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A resolution adopted by the Faculty Senate on February 20, 2002, by a vote of 68-9, expresses the view of the Senate that the Strategic Directions and Initiatives (SDI) Report should not be accepted as a final recommendation, but only as a starting point for further discussion of the challenges and opportunities facing this University. The Faculty Senate resolution urges the trustees and administration, under the leadership of the new president, to undertake an in-depth discussion of the long-range needs of the University before implementing the major recommendations of the SDI Report. This resolution reflects several primary areas of overriding faculty concern.

First, the faculty is concerned that the SDI Report focuses upon certain specific areas to receive additional support, but does not address the likely ramifications of reallocation decisions upon other areas of the academic program. The SDI Report does not provide sufficient data or specificity to show how reallocation decisions are likely to affect units that are unable to generate high revenues. In its current form, the SDI Report provides an insufficient basis upon which to make strategic planning decisions critical to the future direction of the University’s academic programs. Sweeping changes, which will affect the long-range direction of the University’s academic programs, should be made only after a new president has been selected and has had an opportunity to participate in a strategic planning process.

Second, confidence in specific SDI recommendations is hindered by the form of the SDI Report, which often contains brief, conclusory justification paragraphs for its recommendations, omitting underlying facts and assumptions. Faculty senators identified a variety of concerns

---

1 A notable example is the recommendation to move responsibility for ROTC programs to the office of the Dean for Undergraduate Affairs. The first sentence of the “Background” section identifies ROTC as a military officer training program. The remaining sentence concludes only that “ROTC would be placed more logically with the Office of the Associate Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Affairs.” The recommendation follows, which is to “Move the University ROTC Departments currently located within the College of Liberal Arts to the Office of the Associate Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Affairs.” A one sentence “Justification” completes the
regarding whether particular recommendations will, in fact, have their intended salutary effect. However, the Senate meetings provided only enough time to raise these issues, and there has been no opportunity for the University community to consider them thoughtfully. That in-depth evaluation needs to take place, and the concerns raised in that process need to be addressed prior to implementation.

Third, the faculty is concerned that the SDI Report reflects a planning environment focused heavily upon revenue enhancements. As a result, the risk arises that the fiscal impacts of various programs and scholarly activities may be unduly weighted when making planning decisions. When revenue production or potential becomes the primary justification for academic decisions, other more suitable measures of quality may eventually be disregarded, to the detriment, rather than the benefit, of the long-term academic quality of the University.

This document attempts to summarize these concerns of the faculty as expressed during Faculty Senate discussions of the SDI Report. Also provided are a copy of the full Faculty Senate Resolution as adopted, with more than 40 faculty sponsors; full transcripts of the Faculty Senate discussions; and written comments submitted by faculty members for inclusion in this response.

1. Need for Further Strategic Planning; Timing.

The SDI Report sets forth a series of recommended changes that would create a new budgeting process, reorganize certain academic colleges, and establish selected spending priorities. As recognized by both the Faculty Senate and by members of the Washington Advisory Group at the spring retreat of the Board of Trustees, however, the SDI Report does not set forth a comprehensive strategic vision of the future University. The SDI Report considers only a part of the overall planning picture and does not adequately address many important questions about the impact of these proposed changes on the overall quality of the University’s academic program.

The Faculty Senate resolution recognizes the usefulness of the SDI Report as a first step in identifying possible sources of increased University revenue and as an initial consideration of ways in which resources might be allocated to promote growth of certain aspects of the University. The resolution also makes clear, however, that the Faculty Senate does not believe that the SDI Report sets forth a sufficiently complete strategic framework upon which to make final implementation decisions.

Specifically, the SDI Report recommends that existing resources be invested or reallocated to strengthen particular programs and to create new revenues through enhanced grant funding. The discussion, repeating the conclusion that “[t]hese units are better suited administratively to the dean for Undergraduate Affairs.” There is no other discussion of that recommendation.
sole focus of the SDI Report, however, is upon the impact of reallocation upon the programs benefitting from it. The SDI Report offers little, if any, analysis of the likely short-term or long-term impact of these reallocation decisions on programs that receive no revenue enhancement or from which resources are taken. Although some units apparently would receive reduced appropriations in the immediate future in order to redirect those assets toward investment in other, more-favored programs, the SDI Report does not describe how those cuts might be distributed among the less-favored academic units, nor does it identify criteria for reallocation decisions. These uncertainties have created significant worry among academic units that are not identified in the SDI Report as likely recipients of reallocated money.

Nor does the SDI Report discuss how future allocation decisions should be made if new revenues become available. During the Faculty Senate discussions, the Provost indicated that, as colleges increase their revenues through entrepreneurial activities, those revenues would not be taken from that college. Other units could realize a benefit from those increased revenues, however, because state appropriations could be taken from otherwise self-sufficient units and redirected to units that are not self-supporting. As a unit increases its non-appropriated revenue, therefore, it might receive a smaller share of appropriated funding.

The Provost’s oral clarification as to the means by which funds could be reallocated is important. It raises a question, however, as to whether the reallocation of appropriated dollars away from the more entrepreneurial units would dilute their entrepreneurial incentive. Other fundamental questions about reallocation also remain unanswered. To what extent, for example, will additional revenues continue to be reinvested in the same areas of the University targeted as growth areas in the SDI Report and to what extent will increased revenues be used to restore support of academic programs that may have been forced to sacrifice for the initial investment?

Answers to these questions cannot be reliably given until a more complete strategic vision of the long-range university is created. Strategic decisions must be made as to whether “cathedrals of excellence” will be built ever higher, at the expense of broader quality, or whether there will come a point at which revenues can be more broadly invested to protect the comprehensive nature of the University.\(^2\) A strategic decision as to which units will be closed or allowed to shrink in size or quality, as others grow, should be made in the context of a more complete strategic vision that clearly defines not only the recipients of additional funds, but also the intended areas of cuts. Until that vision is clarified, all units, other than those identified specifically for growth, suffer from the uncertainty of their future.

