FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
March 6, 2002  

I.  Call to Order.  

CHAIR ROBERT WILCOX - This is the March 6th meeting of the Faculty Senate.  

II.  Correction and Approval of Minutes.  

CHAIR WILCOX - We have before you one set of minutes of our recent meetings. I will tell you that we have four sets of minutes that are in draft. The February 6th meeting is in front of you. The other minutes for January 30 and February 13 have been prepared, I think, they are now in a final draft form. They were not that way in time to circulate them to you. The minutes of our last meeting February 20 are also being finalized. The comments from people who spoke will not be back until the end of this week. Those should be ready by next week or so. What we will do, with those three meetings that you do not have in front of you, is we will try to get those available on the web site as draft minutes so that they are available before our next meeting. But we will actually approve them at our next meeting. Today we have in front of you the minutes from the February 6 meeting. Are there any additions or corrections to those minutes?  

PROFESSOR NANCY LANE (FREN) - There are at least two professors who are quoted in the minutes who are marked as absent. I should think that needs to be corrected.  

CHAIR WILCOX - Well, it depends upon what they said. Probably it is a problem of people just not having signed in, so I remind people, please do sign in if you are here so we can keep an accurate record. But if you will pass those along to Jeanna, we will make those changes on the attendance sheet as well. Other corrections or additions? Is there a motion to approve the minutes as prepared? All in favor aye. The minutes stand approved.  

Before we have the reports of committees, President Palms has indicated he needs to go smooth a donor in Atlanta. So we are going to let him move up and give his report to us first.  

III.  Report of Officer.  

PRESIDENT JOHN PALMS - I appreciate this. I know you voted a couple of meetings ago that both the President and the Provost would stay until the end. I have done that every time I have come, but I just really, really need to go first, so I can go to meet with somebody at 6 p.m. in Atlanta.  

This is a busy time of the year. I don’t have to tell you that with all the searches that are going on. The student searches as well. Bits of good news: a former athlete at Aiken, Roberto Hernandez has given USC Aiken $1million dollars for a baseball
stadium. Our alumni-athletes are also giving back, and we have to keep track of them a little better after they leave here.

The College of Journalism and Mass Communications received a $1.7 million contribution from Ifra, a German-based media organization. This gift is to build Newsplex, a newsroom with advanced news gathering and dissemination concepts for the new broad band digital world in which we live. I want to commend the Interim Dean Henry Price for his work on this effort. We had a wonderful kickoff with the Governor at ETV where Newsplex is going to be located.

Brandon Fornwalt, a senior in our Honors College, has been named by USA Today as a second team all USA College Academic Team. There are only 60 students out of 600 that are selected, 20 per team. It really is a great honor for Brandon and for us. It puts us again on the academic radar screen.

This week and next week is the budget process in the House. The number one priority we have in that process is the endowed chairs initiative from the lottery money. As for appropriations, we are trying desperately not to be cut at all. So far, we are kind of exempt from those cuts, although the Budget and Control Board will look at this year’s budget again in the later part of March. We are still expecting to have perhaps a cut of one percent or maybe one and a half percent, but we have been expecting that and so have all the college deans. And, I hope they will be able to respond to that. Another part of that budget is a million dollars for the Nanocenter. The state has already made this commitment. They have provided a million-dollar investment for two years, and it has yielded $20 million in grants. So, that $2 million has been very well invested.

Discussion on the SDI report continues. There have been no final decisions or recommendations made. I think the deans have concluded their discussions, and they have a document that they have sent me. We had a joint retreat last weekend with five major boards including the Educational Foundation, the Business Partnership Foundation, the Development Foundation, and the Research Foundation. We had fertile discussions with Jerry Odom and Rick Kelly going over both the academic aspects and financial implications of the report. Good discussions with more than 100 people there. Everybody had a chance to have an input. The WAG had their opportunity to make comments about it. And, now the aspects of the report dealing with different trustee committees are being sent to those committees. I will be in discussion with them and at the conclusion of those discussions we will make recommendations that will then go to the entire Board. I am very pleased with the civility with which this process was formulated and how it has been committed to, and I think this is the way to go about doing it. I am in accord with much of what is in there but still want to hear the rest of the board’s input and any other input you have. There is still a chance to send those to me before my final recommendations are made.

