering, I think Asif was able to be here. And John Richards in Psychology. Congratulations.

When I call the award winners for these awards, if the person would come forward, I’d like to say a few words about each of them and then we’ll be able to thank them. The first award is the Golden Key Faculty Award for Creative Integration of Research and Undergraduate Teaching. The recipient is Mike Matthews from Chemical Engineering. Mike’s son is graduating from college today and he really was sorry that he couldn’t be in both places at one time. Mike Amaridis from the Department of Chemical Engineering, the chair, is going to receive that for Mike Matthews. But let me tell you a little bit about Mike Matthews, the winner of the Golden Key National Honor Society’s 2003 Faculty Award for creative integration of research and undergraduate teaching. Mike Matthews has exemplified the meaning of this award through his work to secure a new National Science Foundation Research Grant, coordinated a collaborative research program with the South Carolina Department of English, and has developed two new courses based on his research. On behalf of Golden Key, we would like to recognize Mike Matthews dedication. Mike?

We have just awarded a new award this spring that we were not able to get in the program. But this is an outstanding undergraduate research mentor award. Is Cathy Murphy here? Cathy, would you come forward please? Cathy Murphy is in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. She joined our faculty in 1993. In the past ten years, she has published over 75 papers on the synthesis and properties of inorganic nano materials for optical and biophysical applications, has been a principal investigator or co-PI on 17 federal and internal university grants. She has received the Mortar Board Excellence in Teaching Award, the Golden Key Faculty Award, and Undergraduate Teaching of the Michael J. Mungo Award. Cathy, Congratulations. Great job.

Next award is the Ada B. Thomas Outstanding Faculty Advisor. Is Cleveland Sellers here? This is an award that was also recognized at student awards day. Cleveland is the director of the African-American Studies program. He is most deserving of this advising award because he believes that advisement is a chance to make a difference in student lives. He advises students on both an academic and personal level. He cares about students’ success and he pushes them to excel. He has a nurturing style with students, tapping into both their abilities as well as addressing their fears. I’m very pleased that Cleveland got this award.

The Russell Research Award in Humanities and the Social Sciences is awarded to Janette Turner Hospital. Janette? Janette is a professor and distinguished writer-in-residence in the Department of English. She began her publishing career in the late 1970s and has
garnered numerous distinguished writing awards for excellence and earned international recognition as one of the finest contemporary authors. Her fiction has been published in translation in at least 10 languages. Her novel, The Last Magician, was recognized as one of the best 12 novels of 1992 and the New York Times identified her novel, Oyster, as notable book of the year 1997. Her collected short stories, North of Nowhere, South of Loss, will be published this year in Australia, England, Canada, and the United States, as will her most recent novel, Due Preparations for the Plague, which will also appear in French and Spanish translations next year. Finally, Janette will be awarded an honorary degree at the University of Queensland on May 29.

The Russell Research Award for Science, Mathematics and Engineering is awarded to Kuniharu Kubodera. Kuniharu came to the university in 1989 and is a tenured professor in the Department of Physics and Astronomy. His research interests have involved nuclear theory and neutrino physics. This theoretical calculation of the interactions between neutrinos and atomic nuclei were vital to an analysis of solar neutrino data that confirmed fundamental features – including the mass – of the neutrino. This confirmation of the neutrino’s mass was heralded as a leading scientific breakthrough of 2002 by the journal Science. The National Science Foundation has continuously funded his research since 1990, and he has over 115 publications in leading physics journals. Congratulations.

The USC Educational Foundation Research Award for Health Sciences goes to Alan Decho in the School of Public Health. Alan was very sorry that he planned to be away at a meeting and will not be able to attend today. Alan is an associate professor in the Department of Environmental Health Sciences in the Arnold School of Public Health. He earned his Ph.D. at Louisiana State University. In 1999, he won the Excellence in Research Award given by the Arnold School in a college-wide competition. More recently, in November 2002, Alan’s research team was awarded a 1.8 million dollar grant from the National Science Foundation. He has also won major grants from the Environmental Protection Agency, the Center for Disease Control, and the Department of Defense. We will make sure Alan’s award gets to him.