Major shifts in university organization and academic emphasis can be implemented

\(^2\) Another issue raised by the faculty is whether a whole college is indeed a “cornerstone” or “cathedral of excellence.” Specifically, will all units of the College of Liberal Arts, College of Math and Science, Moore School of Business, and College of Engineering be viewed as cathedrals, or will only some departments be favored? Can a program be treated as a cathedral, even if not within a college designated as such?
effectively only after adequate strategic planning is completed. A critical aspect of that strategic planning process must be to identify not only the opportunities outlined in the SDI Report, but the impact that funding of those opportunities will have upon other parts of the University. Given the pending change of university administrations, it is critical, in the Faculty Senate’s view, that the new president participate fully in this strategic planning process.

2. Need to Solicit Greater Input on Specific Proposals.

In addition to the strategic questions outlined above, other concerns have been raised as to the justifications for certain assumptions of the SDI Report, particularly with regard to the expected benefits of certain reorganizations. Prior to issuance of the SDI Report, public meetings were held to which faculty and students were invited. At those meetings, the broad objectives of the Committee were described and faculty were invited to ask questions. However, no specific proposed recommendations were put forth for public comment until the SDI Report was issued. Thus, other than at Faculty Senate meetings, there has been no meaningful attempt to gather broad faculty input regarding the merits of the proposed recommendations.

A. Reorganizations

Faculty senators from the School of Medicine submitted a written response to the SDI Report in which they expressed general agreement with the recommendation to reorganize the health sciences, but raised several important specific concerns (a full copy of their response is attached). For example, they noted that while “the real major source of funding and scholarly productivity in most medical schools in the United States is the clinical departments,” they believed that “the role of the clinical departments in the School of Medicine has been ignored in the SDI report.” They noted also that the recommendation to combine the basic science departments would put USC in line with only four medical schools in the nation, none of which is considered to be a desired peer institution. They also questioned the proposal to have a Vice President report to the Provost and were assured that this would not be included in the final recommendation. They further recommended, among other proposals, that “it should be the responsibility of the Vice President for Research to expand research funding from NIH and other federal agencies.”

Faculty senators from Art, Theatre, and Music questioned whether reorganization into a new College of Fine Arts, without a physical relocation of all faculty and studios to one site, would offer any real stimulus to cooperative scholarly work that is not already possible. Art History faculty noted that their scholarly work differs from performing arts. Theatre faculty expressed particular concern about being separated from film studies. Music faculty questioned whether music schools are strengthened when merged into broader colleges. Several faculty from these disciplines worried that their combination in an atmosphere of limited resources might create more competition than cooperation, as each discipline sought a share of a limited budget – especially if the largest discipline is designated as a school and the others are designated only as departments.

Although one foreign language faculty member expressed support for the merger of the
language departments in a written message to the Faculty Senate Chair, all of the other foreign language faculty who participated in the Faculty Senate discussions expressed concern, questioning whether top universities are moving toward similar consolidation of foreign language departments. Some faculty predicted that the merger would result in a dominance of the Romance Languages, with insufficient attention given to non-European languages. Faculty also suggested that the merger may have little positive impact upon scholarly cooperation among the language faculty, noting, for example, that the scholarly interests of faculty in the Oriental languages differ from those of faculty teaching European languages. A suggestion was offered that, to encourage interdisciplinary research, it would be better to reorganize the University into more area studies with languages as a component of an area study such as “Asian Studies.”

A faculty senator from Criminal Justice spoke generally in favor of a move into the College of Liberal Arts, but articulated several specific concerns, including the need for additional senior faculty and the need to keep a distinct curriculum and distinct degree which expressly reflects study in criminology. The Provost gave some verbal assurances that these concerns would be addressed. The Sociology Department urged that Criminal Justice become a separate department in Liberal Arts, rather than a part of their department, citing several concerns, including likely tensions over tenure and promotion standards following a merger.

The faculty representatives from Journalism and Mass Communications and Library and Information Sciences expressed comfort with the merger of their colleges and indicated that the faculty of both were moving ahead with merger plans.

**B. Value Centered Management**

Value Centered Management localizes many budgeting decisions at the college level, encouraging colleges to focus on revenues they can retain and to shift costs to other units if possible. This approach raises an issue regarding the method of funding inter-disciplinary programs, such as the Honors College. The Dean of the Honors College discussed briefly his perceptions of the potential impact upon that program of both the recommendation for growth and the proposed move to value centered management. He indicated that VCM had harmed the quality of the Honors College at the University of Indiana, although he acknowledged that other factors also had affected that situation. He added that, in his opinion, a significant increase in resources would be required to maintain the quality of the Honors College if the SDI recommendations are implemented. There is faculty concern, given the current quality of the Honors College program, that significant uncertainty exists regarding the impact of proposed changes on the Honors College. The potential for detrimental impact upon the Honors College must be fully considered and understood before any changes are implemented.

The faculty understands VCM to be a new budgeting tool, intended in concept to create incentives for each college to increase revenue by allowing each unit to retain revenue earned. By also allocating overhead costs to each unit, VCM may also provide a clearer picture of the actual cost per FTE of operating each college. In addition, VCM is intended to give colleges increased authority to make resource allocation decisions. The concept is not without potential problems,
however. Questions include how state appropriations and university overhead costs will be allocated among colleges and whether VCM will create undesirable incentives for colleges to implement or terminate programs and courses solely because of revenue implications. Many of these same uncertainties were acknowledged, in fact, by the SDI Committee. If VCM is implemented, active faculty involvement in the budgetary process, through the system of faculty governance, is critical to ensure that allocation decisions are made in a manner consistent with the best academic interests of the University.

C. Other Recommendations

Several faculty expressed grave concern that the SDI Report did not reflect properly the value to the University academic program of either the USC Press or the McKissick Museum. With regard to the Press, it was suggested that academic presses are traditionally subsidized in order to ensure that they are able to publish significant scholarship that is not otherwise marketable in the trade press. A February 22 article in the Chronicle of Higher Education responded to rumors at Northwestern University that the press might be closed because it loses money. The author argued that “[e]ven if Northwestern University Press received a subsidy of $1 million a year – which it doesn’t – it would be a small price to pay for a complete academic department.” Similar sentiments were expressed in the Faculty Senate with regard to the proposal to reduce subsidies of the USC Press.