On the student recruiting we are at about 11,000 applications for the 3,000-student freshman class. I had the privilege of calling 30 of the Carolina Scholar Finalists here in the last week and 30 of the McNair Scholar Finalists. I didn’t see many SAT’s in that
group below 1,500, GPA of 4.5 and 4.6. Advanced classes and weighted GPA’s in high schools have given people all kinds of opportunities to go beyond a 4.0. We ought to be successful. I think these are the best crop of students that we have recruited for those scholarships. And, with the Palmetto Fellows, Life Scholarships and the other scholarship monies, we should continue to be successful in recruiting outstanding students. When I call them, I say, “Congratulations, you have been selected as Carolina Scholar or a McNair Scholar.” And I hear, “Oh wonderful, wonderful.” Then I say, “I know that you have just had wonderful success and have many opportunities. Where else are you applying?” And, I usually get the same half dozen or so names: Duke, Georgetown, Virginia, Chapel Hill, Vanderbilt, and Emory. At USC, we look at what they are interested in. I usually put a note on each student profile after I call, such as “Have the English Department call, have History call, have Ralph White call....” We need your help in closing, in getting these students to matriculate at Carolina. I’ll be happy to almost close out admissions because we have so many applications, but we are still looking for outstanding students. I want to complement the Admissions Office for handling the volume of applications so well.

Jerry and I have been reading promotion and tenure files. As I prepare to make my last set of recommendations to the Board of Trustees in their May meeting, I can tell you that it is the best set of files that I have read since I have been here. There are many, many files that have unanimous recommendations from the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions, outstanding letters from the outside. You should be very proud of bringing in the faculty you have brought in here in the last five or six years, their progress in the last seven years, and the credentials they have. Just very, very outstanding. I know that is a difficult task for you in your departments. You didn’t go into higher education to evaluate peers, write letters of recommendation, and to vote against or for friends. Thank you for participating in this process. As you well know, if you didn’t do this, somebody else would do it for you and may be not even in the university. This process has withstood the test of a lot of law suits in front of many judges throughout the country, and I think this is still the best way to go about evaluating our peers.

A word about the central administration's response to the budget difficulties in the last year or so, including this year. As you know the first priority is always to protect the academic mission. We have many visiting teams come in and tell us we are still under funding people from the physical plant, we are still not funding property improvements in the right way. But, we emphasize the academic mission. And, this emphasis has been very, very clear, starting in 1993 when we reallocated about $1.7 million away from administrative needs to academic needs. The university responded to the November mid-year 01-02 cut with a variety of measures including withdrawing funds from institutional core administration again ($2 million). We cut 1.5% from all administrative departmental budgets, with the exception of law enforcement and safety. The academic units sustained cuts ranging from .5 percent to 1.5 percent. Liberal Arts, Business, Science and Math, and Engineering sustained a half-percent cut. Education and Music experienced a one-percent cut and the other seven colleges sustained 1.5-percent cut. Since 1998-1999, 94 percent of all hires in the university have been in academic units.
94 percent of all new hires. We have 148 vacancies in the central administration (including the Office of the President, the Board of Trustees, the Business and Finance, Development, and Human Resources), and, they may not be filled because of strategic planning or budget constraints. During fiscal year 2001 and 2002, we did institute a hiring freeze for all units, with exceptions only for “mission critical positions,” mainly in the academic but some in non-academic. We issued a caution to all departments about equipment purchases and travel expenditures. And, actually the President’s Office is down four positions. So, it has been a very difficult time for all of us.

It doesn’t look like we are going to get major increases in the recurring budget for next year, but I will be very pleased if we do not get cut. The Ways and Means Committee is taking up the State’s budget here today, tomorrow and next week. The Endowed Chairs Program still has very good support, not as good in the Senate as we had hoped but it has strong support from Bobby Harrell in Ways and Means, and from David Wilkins. Typically, in the egalitarian way that South Carolina operates, a very good program comes along for endowed chairs and centers of excellence that is going to lift three research universities. Then, people start to talk about it and everybody wants some of it. Lots of lobbying efforts are going on to get a share of the lottery monies: the technical schools, somebody wants school buses, and somebody else wants technology at four-year campuses. We have an excellent chance of getting between $20 and $30 million a year for the next five years. This would total $150 million to be matched by fundraising of another $150 million, resulting in $300 million for the three research universities for endowed chairs in the development of centers of excellence. That would be a tremendous statement from this state as we are transforming ourselves from a manufacturing and tourist economy into a more information-based economy. Business people are some very strong supporters of this effort. The State’s Chamber of Commerce has been very supportive of this. The Governor was also supportive and bipartisan when announcing this effort; we had both the former Republican Governor and the Democrat Governor there at that announcement. The Governor’s technical transition team, led by Harry Lightsey, president of Bell South, and USC Board member William Hubbard were working along with the other business people to promote this initiative, and the trustees have also promoted it. It is a wonderful initiative. If you want to get on the phone and do something, call your members of the House, particularly those on the Ways and Means Committee.