The Educational Foundation Award for Humanities and Social Sciences goes to Allen Miller, who is also away giving an invited paper. Allen has produced an astounding corpus of scholarship – 30 articles, 10 edited books or special issues of journals, several books, including a forthcoming book from Princeton University Press, plenary talks at major national and international conferences – that constitutes some of the most innovative work in classics and comparative literature. And we will make sure Allen gets his award, as well.

The USC Educational Foundation Research Award for Professional Schools goes to John Addison from the Moore School of Business. John is the Hugh C. Lane Professor of Economic Theory. He is concurrently a research fellow of the Institute for the Study of Labor in Bonn, Germany, and also at the Center for Labor and Employment Law at New York University. John was educated at the London School of Economics. He has published widely in the major economics and specialty labor economics journals. He is
the author or editor of a number of labor economics textbooks. His immediate research interests are union effects on employment, unemployment duration analysis, the consequences of employment protection, and the impact of workplace representation on company performance in Germany. John, congratulations.

The USC Educational Foundation Research Award for Science, Mathematics and Engineering—Vladimir Temlyakov. Vladimir came to our Department of Mathematics and Industrial Mathematics Institute in 1992. He received his Ph.D. from the prestigious Steklov Institute of Mathematics in Moscow. His research is in the general area of functional analysis, and more specifically approximation theory. He is known internationally for his work on “greedy algorithms” which lead to highly economical numerical approximations of complex nonlinear mathematical models. His techniques, often referred to as “Temlyakov inequalities,” are applied to diverse problems in information theory, signal processing, learning theory, image analysis, data compression, and statistical inference, and have had a significant impact on other areas of research in the mathematical sciences. His research has been supported by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Defense. His research has resulted in over 90 papers, two books, and more than 60 invited conference presentations. Vladimir, congratulations.

The USC Educational Foundation Outstanding Service Award goes to John Logue from the University of South Carolina at Sumter. John Logue is a professor of biology. He has served the University for 34 years. In addition to his commitment to science education in the public schools and in various state communities, John is a stalwart of the University's faculty governance system. In just this year alone, John serves as Chair of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate and as a key member of the Faculty-Board of Trustees Liaison Committee, the Provost's Academic Advisory Council, the Long Range Planning Committee, the Computer Advisory Committee, and the Palmetto College Task Force. I have worked very closely with John since I’ve been Provost, and he has been incredibly valuable to me in terms of alerting me to various concerns on the Regional Campuses. Thank you and congratulations.

The Carolina Trustee Professorship is a professorship that is in many cases termed a “best all-around” or “most valuable player” professorship. The person needs to be outstanding in all areas: teaching, research, and service to the university. This year’s Carolina Trustee Professorship goes to Chaden Djalali in the Department of Physics and Astronomy. Chaden joined the University of South Carolina as an assistant professor in 1989. He was promoted to Full Professor in 1996. He truly excels in all three areas of teaching, research, and service; and is only one of six active faculty members who has won both of the university's top awards for teaching and research. In teaching he has won the AMOCO Award, the highest faculty honor at our university. In research, he has published nearly 175 papers, has received outside funding totaling more than five million dollars, and has won the university's Educational Foundation Research Award. In service he has served on the Faculty Grievance Committee and the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, and has chaired the most complex faculty committee on campus: the
University Committee on Tenure and Promotion. Truly a most valuable player. Congratulations.

There are four Michael J. Mungo undergraduate teaching awards that are being awarded this year and if I can ask all of them to come forward and let me then say something about them. Could I ask Ward Briggs, Art Cohen, Jed Lyons and David Reisman to come forward?