The Faculty Admissions Committee expressed disagreement with a proposal to permit transfer into the University after 15 hours of education elsewhere. The committee concluded that two semesters of work are required to gain a fair indication of a potential transfer student’s ability to perform at acceptable levels. The committee concurred, with some dissent, with a proposal to abolish the Transition Year, although the committee believed the program to have been successful in fulfilling its purpose. Questions were also raised as to the impact of the admissions recommendations upon the University’s diversity.

The Faculty is on record as strongly supporting improvements in graduate assistant stipends, but senators from the College of Social Work expressed concern that the particular proposal of the SDI Report may affect their college adversely.

These are but a sampling of the comments made by Faculty Senators to specific proposals of the SDI Report. They are indicative of a need for additional discussion with those who best understand the particular areas of the University affected by the recommendations. Those discussions would enable a more complete understanding of the likely impact of the specific recommendations upon the overall academic quality of the University.

3. Concern that Quality Not be Measured Only by Revenue

A broad concern expressed by the faculty is the perception that the focus of the SDI Report
upon investment in revenue-producing programs is not balanced by an equal reaffirmation of non-revenue-producing programs. Of the 28 primary recommendations of the SDI Report, ten recommendations expressly include, within their justification, some aspect of enhancing University revenues. Of the 15 identified “Opportunities,” specifically refer to the external funding potential of the opportunity. Another major recommendation is to restructure the University budgeting process so as to facilitate resource reallocation. At least five other recommendations focus upon reallocating resources away from current uses toward specific areas of University development. The primary message of the SDI Report, as reflected in these proposals and reinforced by comments from members of the SDI Committee, is that the University must look increasingly to revenue from sources other than state appropriations and that the University must reallocate its current resources to strengthen particular areas.

The Faculty Senate supports efforts to better position the university for increased grant funding and recognizes the value of the SDI Report in identifying possible sources of enhanced support. Potential revenue enhancement, however, is not sufficient justification alone for fundamental changes in the emphasis or organization of the University academic program. Not

---

3 Specifically, recommendations with the following headings:
Create a College of Health Sciences
Enhance Scholarly Activities and Funded Research
Enhance Diversity Research and Scholarship
Restructure Graduate Student Assistantships
Create a College of Fine and Performing Arts
Refocus College of Education
Review Centers and Institutes
Reorganize Evening Classes
Review School of the Environment
Refocus USC Press

4 Opportunities that specifically refer to external funding include:
Continued Development of Reputable and Emerging Programs
South Carolina Public Health Research and Intervention
Child Development
Distance Education
Tourism and Hospitality Industry

5 The recommendations include those entitled:
Manage Enrollment and Enhance Scholarships
Expand the South Carolina Honors College
Reallocate Resources Within Colleges and Schools
Reallocate Indirect Cost Recovery
Adopt a Human Resources Alternative Work Plan

---
surprisingly, given the SDI Report’s emphasis upon building areas of the University that may provide new revenues and given the number of recommendations suggesting reallocation of existing resources to certain favored programs, the faculty is gravely concerned about the future quality of academic areas not favored in the SDI Report. It is critical to the long-range mission of the University of South Carolina and to the State of South Carolina that the University continue to offer to its students a comprehensive academic program with strength in a wide range of disciplines of the arts, humanities, and social and natural sciences at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional school level. The Faculty Senate has made clear its concern that, as efforts are made to improve the overall quality of the University, the future qualitative progress of University programs and activities must not be measured only in terms of the revenue that each program or activity creates.

Conclusion

If the university is to fulfill the promise of its motto, which is that “learning humanizes character and does not permit it to be cruel,” investments must be made in all fields of study that are critical to the broad liberal education of USC students, despite potentially low revenues associated with some of those programs. As a comprehensive university, USC also must be fully committed to the support of a broad range of faculty research and scholarly activities, valued for their contribution to the discovery, creation, and dissemination of knowledge, and not simply for the revenue that they may provide to the institution.

This summary of the Faculty Senate response is offered to the Board of Trustees and the President as information and as an expression of concern that the planning process fully engage all appropriate constituencies and the new president before sweeping changes are designed and implemented. The concerns expressed in this response are significant and widely held, as indicated by the vote of the Faculty Senate on its resolution.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. Wilcox
Chair, USC Faculty Senate
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RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Whereas, the Strategic Directions and Initiatives Committee has issued a report that recommends a series of profound changes in the structure, operation, and financial governance of the University, but which makes available little factual information in justification of many of its recommendations; and

Whereas, the SDI Report includes a number of proposals intended to encourage the development of new revenue, but does not attempt to set forth a more fully developed vision of the future University and leaves unanswered many important questions about the implementation of the recommendations; and

Whereas, the sole long-range objectives identified in the report are “to increase markedly the academic quality of the student body” as measured by entering test scores and “to increase dramatically research and scholarly productivity,” and notably absent from those objectives is any expressed goal for improvement in the teaching and service of the University, which are critical components of a “comprehensive” or “flagship” university; and

Whereas, it is the overriding concern of the Faculty Senate that financial considerations must not create a long-range planning environment in which the value of academic programs and of scholarly and research activities is measured predominantly in terms of the revenue that programs and activities bring to the University; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate is concerned that long-range plans must identify the core values to be honored and protected as the University continues to mature and must include express assurances of adequate support for the maintenance and strengthening of all programs that are fundamental to the comprehensive academic mission of the University, regardless of whether those programs are financially self-sufficient; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate believes it is critical to the long-range mission of the University of South Carolina that the University offer to its students a comprehensive academic program with strength in a wide range of disciplines of the arts, humanities, and social and natural sciences at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional school level; and

Whereas, as a comprehensive university, USC must be fully committed to the support of a broad range of faculty research and scholarly activities, which must be valued for their contribution to the discovery, creation, and dissemination of knowledge, and not simply for the revenue that they may provide to the institution; and

Whereas, in addition to the recommendations proposed by the SDI Report, there exists a need for a detailed plan for adequately assuring that sufficient resources will also be allocated to
the maintenance and improvement of the broader range of academic programs; and

    Whereas many of the changes proposed by the SDI Report are of such a fundamental nature in regards to the structure and budgeting of the University that it would be imprudent to proceed with full implementation of those proposals without first identifying clearly and expressly the values and qualities of the University that are to be honored and protected in the reallocation of resources; and

    Whereas, it is important that the next President of the University have the same freedom accorded to President Palms upon his arrival ten years ago to participate in and lead the process of defining the vision of the University;

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

    AND BE IT RESOLVED that the Chair and Secretary of the Faculty Senate are instructed to present this resolution to Dr. Palms and the Board of Trustees for their consideration.