I’ll be glad to answer questions. I’ll be glad to come back at an appropriate time to have further discussions with you on any of the issues concerning the SDI. I appreciate your comments.

PROFESSOR CHARLES ALBER (GERM) - Can you give us any assurance that none of the proposals in the SDI report will go forward in the next 6 months without faculty approval?

PRESIDENT PALMS - No, I can’t do that. First of all, I am not the one who makes the final decision. I make recommendations to the Board of Trustees, and they have the final authority to make that decision. I believe that there is a necessity for many of those
recommendations. Budget realities are going to dictate strategic foci that have to be implemented. I think that is what our visiting committees are saying about accreditation. Jerry and I sat for an hour with the Law School Visiting Committee before they started here and then another hour and half when they left, and it is all about strategic planning. That school making priority judgements about what they want to do, reflecting that in budgets, and getting on with it. The recommendations we are getting from about every visiting committee looking at our colleges say we must do this. The Board of Trustees is committed to having a more substantial, detailed strategic plan backed up with a realistic budget and responding to the changing nature of what the world is requiring of us all. I think we are going to be very careful here. I am proud of the balanced curriculum we have had at this university. Everywhere I have been I have spoken about the balance of the applied performing arts as well as the appropriateness of having an important business school in this state and engineering school. And, we are comprehensive. I have heard all the debates here. I have sat here and listened to you, but I think we do have to adjust to the reality of a different university base budget. Some very difficult judgement calls will have to be made. In the end, it is about judgement. It is about potential. It is about performance. It is about what really defines the ideal of a great university. We are committed to real substance in Humanities and Social Sciences as well as the Sciences. But we also have to look at the needs of this state to support this endeavor. Much too a long an answer to very simply question.

PROFESSOR LANE (FREN) - Since we are talking about budget, I have a money question. I’d like to know how much it is costing to pressure wash the outside of the two Humanities buildings. And, however much that is, why is that being spent on the outside of the building when the inside of both buildings is a total disaster? With plumbing that doesn’t work, with wiring that is antiquated, and with a HVAC system that doesn’t work, and elevators that don’t work.

PRESIDENT PALMS - Well, that is an excellent question. I don’t have the answer. I don’t schedule the campus beautification work. I really can’t answer that for you. I just have to look and see why they are doing that. They still are painting buildings by the way because there is a schedule of painting. Remember we continue to have visitors on campus. Perhaps, instead of seeing a building that is all mildewed, browning, changing color and oxidizing, they will see a clean, washed building, and just maybe we’ll get two more students and another gift. This is judgement. I think the relative cost has something to do with that also. You know we are committed to a massive facilities master plan. We have received money for renovations. We are about $1 million or more, what Jerry - $150 million behind? $150 million behind - it is a priority. The trustees do not want us to abandon the renovation. They are pleased with the renovations that have taken place. We are committed to continuing that. It is one of the items of priority for the bond bill with the Legislature. They want to see a campus here that is a showcase, even if it has just taken more time than we are satisfied with.

PROFESSOR RANDY MACK (ART) - Back to the SDI just for a second. As you are evaluating the SDI report and changes for the future, are you also factoring in the
resolution of the Faculty Senate and the comments that were made in the several weeks of our considerations.

PRESIDENT PALMS - Absolutely.

PROFESSOR PHILIP ROLLINSON (ENGL) - You mentioned that the 5 groups got together and finally started discussing budgetary considerations, because our consideration of the SDI had no budgetary aspects at all.

PRESIDENT PALMS - The SDI is not a budget document.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - But the budget document is being….  

PRESIDENT PALMS - …but the SDI document itself is going to help us establish a strategic framework in a budgetary way. Decisions are made as we move ahead; this is a dynamic process. If you look at the money that was available last year, there was not that much new money available but there were key investments made in some essential areas. And, that is really what, in my opinion, Jerry has done over the years. There just hasn’t been much additional money, but some of the major colleges for a lot of reasons (based on accreditation needs, enrollment, and other factors) needed and required some infusion of additional resources. Now, there are some business people who would like to have a much more detailed and stringent kind of a budget every year. I would be opposed to that. I think we ought always to allow for flexibility and judgements on that. So, there is a lot of discussion on value-centered management, and it will continue.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - Aren’t we already doing it?

PRESIDENT PALMS - We are doing it but not in quite the formalized way that some people think ought to happen.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - The previous question was addressing that and some of the items in the SDI are already being implemented before anybody from the Board of Trustees has approved or disapproved at all. Is that not correct?

PRESIDENT PALMS - Some of these have been discussed over a period of years….  

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - ….being implemented right now, is that not correct?