Let me start with Ward Briggs. Ward is Carolina Distinguished Professor of Classics and Louise Fry Scudder Professor of Humanities. He has taught at USC since 1973 and has won the Educational Foundation Award for Research and a Mortarboard Award for teaching. His chief scholarly interest is the History of American Classical Scholarship, and his favorite teaching experience is introducing students to Virgil, his favorite poet. Congratulations, Ward.

Art Cohen is a Professor of Geological Sciences and Marine Sciences. He joined our faculty in 1975. Since arriving here, he has published over 200 scientific papers and books and has won numerous national awards for research and service, including the Geological Society of America's Distinguished Service Award. At USC, he has taught courses taken by more than 4,500 students at all levels. Art, congratulations.

Jed Lyons is an Associate Professor in the Department of Mechanical Engineering. His passions are to teach engineering laboratory courses and to conduct educational research. He is the Chair of the national Mechanical Engineering Division of the American Society for Engineering Education. This year, he was invited by Taiwan's Ministry of Education to lead workshop sessions on educational assessment and quality building for Taiwan's engineering colleges. Jed, congratulations.

David Reisman is an associate professor in the Department of Biological Sciences and joined our faculty in 1991. His research deals with the molecular biology of cancer. He teaches courses in Molecular Biology and Human Molecular Genetics. In 2000, David was the recipient of the College of Science and Mathematics Outstanding Undergraduate Advisor Award. David, congratulations. Thank you very much.

The Michael J. Mungo Graduate Teaching Awards this year go to Christy Friend, Ted Moore, and Dan Reger. If you will come forward please.

Christy Friend received her Ph.D. from the University of Texas at Austin in 1997. She came to the University in 1998, where she is currently Assistant Professor of English and Associate Director of the First-Year English Program. She directs the Split P Soup: Poetry for the Community project and serves as a faculty affiliate of the Women's Studies Program and the School of the Environment. Christy, congratulations.

Ted Moore is the Berlinberg Distinguished Professor in the Moore School of Business, and is actively involved in the International MBA program, IMBA, formerly the MIBS program, as well as the Ph.D. programs in Finance and International Finance. He

Dan Reger is a Carolina Distinguished Professor of Chemistry and Chair of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. Particularly notable in regard to this award with Dan is that in addition to his graduate student teaching in the classroom, he has an outstanding record of mentoring graduate students in his research laboratories. All but one of the 29 graduate students who have worked in his laboratories have received or are currently working toward the Ph.D. degree. A total of 146 research papers have been published working with these students. Congratulations, Dan.

The last award is truly the University’s highest award. It is the AMOCO Outstanding Teaching Award and I’d like to ask Vince Van Brunt from the College of Engineering and Information Technology to come forward. This award is considered the highest honor for teaching on this campus for a faculty member, and is given annually to a truly exceptional teacher. I’m very proud and happy that it is Vince Van Brunt. He’s been a good friend for a long time. Vince is Professor of Chemical Engineering. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Tennessee in 1974. He is recognized by his students and peers for creating a rigorous course on safety in chemical engineering and technology environments. He is also renowned campus-wide for the way he uses art in his engineering classes and for his willingness to help the students in the lab, even if the sessions last into the early morning hours. I had the chance, one of the things I really enjoy doing is letting people know that they won the AMOCO Award. And so, I went to Vince’s class and he didn’t know that I was coming so I just walked into the class and said, “I need to stop this class.” And everybody looked at me like what’s going on. And I said, “You know, one of the jobs of the provost is to give bad news.” And everybody looked really worried at that point and Vince was standing there. And I said, “But today, I get to give good news.” And so I told the class that Vince had won and he really received a very heartfelt ovation. It was very clear that you had great respect from your students so congratulations.

Mr. President, that concludes my report.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Thank you very much, Mr. Provost.

VI. Old Business.
None

VII. New Business
None

VIII. Good of the Order
None
IX. Adjournment

PRESIDENT SORENSEN - I offer to receive a motion for adjournment. Second? All in favor, say aye. The general faculty meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.