Co-Sponsors:

    Gregory B. Adams - Law
    Shahroug Akhavi - Government and International Studies
    Charles Alber - Germanic, Slavic, and East Asian
    James R. Augustine - School of Medicine
    Nancy K. Brown - Social Work
    Mary Bange - Darla Moore School of Business
    John Brunswick - Thomas Cooper Library
    Lewis Burke - Law
    Brette Barclay Barron - University Libraries
    David Berube - Theatre, Speech and Dance
    Richard Clodfelter - Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management
    Richard Conant - Music
    Adrienne T. Cooper - Civil and Environmental Engineering
    Alma Creightorn - Thomas Cooper Library
    Craig W. Davis - School of Medicine
    Wanzer Drane - Public Health
    Peter Graham - Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management
    Karen Gray - Social Work
    Freeman G. Henry - French and Classics
    Leon Jackson - English
Robert A. Jacoby - Law
Judith Giblin James - English
Jeanette Jerrell - School of Medicine
Jim Knapp - Geological Sciences
Jessica Kross - History
Nancy Lane - French and Classics
Gary Luoma - Darla Moore School of Business
Charles R. Mack - Art History
Nawin Mishra - Biological Sciences
Lisle S. Mitchell - Geological Sciences
Bob Molyneux - Library and Information Science
Bob Nerbun - Physics/Sumter
Jan Opsomer - Philosophy
Ruth Riley - School of Medicine/Library
Phillip Rollinson - English
Jerel Rosati - Government and International Studies
Robert Skinder - Thomas Cooper Library
Ken Watkins - Public Health
Eldon D. Wedlock, Jr. - Law
Ran Wei - Journalism and Mass Communications
John Weidner - Chemical Engineering
Ernest L. Wiggins - Journalism and Mass Communications
Clyde Wilson - History
S. Robert Young - Obstetrics and Gynecology
From Charles R. Mack, Art History Division, Dept. of Art
Some Thoughts on the Comprehensive University & Flagship status:

Definition:
A comprehensive state university offers balance in disciplinary offerings, breadth in educational endeavors, and diversity in the constituency it serves. It is a “full service” institution responding to the fundamental requirement to preserve, create, and disseminate knowledge. While it may demonstrate particular strengths in certain areas, due to circumstances and faculty, it must attempt to strike a balance between the various fields of learning it encompasses be they in the sciences, social sciences, humanities, performing and fine arts, or in the more professionally oriented disciplines. Such an institution should provide not only a suitably challenging learning environment for both undergraduate— and graduate-level instruction but also offer opportunities for the non-traditional student through programs designed to meet their needs. Only a comprehensive university can aspire to state-wide flagship status, a title which can only be awarded through its performance over time and by outside consensus.

Further Explanation:
A state-supported comprehensive university must recognize its primary obligation to serve the citizen-student of the state as well as its function as a stimulus to the intellectual life and cultural and economic well-being of the state. The student body of a comprehensive university should reflect the diversity of the state’s population, while attempting to elevate its intellectual level though appropriately rigorous standards and academic leadership. While instruction remains at the core of a comprehensive university, it is certain that the most creative and stimulating learning environment can be found only when instructors are not only engaged in imparting knowledge but are actively involved in its creation. Thus the research component should play a vital role throughout the institution, motivating the student body and stimulating the faculty. Although it must be recognized that research comes in many forms and reflects the particular character of each discipline, the comprehensive university must encourage such demonstrations of intellectual creativity and productivity in an even-handed fashion addressing the particular needs of the individual disciplines. This third element of the task of a comprehensive university — that of the creation of knowledge — distinguishes those institutions ambitious for “flagship” status. Such a designation of primacy is however, only appropriate for institutions which meet the
companion criteria for preservation and dissemination of knowledge. Flagship status requires the institution to walk a fine line, balancing the required breadth of its disciplines and the focus of its attention. The Flagship designation within a state-supported system is only suited to a broad-based and truly comprehensive university.
Date: February 18, 2002

To: President Palms; Provost Odom; Members of the Board of Trustees; Members of the Faculty Senate; Members of the Faculty of the School of Medicine

From: Faculty Senators from the School of Medicine

Re: Response to the Report of the Strategic Directions and Initiatives Committee

I. Background

Shortly after the University of South Carolina Strategic Directions and Initiatives Committee (SDI Committee) made its report (http://www.sc.edu/provost/FinalSDI.pdf) public (January 10, 2002), faculty senators in the School of Medicine (SOM) were invited to meet with Dean Faulkner. SOM Faculty Senators then held open meetings with the basic science and clinical faculty members on the Richland and VA campuses. The SOM senators also met among themselves. What follows are the responses of the faculty senators from the SOM regarding issues in the SDI report that impact on the SOM.

II. Introduction

· The stated goal of the recommendations of the SDI Committee is to “establish USC Columbia as an efficient, nationally-respected, comprehensive research university within five years.”

· The faculty senators from the School of Medicine are strongly supportive of the stated goal of the SDI Committee to establish USC Columbia as an efficient, nationally-respected, comprehensive research university within five years.

· The objectives of the SDI Committee are to (1) increase dramatically research and scholarly productivity and (2) to increase markedly the academic quality of the student body.