PRESIDENT PALMS - Yes, that is correct. The world just didn’t stop because of SDI. There were still things going. We have hired deans, we have made commitments to deans, there are things in process. So, reasonable decisions are being made depending on the circumstances, etc. It is not a perfect world.

PROFESSOR KIRSTIN DOW (GEOG) - Can you give us an update on the status of the proposals to increase graduate student stipends?
PRESIDENT PALMS - The Dean of the Graduate School - do you want to do that Jerry?

PROVOST JEROME ODOM - It is one of the recommendations of the SDI Committee and we are waiting to see what the Board adopts and we will go from there. Clearly though we did recommend that that be a phased in process over 3 years if that recommendation is accepted. So we could do that over a period of time.

PRESIDENT PALMS - Thank you very much.

CHAIR WILCOX - Thank you Dr. Palms.

IV. Reports of Committees.

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

PROFESSOR WISE – Regional campuses had phone line problems at the last meeting. Because of these problems, the phone line for today’s meeting is: 888-531-0685. This is the number for the regional senators to make a comment at the meeting or to cast a vote. To record attendance at the meeting, which counts only if present while the meeting is in progress, call 777-6073.

I would encourage you to make nominations for senate committees by March 18. If you nominate someone, please check with that person for approval and either e-mail or call your nominations to the Senate Office.

CHAIR WILCOX - I should add the nominations will be open at the next meeting, but we would like particularly if you would let faculty know. We sent out a sheet some months ago asking for preferences, and we are just kind of trying to redo that a little bit verbally. If you would let people know that, if they have preferences, to just advise the Faculty Senate Office and we can take that into account. But you will also have a chance to make nominations from the floor at the next meeting as well. In light of some of the SDI discussion there may be a sense that some committee work may have changed and perhaps even taken on some increased importance. Some people who may have not been inclined to be involved might wish to be involved and we want to give them an opportunity. I would particularly point out that things like Curricula and Courses, which has been discussed, may have a significantly different role and may cause some people to think they need some representation on that committee. So please let us know if people are interested - advise your departments of that opportunity.

b. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Jeff Persels, Chair:

PROFESSOR PERSELS - We have 7 items for your consideration today. Attachment 1 pages 32 to 37. Item I. College of Education, there is a change in title, cross-listing, and prerequisites for EDSE 575 as well as deletions for EDSE 576, 577, and 578 contingent upon approval of EDSE 575.
CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved item I. College of Education - some changes in title, cross-listing, prerequisites and some deletions of courses. Discussion? We are ready for a vote? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. Item I is approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - Item II. College of Engineering and Information Technology, first a new course in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering - ECIV 524. And, then new courses from the Department of Mechanical Engineering - EMCH 553, 555, and 555L.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved the approval of Item II - a new course in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, and 3 new courses in the Department of Mechanical Engineering. Discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. Item II is approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - Item III. College of Liberal Arts - there are a large number of items. In the Department first a curriculum change, the Department of French and Classics a change in designator, title, and number for FREN 575. Also there is a correction here, I would like to move that if you look under D the change in designator, number and title that is the LATN 575 should be moved from the Latin American Studies Program (this is a Latin course) to the Department of French and Classics. C the Department of Germanic, Slavic East Asian Languages there is a change in designator, number, and title - GERM 575. Latin American Studies Program a new course LASP 440. Linguistics Program a new course LING 540. Department of Psychology a new course PSYC 525. Three new courses in the Department of Religious Studies RELG 592, 593, and 594. A new course in the Department of Spanish, Italian and Portuguese - SPAN 512 and a change in designator, number, cross-listing and title for SPAN 575. From the Department of Theatre, Speech and Dance a new course THEA 283 and from Women’s Studies a new course WOST 525 [=PSYC 525].

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved the approval of III found on pages 33 to 35 it is a change in curriculum in the Department of Art and then various other new courses, changes in designators and the like. With the one correction that the change in the second part of D should become the second part of B. Discussion?

PROFESSOR LANE (FREN) - I have a question on LASP 440. How is it that a 400 level course can be cross-listed with a 600 level course? Unless graduates are barred from the 600 level course?

PROFESSOR PERSELS - This was actually approved last year. This is a correction HIST 664 which is cross-listed was approved last year and is already in the catalog as cross-listed with LASP 440. The paper work for the LASP 440 got lost somewhere in cyberspace and it was only brought to my attention because LASP wants to offer that course. But it has already been approved and we are just following up on that.

PROFESSOR LANE - Does that make it right?
CHAIR WILCOX - It is creating what problem? Will you elaborate the problem a little bit?

PROFESSOR LANE - The problem is that an undergraduate course 440 which can be taken only for undergraduate credit by undergraduates is somehow cross-listed as the same course as the 600 level course. Which violates the SACS recommendations that we clearly distinguish between graduate level course work and undergraduate level course work. That is the problem.