· The faculty senators from the School of Medicine are strongly supportive of the SDI Committee’s objective to increase dramatically research and scholarly productivity. The reality of the situation is that the real major source of funding and scholarly productivity in most medical schools in the United States is the clinical departments. Unfortunately the role of the clinical departments in the School of Medicine has been ignored in the SDI report. The Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) investigated the distribution
of NIH awards among medical schools from 1986 to 1997, the differences in the patterns of distribution according to the medical school department, the academic degree held by the principal investigator and the awarding NIH institute. This study, published in the New England Journal of Medicine – January 2000 indicated that the proportion of research awards granted by the NIH to the 10 most research intensive medical schools increased from 24.6 to 27.1 percent from 1986-1997 while the 75 least intensive medical schools received proportionately fewer awards 24.3 to 21.8 percent. The 40 medical schools in the mid-range of research intensity remained constant. There are currently 125 U.S. medical schools. Seventy five percent of NIH research funds are awarded to the 40 schools with the most research activity. The increase in the proportion of awards concentrated in the 10 medical schools with the most research activity was greater among clinical departments than among basic science departments and greater among principal investigators with a M.D. than among those with a PhD. The authors of this study noted that many external factors may be hampering the ability of some medical schools to support research including the ability to recruit and retain clinical investigators from among the limited pool of physician researchers.

The nine clinical science departments in the SOM have 175 full-time faculty: 58 professors, 40 associate professors, 63 assistant professors and 14 instructors.

There are a total of 40 tenured clinical faculty in the SOM. In comparison, the AAMC (2000) reported there were an average of 690 clinical science faculty on average for all medical schools and a mean of 287 clinical faculty at the 7 other community based medical schools founded since 1970. Financial support for the SOM in FY 2000-2001 totaled $1.04 million dollars of which 25% came from the State of SC, 31% from clinical income, 28% from grants and contracts, 3% from tuition and fees and 13% from other sources. Approximately $17 million in grant support was received by the SOM in 2000-2001 in support of research, service, and training. Of this amount, $3.5 million was received from NIH by the basic science departments and $1.3 million by the clinical science departments. In 1999-2000 the grant dollars per basic science faculty member was $66,415 which ranked 3rd out of the eight community-based medical schools (for all U.S. medical schools the figure was $145,551 for basic science faculty). For the same year the grant dollars per clinical science faculty was $12,963, ranking the USCSM 4th of 8 in this category among community-based medical schools (for all U.S. medical schools the figure was $47,190 per clinical science faculty).
Because of pressures to teach medical students and provide patient care under the umbrella of managed care contracts, the number of clinical science faculty in the School of Medicine involved in research is not adequate, yet those that do participate are very experienced and have expertise in their specific fields. Unlike most medical schools, the USC SOM does not own its teaching hospital. This has a negative impact on clinical department finances, space and facilities for research. Clinical department finances are inadequate to stimulate and support research activities. Clinical department space and facilities are inadequate for current research activities. There is very little space available at the clinical campus for research. It is apparent from the AAMC report and the reality of the situation as it exists in the SOM, that for USC to dramatically increase the level of research and scholarly productivity in that area of the School of Medicine that has the best chance of competing for NIH dollars will require an enormous infusion of millions of dollars of new funding for clinical laboratory facilities, research infrastructure, new initiatives as well as the recruitment and retention of clinical investigators from among the limited pool nationally of physician researchers.

- We believe that a concerted effort should be made to increase markedly the academic quality of the student body including students in the School of Medicine. Unfortunately no specific mention was made in the SDI Committee’s report of increasing the academic quality of medical students. As a state supported institution we have been limited in the past to accepting applicants who are South Carolina residents or those with strong South Carolina ties. To increase markedly the quality of the student body in the School of Medicine within the five year framework of the SDI Committee’s goals would require accepting as many as a dozen out of state students with MCAT scores and undergraduate GPAs that are significantly higher than the average entering medical student who is a South Carolina resident.

III. Other Issues Impacting on the School of Medicine

- Create a College of Health Sciences (p. 9)

- We believe it makes good sense to create a College of Health Sciences to include the present Schools of Medicine and Public Health and the Colleges of Social
Work, Pharmacy and Nursing. This reorganization could lead to greater interaction among the different faculties, better efficiency of operation, additional cooperation in teaching and enhanced collaborative research. A broader and more enthusiastic vision in this regard would have been to locate the new College of Health Sciences on the present SOM campus with new facilities for faculty from public health, social work, pharmacy and nursing. The recent decision to locate the new School of Public Health building on Assembly Street reduces the probability that collaborations will increase from current levels. Some school of medicine senators believe that the creation of a College of Health Sciences will not achieve its purposes unless there is a true physical combination of the existing schools and colleges in one location (perhaps on the present School of Medicine campus) rather than a virtual college on paper.

- The SDI Committee recommends that each existing unit should be named a school and be headed by a dean. The deans should answer to a Vice President for Health Sciences who would report to the Provost. We have serious concerns about this cumbersome chain of command which would require the VP for Health Sciences to report to the Provost and introduce another layer of administrative bureaucracy between the deans and provost. This is not desirable and might make it difficult to recruit outstanding deans while giving them little power and influence on behalf of their school. Because of the nature of the relationship between the School of Medicine and its affiliated hospitals, it is imperative that the Vice President for Health Affairs have the same standing and authority as the CEO’s of those institutions when he or she must negotiate with them and with the President regarding affiliation agreements, concerns related to those agreements and matters pertaining to interactions between the School of Medicine and the hospitals. He or she must have full and direct access to the President of the University. The question remains whether USC can afford the very high salary and operating costs needed to attract an outstanding person in this position and staff that office.

- The SDI Committee would charge the Vice President for Health Sciences with expanding research funding from NIH and other federal biomedical and public health agencies and, toward that end, encourage research collaboration between USC and other institutions of higher education in the state, particularly the Medical University of South Carolina. We believe it should be the responsibility of the Vice President for Research
to expand research funding from NIH and other federal agencies. There are many collaborative efforts between USC and other state institutions which have been investigator initiated. It is a misconception to assume that such collaborations have not occurred. While the VP for Health Sciences may facilitate those efforts, his/her main function should be in developing and supporting research centers that excel thus bringing prestige to the College of Health Sciences.

The SDI Committee recommends combining the six basic science departments in the School of Medicine (the Departments of Biochemistry; Cell Biology and Neuroscience; Developmental Biology and Anatomy; Microbiology and Immunology; Pathology; and Pharmacology and Physiology) into one department. The SDI Committee seeks to measure the University against its peer and peer-aspirant institutions. Applying that principle to this recommendation leads us to conclude that combining the basic science departments into a single basic science department is a bad idea. Only three medical schools in the country have a single basic science department – the University of South Dakota, Mercer University, and the University of Missouri at Kansas City. In no way would we consider these three schools to be peer or peer-aspirant institutions. It should be noted for the record that the current five basic science departments have 34 full-time, tenure track faculty members. Thirty are tenured, and of these, 16 are professors, 13 associate professors, and 4 are assistant professors. There are also 10 faculty members in non-tenure track lines. The average size of basic science faculties in among all U.S. medical schools is 101 members. The size of the basic science faculty in the eight community based medical schools founded since 1970 is 39. It has been estimated that it takes about 25 FTEs to carry out the educational mission of the SOM in the basic sciences that would leave the equivalent of 17 FTEs available at the present time to carry out research. The School of Medicine has had for many months an internal committee, the SOM Research Strategic Planning Committee (Basic Science Unit) addressing the status of the current five basic science departments with the possibility of a three department model centered around research focus areas (Biochemistry is not a SOM basic science department. The SOM provides financial resources to the College of Science and Mathematics to support teaching Medical Biochemistry. It is our understanding that that relationship will remain as is in the future). The prevailing opinion among basic science researchers is that it would be a great boost to the research endeavors in the SOM basic science unit to have Medical Biochemistry as a sixth department physically located on the SOM campus. Members of the SOM Research Strategic Planning Committee (Basic Science Unit) believe that a three department model (with about 15 members in each
department) would have significant research and educational advantages to a one-departmental model as proposed by the SDI Committee. We look forward to the report and recommendations of the SOM Research Strategic Planning Committee on this matter.

3. The SDI Committee recommends that new basic science faculty appointments are to be funded from the allocated budget at no more than 9 months per year. It is expected that the faculty member will generate up to 3 months additional salary through extramural funding. More than 3 months of such salary from extramural funding is encouraged. Unfortunately this recommendation has already become a reality before the faculty in the School of Medicine has had a chance to voice their concerns on this matter. It should be noted that 115 of the 125 medical schools in the United States appoint faculty on a twelve month basis. This newly established policy may have a detrimental effect on our recruiting efforts as we try to compete against our peer and peer-aspirant institutions that have twelve month appointments. Perhaps more importantly is the possibility that those recruited to 9 month appointments who do become funded will leave the USC-SOM for institutions that have 12 month appointments. A final point is that investigators on the main campus who cannot supplement their salaries from grants can teach summer classes. Such opportunities do not exist at the School of Medicine during the summer. The SOM operates on a ten month calendar (August to May) for classes in the first two years. Thus any new hires will be unable to teach in both semesters. If they are paying themselves from external grants for June through August they cannot legally teach in August. This may hamper the teaching mission of the SOM in the future.

IV. Other Observations Regarding the SDI Report

· While the SDI report provides Goals and Objectives and some Strategies, there is little detail given in the report as to how the recommendations would be carried out.

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

· Perhaps most troubling of all is that the School of Medicine did not merit membership on the SDI Committee yet the School of Medicine was singled out among all the health sciences for school wide and departmental micromanagement.
The SDI report suggests a “Department of Biochemistry” exists in the School of Medicine something that should have been part of the school from the beginning but was not. The lack of a department of Biochemistry among the Basic Science departments has been a major set-back in the functioning of our school from a teaching and research perspective. The new proposal will not remedy this situation.

Last of all the new organization into a single College of Health Sciences may further separate our basic science departments from the clinical departments in the School of Medicine. This separation began a number of years ago with the establishment of separate promotion and tenure units which has had a positive impact on the retention of clinical faculty but a negative impact on collaboration and cooperation between the clinical and basic science units. As a result of pressures on our clinical faculty to teach and bring in revenue to the practice plan many newly hired clinical faculty are on a non-tenure track.

V. Conclusions

Having celebrated the 20th anniversary of the graduation of the charter medical class in 1981, the faculty senators from the SOM recognize that it is appropriate for the USCSM to move forward into a new phase in its development as a medical school focusing on research activity that maximizes the school’s potential. A research strategic planning process for the SOM is nearing completion. Much work must be done to insure the successful implementation of this new phase in the life of the SOM and the successful development of basic science and clinical science research areas. We look forward to that report and any additional resources that can be allocated to the SOM from the University administration to support research and scholarly activity.

Faculty Senators from the School of Medicine

James R. Augustine – Cell Biology and Neuroscience
Wayne Carver – Developmental Biology and Anatomy
Craig W. Davis – Pharmacology and Physiology
Abdul Ghaffar – Microbiology and Immunology
Paul R. Housley – Pharmacology and Physiology
Jeni Jerrell – Neuropsychiatry and Behavioral Science
Suzanne McDermott – Family and Preventive Medicine
Lucia A. Pirisi-Creek – Pathology
Ruth Riley – School of Medicine Library
Robert S. Young – Obstetrics/Gynecology
MEMORANDUM

To: Robert Wilcox, Chairperson, Faculty Senate

From: Michelle Mohr Carney, Ph.D. College of Social Work Senator
       Nancy Brown, Ph.D. College of Social Work Senator
       Karen Gray, Ph.D. College of Social Work Senator

Subject: SDI Report: Implications for the College of Social Work
Date: 05/30/02
cc: College of Social Work Faculty

The faculty of the College of Social Work respectfully requests the consideration of this response to the SDI Committee Report. The College of Social Work faculty has identified two recommendations in the Report that, if implemented as proposed, would have significant negative implications for our program – the plan for graduate assistantships, and the change in the administrative structure under the proposed "College of Health Science".

Graduate Assistantships

It is important for the University to recognize that the proposals for graduate assistantships do not fit the special situation of the College of Social Work, and that it is crucial to maintain graduate assistantships for our students as a way to provide financial assistance. In a state that has historically poor relationships between state institutions and the minority communities throughout the state, the College of Social Work has done an exceptional job of recruiting and retaining minority students. This has only been possible because of the current graduate assistantship structure. Although the College’s assistantships are minimal, these awards, accompanied by the tuition waivers, make it possible for many of our students to attend school who would not otherwise be able to do so. Without additional funds to support an increase in assistantships, the number of assistantships we award would be reduced significantly, leading to the loss of students and reducing our enrollment by devastating proportions.