PROFESSOR ANN KINGSOLVER (ANTH) - The Latin American Studies Program is not authorized to offer 500 or 600 level courses. So the standard practice has been to always cross-list those as 400-level courses.

PROFESSOR LANE - Why are you not authorized?

PROFESSOR KINGSOLVER - I don’t know the answer to that.

PROFESSOR LANE - Are undergraduate students barred from the HIST 600 level course?

PROFESSOR JESSICA KROSS (HIST) - I can answer that. We offer 600 level courses that are open to both upper division undergraduates and graduate students.

PROFESSOR LANE - That is the normal purpose of the 500 and 600 level courses -- correct. But a 400 level course is not a course that a graduate student can take. Presumably it is the same course.

PROFESSOR KROSS - My understanding is what Dr. Kingsolver suggested that Latin American Studies is not authorized to offer graduate level courses and that this has been done in fact before.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - So this is a trick to circumvent the restrictions, is that what you are saying?

PROFESSOR KROSS - No.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - It sure sounds like it.

PROFESSOR DAVID BERUBE - There is a real logic behind this. The person who is teaching the course for example, resides in the History department and offers the course as 664. Someone who is a Latin American Studies major can take that course. Also, the assumption you have here is that there should be a clear separation between graduate and undergraduate courses - which there clearly is not on this campus. There never has been especially with the 500 level proliferation. It really depends on which units are offering the course -- that are introducing the course. When someone in History is teaching it at
664, a Latin American Studies Program major/minor student can also take it. They are just getting a 400 number associated with it.

PROFESSOR MACK (ART) - The Graduate Council will require a distinction made in the course requirements for an undergraduate and for a graduate student. And, the distinction is made internally and in the course descriptions and the syllabus and in the administration of the course. I don’t really see personally a problem in that as long as those distinctions are made in how the different students are evaluated at particular levels.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (CSCE) - Could someone address the question of why it is regarded as essential to have the LASP 440 course and not simply the other courses. And, are there reasons why it needs to be an LASP course rather than a History or Women’s Studies course.

CHAIR WILCOX - Is there an answer to that question as to why it has to be an LASP course?

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - Would it not be offered?

PROFESSOR LANE - Well, there seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding of the principle of separation between undergraduate and graduate course work. It is in 500 level courses and 600 level courses, which both undergraduates and graduates students can take, that it is essential that the differential criteria be explicit in the syllabus. This is a critique that came directly out of the SACS reaccreditation visit. This does not mean that undergraduates taking a 400 level course can be taking the same course as graduate students who are taking it for graduate credit. That distinction applies solely to 500 and 600 level courses.

PROFESSOR JUDITH JAMES (ENGL) - I am curious as to why the Latin American Studies Program is prevented from offering the course at the 600 or 500 level? Other programs have graduate courses without having graduate degrees. There are plenty of precedents for allowing it.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - I don’t have an answer. I am only responding to what is already on the books. That the HIST 664 was approved by this body last year and is already in the bulletin and in that listing it says that HIST is cross-listed with LASP 440 which did not go through at the same time due to, I’m guessing, some sort of glitch. Our committee will be happy to consider this in any way you wish. We were only acting on what was already in the book.

PROFESSOR LANE - I would like to move that item D only be sent back to committee and the designation of LASP be changed to 640.

CHAIR WILCOX - Let’s sever the D from the rest of it then at this point and consider the rest of the proposal with that issue severed. Any other comments other than that issue?
PROFESSOR DANIEL FELDMAN (BADM) - I just have a question of clarification. With all these language departments potentially being merged, are we going to keep the same designators or are we going to go through the changes in designators again?

PROFESSOR PERSELS - It is my understanding the designators will remain the same. As they were before the programs were merged 11 years ago or 12.

CHAIR WILCOX - Other discussion other than subsection D? All in favor of the proposal excluding subsection D signify by saying aye. Opposed. Now there is a motion in regards to subsection D that it be referred back to the committee. I assume we need to take a vote like any other motion - is that correct? Yes. Any further discussion?

PROFESSOR PERSELS - May I ask for the committee to do what?

PROFESSOR LANE - For changing the designator of the LASP course to 640 or 540.

CHAIR WILCOX - To at least as fully as possible answer the concern of those that wonder why a graduate course is being offered at the 400 level. I am not sure what that is asking you to do. But what I think it needs is to go back to the History people and the Women’s Studies people and the Latin American Studies people and ask the question that was asked - “Why do we have 400 and 600 combinations?” And, see what answers we get.

PROFESSOR JAMES - I would like to suggest that I think this is what Nancy is suggesting that the real question is “Why LASP would be prevented from offering the course at the 500 or 600 level?”

CHAIR WILCOX - That in itself maybe a separate issue ultimately. If the answer is there is a reason, it may inform our decision to this, but it may be a separate issue. All in favor of the motion to refer that subsection D back to committee signify by saying aye. Opposed. You got it.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - Item IV. College of Nursing - on page 36 a number of deletions - NURS 302, 329, 424, 426, 450, 450L, 502, 524, 540, 550, and 604.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved item IV the deletion of a number of courses from the College of Nursing. Discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. Item IV is approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - Item V. School of Public Health, the Department of Health Promotion Education and Behavior a change in designator from HPRE to HPEB. I won’t list all the course - this has actually already been done.
CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved the approval of item V to ratify the changes in designators from HPRE to HPEB. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. Item V is approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - Item VI. College of Science and Mathematics deletions from the Department of Geological Sciences: GEOL 517, 522, 543, 544, 551, and 552. And, from Marine Science Program a deletion of MSCI 517.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved Item VI a variety of deletions in the Department of Geological Sciences and the Marine Science Program. We have a question.

PROFESSOR JAMES - I would like to inquire if this is micropaleontology rather than the way it is spelled?

PROFESSOR PERSELS - Have to do it going out - that is fine.

CHAIR WILCOX - We will be sure we check micropaleontology. Other discussion? All in favor of VI signify by saying aye. Opposed. Item VI is approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - Item VII. Experimental Course from the School of Music - MUSC 582X.

CHAIR WILCOX - Experimental course approval in the School of Music the committee has moved VII. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. That is approved.

c. University Athletics Advisory Committee, Professor Elaine Frank, Chair:

PROFESSOR FRANK - I want to report to you from Athletic Advisory. A lot of you know that our athletes are doing very well. We have two-thirds of our teams in the top 20 in the nation. Academically they are doing extremely well as well. It may surprise some of you to realize that they actually have a graduation rate that is higher than our general student body, that they graduate a higher percentage of their students than our general group. They continue to that quite a while. It speaks to our wonderful support system for athletes as well as our ability to attract academically and athletically talented students. This spring our grade point averages for athletes was essentially equivalent to the general student population. Some of the academic stars were women’s tennis with a 3.498 average, women’s swimming with 3.577, and women’s golf 3.429. And, the men are not far behind over a 3 point we have men’s golf, men’s swimming, and men’s tennis as well. As a matter-of-fact our lowest grade point average by team is 2.49 and that is for basketball and that is a significant improvement over several years ago. So we are quite pleased with all of them.

The other thing that you probably need to know is that we are involved in the NCAA re-certification and we are doing a self-study at this point. A lot of our faculty are
involved in that. I would also encourage any of you who have concerns about any of your student athletes to keep close contact. I know the academic advisors do call you and they are trying to work very closely to encourage and help these athletes to be successful in your classes.

PROFESSOR LEWIS BURKE (LAW) - What is the graduation of the football program?

PROFESSOR FRANK - The football program is 57% only second to men’s golf.

PROFESSOR BURKE - That is lower than it was under Coach Brad Scott.

PROFESSOR FRANK - Yes, but is it also equivalent to our general student population.

PROFESSOR JON SPENCER (RELG) - I have a question that perhaps you can answer. Some of my student athletes who are on scholarship apparently get their books free, but then they have to return them at the end of the semester. I assume that they are not able to write in the text, to underscore, to write notes to themselves so that they can……

PROFESSOR FRANK - Oh yes they are. They can even buy books at the end of the semester as well.

PROFESSOR SPENCER - They can actually buy books?

PROFESSOR FRANK - These are NCAA rules as to how much can be provided. The NCAA rules amazingly go down even to how much you can feed an athlete. I mean how much money can be spent on food. It is very well specified as to everything that has to be done for an athlete. But they can buy those books at the end of the semester.

PROFESSOR MACK (ART) - I just would like to comment that I have been rather pleased over the past few years about the efforts to academically track the student athletes in my classes. I appreciate receiving those pesky forms and am delighted to fill them out. It has been a real improvement - at least it appears to be an improvement.

PROFESSOR FRANK - It is an improvement and lot of attention is being spent on this. The professionals that are now serving with their academic advisors are quite skilled and working with our athletes that have special talents as well as special needs. I would encourage any of you who would like to take a look at the academic support center to come down and take a look at it. I have gone on a tour of it and I have been quite impressed. As well as the fact that we do have some other programs that if you have a student athlete in your class and you would like to know more about their team, come down get a tour and be involved in anything with their team, you can contact Tom Perry and he will help you do that. The athletic advisory program is really trying to work towards having more faculty/student athlete contact. And, these are really nice people. I have to say I have been more impressed (I was not an athlete myself) and I am more impressed every time I get involved with the athletes as to what they are actually doing at this university.
CHAIR WILCOX - Thank you for that report. In the interest of time are there any other standing committee reports that need to be made. If not, we will move on.