Additionally, requiring a minimum graduate assistantship of greater than we now pay in order for a student to qualify for a tuition waiver would be damaging for the College. Currently we pay $1,500 per semester, which is equivalent to $100.00 per day – a seemingly fair compensation. Requiring organizations that pay external assistantships to include tuition payment would, in effect, wipe out most of our externally funded assistantships (72 for MSW and 6 for PhD).

Furthermore, agency directors have told our Director of Field Instruction, who arranges most of these externally funded assistantships, the same thing. The College’s field instructors are agency-based social workers that provide their services pro bono to the College of Social Work. This includes 235 field instructors, who oversee the work of students in their internships two days per week. If the University were to charge agencies tuition for graduate assistantships, it would be fair for them to charge the University for the field instruction services they provide.
Limiting assistantships would hurt our program in another way. Assistantships not only make it possible for MSW and PhD students to pursue graduate study, but these arrangements also meet other important needs of the College. Currently, the College of Social Work provides three distinct types of graduate assistantships. Graduate research assistants support faculty in their scholarly activities, enabling them to be more productive. Graduate teaching assistants (doctoral students) support faculty in their teaching efforts, enabling them to teach larger numbers of students more effectively. Finally, graduate staff assistants perform a number of administrative activities for the College that must otherwise be provided by paid staff at a significantly higher cost.

Additionally, it is important to recognize that the mission and needs of every unit at the University differ. Hence, one policy regarding assistantships cannot meet the needs of all units with equal effectiveness. Graduate assistantships should be viewed within the context of the University’s overall mission, not only in terms of the University’s “bottom line.” For example, if policies on graduate assistantships result in reducing the numbers of students in the College of Social Work, the College would not be able to fulfill its mission of providing professional social workers for the state and region. By educating fewer students our program would be less expensive, but less effective. Policies regarding graduate assistantships should be developed from the perspective of enhancing cost benefits, rather than simply reducing costs.

Finally, it is vital that the University recognizes that the Master of Social Work degree is a terminal professional degree, and in order to meet the needs of the operation of the College of Social Work, the current model employed by the College of Social Work needs to be recognized and supported.

College of Health Science Structure

The College of Social Work is supportive of the reorganization that would unite social work with other health related colleges and schools, however designating the new unit as a college appears to demote the current collegiate units to a departmentalized level. This reduced status, from a freestanding college to a sub-unit within a larger “college” could potentially jeopardize accreditation for our program and is contrary to the practice of other large universities who call such groups “centers” or “divisions”. The College of Social Work is therefore proposing that this new body be designated a Division of Health Sciences with a Vice President that reports directly to the President of the University. We would also recommend that the College of Social Work maintain a Dean, in status and title, who reports directly to the Vice President of Health Sciences, and is a member of the Council of Academic Deans.
Comments of Professor Margit Resch (Chair, Department of Germanic, Slavic, and East Asian Languages and Literatures).

5 February 2002

TO: President John Palms
    Provost Jerome Odom
    Members of the Board of Trustees
    Robert Wilcox, Chair, Faculty Senate

FROM: Margit Resch, Chair

RE: Merging Foreign Language Departments

Why is the Faculty Senate reviewing the SDI’s proposal to merge the foreign languages into one department? The faculty has no voice in this process. This was sadly obvious when Dean Stewart forbade a referendum on the issue—twice, and when she ordered the reunification although the foreign language faculty (over seventy members) is almost unanimously opposed to it. The merger is a fait accompli: the departmental bylaws are already devised, the chair will be appointed in a couple of weeks.

USC wants to enhance its research profile. Unfortunately, merging the foreign language departments contravenes this goal. There is not a single department of foreign languages in this country that has a scholarly reputation. For that reason, attempts to join departments at other schools have met with vehement resistance—see Stanford University.

We resist a merger because we do not believe that the goals stated by Dean Stewart and the SDI can or should be realized. How can “solidarity, collaboration, and increased productivity” be achieved by unhappy faculty members who are forced into one unit against their will and better judgment? Does anyone seriously believe that “more uniform standards” and “development of a common mission” are actually attainable in a department with fourteen different languages? Are such goals even desirable for a group whose hallmark is diversity? Do you seriously believe that a dozen study-abroad programs in seven different countries can be coordinated more efficiently in a large unit? How can faculty time be redirected “away from administration towards new efforts in teaching and research” when the new departmental bylaws specify more administrative duties than we currently have in all three departments combined?
It is ironic that the reasons for reunification are identical to the reasons for separating the faculty into three departments a dozen years ago: increased solidarity, collaboration, flexibility and productivity in teaching and research. We achieved just this since our separation, at least in my department. We have enjoyed working together, we were immensely productive with over 250 publications, two new minors, one new major, five new study-abroad programs, and much more. We have gained an international reputation. The separation has proven to be beneficial in every way.

A reunification will yield minimal savings, yet the human costs are tremendous. There are no academic benefits for faculty and students: why are we forced to merge?

Comments of Professor Paul Allen Miller (Director of Comparative Literature, Department of French and Classics)

Margit Resch's letter on the pending merger of the foreign language departments has recently come to my attention. It is inaccurate on a number of counts. Let me briefly try to set the record straight.

1. The departmental merger was not opposed by all. Indeed, a number of faculty members urged the dean to follow this course, myself included.

2. The bylaws were not imposed on the new department. They were drafted by a committee of six department members. They were then extensively amended and debated at two meetings of the full department. The final version was unanimously approved. Indeed, given that this is the only public vote on the matter, it would make better sense to say that the new department has the near unanimous approval of its members, rather than to claim the opposite, as Professor Resch does without any verifiable evidence.