IV. Report of Secretary
None.

V. Unfinished Business

CHAIR WILCOX - I will report that final vote on the resolution at our last meeting was 68 to 9. There were two votes in favor of it that were received from the regional campuses, I believe total. And, I believe there were 44 co-sponsors of that resolution. That resolution with the co-sponsors names will be attached to a report that I am preparing. It will be finished this week and submitted to the President, to the Board of Trustees, and the Provost. It will be about an 8-page summary of our discussions. I drafted a reasonable final form that I have circulated to some of the committee chairs who were present for those discussions to ensure, through different perspectives, that it catches the tenor of the meetings. I am comfortable that it does and that report will be finalized this week. We will attach to that the resolution first and foremost, the minutes of the meetings, and also the comments that are being submitted in addition too. I am going to read out the list of people that I have comments from. In case any of you think you submitted comments to me, I need to follow up on them if I don’t have them. I have comments from Professor Mack (not surprisingly), I have comments from the School of Medicine, the College of Social Work, comments from Professor Resch, Professor Paul Allen Miller, Professor Wiggins, Professor Wilson in School of Medicine, Professor O’Connor, and Professor Walling. If anybody else had submitted comments that they intended to be included, or if any of you did not intend yours to be publicly included, please let me know because I will be sending that out this week.

The President mentioned the Board’s consideration of these matters. There will be a number of the issues, not all of them, that will be in front of Board committees the next couple of weeks. They have scheduled meetings beginning next week and the next two weeks after that. I think all of the reorganization issues and a number of the other issues that effect the academic part of the institution were referred to the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee. Professors Sabia, Feldman, and I sit as faculty representatives to that committee and we will attend those meetings. Some of the other issues like value-centered management was referred to the Executive Committee of the Board, I will attend that meeting as well to insure that they hear, as need be, the faculty perspective on those issues. The Board is well aware of the resolution you passed. It was as you know, printed in its entirety in the newspaper which was very beneficial in getting their attention. What I can tell you is that I think they have heard our voices. I think they have actually listened to some extent to our voices. I cannot assure you they will do what we asked them to do necessarily. But I think that is part of the process, being involved. I did have the sense in talking to individual trustees that we did present things in a manner that has been received at least. I am ambivalent as whether we will carry the day in terms
of some of the things we have asked them to do. I would be less than honest to tell you otherwise.

I did want to relate to you a couple of things from the Board retreat. It was not a broad ranging Board discussion of the report. The Board were largely there as audience members along with members of the various development boards and the like. They did receive a presentation Friday morning from the Provost and from Rick Kelly, the Vice President for Finance, on the SDI report. There was then a lengthy question and answer session. Toward the end of that session I gave my several minute summary of what I thought were some of the faculty perspectives on that report. One of the points of emphasis to begin was the idea that the faculty is as dedicated, if not more dedicated, than anyone else to the improvement of the university. Questions were raised about morale and recruitment and I said “That is what all this is about: morale and recruitment and the like.” A sense that the university is going somewhere is very important to the faculty as long as it is going upward. I then pointed out, however, there were concerns that we had -- particularly regarding the strategic vision and the importance of revenue and the impact that revenue concerns could have on making good quality decisions. I also pointed out some specific issues that needed to be analyzed in terms of the academic impact and not just in terms of revenue production. It was a relatively short little spiel from me, and they went on with a couple more questions and answers.

That afternoon, the Washington Advisory Group representatives spoke to the Board and, quite frankly, I thought said some things the Board needed to hear from a voice other than ours. One of the key things that they pointed out was that the SDI report was not a full strategic plan and it should not be perceived to be one. They pointed out that there was a lot of work still to be done by this university to develop a strategic plan -- which I think is one of the important messages the faculty was sending. The second thing I thought was very important (and it was discussed enough that there was a question about the term that was used) -- they put a slide on the board that said “Need for faculty buy in.” Then there was a question of what “buy in” meant or would it be better to say participation in the process or whatever. But I think they heard the message from the Washington Advisory Group, as well, that strategic planning is only going to work if the constituents of the university, and they specifically said faculty as the major constituency, but students also, and some external constituencies as well, they need to buy into the long-range plans. The trustees heard it from more than just us and I think that was encouraging. That is not to say, however, that the trustees are not going to be anxious to be able to say that the university is taking control of its financial situation, its planning situation and that we are moving forward. So I don’t know exactly how it is going to play out. But I do think they have heard some of the points we wanted raised and I think that was very important. So I wanted to share that with you. They will hear it again in my report to them which is going to them this week in writing.