3. Professor Resch is retiring at the end of this year and will not have to live in the new department.

Professor Resch has every right to express her opinion forcefully. I respect that. But please do not presume she speaks for us all.
Comment of Ernest L. Wiggins, Associate Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communications

Those of us in higher education instruction are involved in numerous enterprises, many, if not most, of them worthy and meaningful. We are engaged in teaching, research or creative exploits and service activities that we hope meet the needs and interests of our students, our state and our disciplines. I've come to realize lately that the main thing academics do, however, is talk. And the kind of talk we've been doing is anything but cheap. We talk about the quality of our students. We talk about being under-appreciated and misunderstood. We talk about the penurious legislators who won't fully fund higher education and the pinch that puts on our travel budgets so we can't attend conferences to talk with our colleagues from other institutions.

We have been talking about the administration's Strategic Directions and Initiatives proposal to reorganize the university to better fit expressed goals, specifically, a higher caliber of students and a marked increase in funded research. This would, it is argued, get important people at prestigious institutions talking about USC in more respectful terms. But, as with many things in life, I believe we need to talk about hidden costs. To improve the academic profile of the student body, admission standards must be raised and financial incentives for star students must be increased. So, on the one hand, income contributed by "average" students -- who, I would contend, are the bread and butter of public institutions -- would decrease while the expense of drawing and supporting higher caliber students would increase. This would be like the average Joe or Jane cutting back on the number of hours worked in a week at the same wage and then planning to build an extension on the house. All of which is sure to get the neighbors talking.
Currently, exceptions are made for specially talented students (for example, gifted athletes) and others who do not meet the minimum requirements but show promise. However, under the SDI proposal the Transition Year, which assists these students in preparing for full admission into a degree program, will be dissolved. Though I suspect the gifted football and basketball players with weak SAT scores and high school grades will be admitted into the university, the others served by Transition Year will not.

It might be that the Transition Year and current admission standards are not consistent with the administration's vision of a top-flight research institution, but they might be consistent with the will of the people of the state, who understand the purpose for standards but also expect their university to show compassion. The cost of funding four-year scholarships for star students, according to members of the SDI committee, would be covered by proceeds from government grants garnered through research. Though the size and amount of any kind of federal funding, especially in these times, cannot be accurately estimated, millions of dollars in multi-year grants from the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation and the Department of Defense, among other agencies, are awarded annually to researchers all over the country and USC would like a piece of that pie. This, I feel, is laudable.

But I also feel funded research assumes the scholar's inquiry matches the goals of the sponsoring agency, which, it is to be hoped, are benign if not beneficial. Beneficial or not, the funded researcher may no longer be an independent scientist in search of truth but a contracted player, for he who pays the fiddler calls the tune. Isn't it possible that when faced with pressures from the leaders of a financially strapped host institution, who are counting on research funding to offset some administrative and instructional costs, the formerly independent scientist might find his or her research agenda directed by expediency and not pure inquiry. How many would be willing to pay that cost? Shouldn't we be free to exercise this choice without fear of reprisal or dismissal for lack of "productive" scholarship?

While this might not be problematic for some, for others, who greatly value their independence as scholars, this might be too dear a price to pay.
Comments of Professor Steven P. Wilson (Chair, Department of Pharmacology and Physiology, School of Medicine).

The background statement on page 9 (Create a College of Health Sciences) contains a totally erroneous statement: "...the departmental divisions in the School of Medicine impede multidisciplinary research, particularly with the NIH." This statement is a best an assumption and at worst an outright falsehood. If the committee had cared to investigate this issue carefully by consulting with SOM faculty members, they would have learned that there are few barriers to multidisciplinary research here and none that relate to the organizational structure. The only barriers that exist are in basic-clinical collaborative research. These have mostly to do with geographical separation of the clinical and basic science departments and to the relative lack of research expertise in the clinical departments (a fact that flows from the legislative mandate that established the School of Medicine).

It is also instructive to note that the only remedy proposed to correct this situation is to merge the basic science departments (recommendation #3), where no geographic or other barriers exist (excluding the separate location of biochemistry, a fact that would not be remedied by a change of organization). Curiously, no mention of the clinical departments is made, despite the fact that grants from NIH for clinical research are often the major source (in dollars) of research support in most academic medical centers.

I recommend that the School of Medicine be charged to "promote group research activity". Leave the faculty and administration of the school to address "departmental consolidation or reorganization for the purposes of reducing administrative overhead and enhancing research and scholarly productivity", as noted on page 17 of the report.
Comments of Professor Jim O’Connor (Chair, Department of Theatre, Speech, and Dance).

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the SDI report during the Faculty Senate meeting on January 30.

I did not want to waste time by engaging in a disagreement that may well not concern that large body. It is important, however, to point out that the Department of Theatre, Speech & Dance is interested in its Bachelor students having the highest possible SAT scores rather than being an exception. Only through application of the highest possible standards for selection can we assure that we produce the best graduates.

We have adhered to these standards and this might be the reason why our students are in the Honors College, and one minor, in fact, received a Rhodes Scholarship this past year.

Theatre, Speech and Dance will be best served by recruiting and accepting the most academically advanced undergraduate students. To indicate other than this is to diminish the rigor of our disciplines.

Thank you for your time and attention
Comments of Professor Linda Lucas Walling (College of Library and Information Science)

Subject: Why should SC parents send their children to USC?

I was disappointed in the statements at Faculty Senate Wednesday on this subject. I think we really do need to be able to explain the importance of a truly comprehensive undergraduate education to the citizens of the state, not just to other academics. The following is a statement I came up with. I think it may express what we academics believe in terms that non-academics can relate to:

The world we live in and the world our children and grandchildren will live in is changing rapidly. The changes are not always changes we would choose. Regardless of the career path your child takes, he or she needs to understand how and why the changes are happening, what he or she thinks and believes about the changes, and how he or she can communicate those beliefs and influence changes to make a better world for future generations. Through an education that includes the study of literature and languages, music and art, history and economics, and all the other disciplines which make up what we refer to as the humanities and social sciences, our children and grandchildren can gain the knowledge and wisdom they need to be strong, effective, productive leaders in the future.
SPECIAL CALLED MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

To view the minutes of the following special called meetings, go to:
http://www.sc.edu/faculty/drafts.html

January 30, 2002
February 6, 2002
February 13, 2002