PROFESSOR JEREL ROSATI (GINT) - When you are through with your report and you send it out, could you also send out copies to members of the Faculty Senate?
CHAIR WILCOX - I can. I will certainly at least make it electronically available. It is going to end up with the various comments and things being about 15 pages even without the minutes and all attached. But in some way I will make it electronically available to you. One of things we are working on in the Senate is improving our access to the web page so we can make these things more readily available to people.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON (ENGL) - Mr. Chairman I would like to thank you for the tremendous amount of work you have done on our behalf. And I think everybody here agrees the skill and tact that you have exercised. You have done a great job for us. (Applause.)

CHAIR WILCOX - This is not the time to applaud ourselves quite frankly. We are in the middle of a long process here. What has happened though is I think this body has established itself as a group that deserves to be listened to and I think that is important. How much influence that is going to come and go from time to time. We are not the decision makers on a lot of these that we might like to be on but I think we have done a good job of persuading some people that it is worthwhile to listen to us and that is the great achievement of this process.

Anything else on the SDI issues that we need to talk about today before we move on?

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON - President Palms mentioned that Board of Trustees was going to dole out the different pieces of the SDI report to different trustee committees. Do you have any listing of which pieces are going to go to which committees?

CHAIR WILCOX - I don’t have the listing with me, I don’t believe. If you look to the front of the SDI report you’ll see that there are about 11 or 12 of the recommendations (I suppose it is at the very beginning in the executive summary) that they pulled out. The Board took those and added the College of Criminal Justice to that group because they had been getting obviously interest in that. Those are the one they put out to committees so they didn’t even necessarily take the whole 28 recommendations. That is not say they aren’t going to come up in times in the discussion I can assure you, but formally they will take these. As I say most of the reorganization ones went to the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee. I remember value-centered management specifically went to the Executive Committee. I think the Honors College, for example, was Faculty Liaison. [Voice from audience adds that health science merger issues were referred to Health Affairs Committee]. It did, thank you, Health Sciences went to Health Affairs then.

PROFESSOR ALBER (GERM) - I am in possession of a letter dated February 22nd to the three departments of foreign languages from Susan Cutter, Chair of the Search Committee for a prospective chair of the newly created Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures. I have already distributed copies to members of the Senate and have extra copies if anyone cares to see them. Anyone? The letter calls for conclusion of the search process by the end of March, this despite the near unanimous disapproval of the faculty and the lack of referendum of any kind. The Dean has said that she is waiting
for approval of the Board of Trustees to formally constitute the new department, but she has made no attempt to provide for alternative leadership if the Board of Trustees fails to approve this provision of the SDI report or the SDI report in general. I would like to call for a poll of the Faculty Senate to determine if, in their minds, the Dean’s action is consistent with the Senate’s recent resolution regarding the SDI report.

CHAIR WILCOX - Could you sort of state that as a motion for us?

PROFESSOR ALBER - I move that we take a poll of the Faculty Senate to determine if, in their minds, the action of the Dean is consistent with the Senate’s recent resolution regarding the SDI report.

CHAIR WILCOX - Is there a second to that motion? If I interpret the motion it is a sense of the Senate resolution when you say to take a poll?

PROFESSOR ALBER - That is correct. A sense of the Senate resolution.

CHAIR WILCOX - Discussion on that?

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - Might it be better moved to that the sense of the Senate is that this action is not in the spirit of what we adopted? Then you can vote yes or no on it.

CHAIR WILCOX - You can offer that as a substitute motion if you wish.

PROFESSOR ALBER - That sounds find with me, perhaps more clearly put.

CHAIR WILCOX - Does the second accept that substitute? The motion would be that the Senate expressed its sense that this is inconsistent with the action of the resolution of the Senate.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON - I take it this is not a national search?

PROFESSOR ALBER - No, definitely not. As a matter of fact according to the grapevine I hear there is one candidate. There is one candidate - I’ll say no more.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - That’s okay, it’s the dean’s cousin.

CHAIR WILCOX - Discussion of the resolution? There being none, I will put it to a vote. All in favor of the resolution signify by saying aye. Opposed. It has been approved.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON - Could we take a vote count?

CHAIR WILCOX - There is a request for a show of hands. All in favor raise your hand please. Okay 25 in favor. Opposed raise your hand. The motion passes 25 to 3 with a number of abstentions. Would you like a count of abstentions? Okay all who abstained
VI. New Business

CHAIR WILCOX - We have a proposed resolution from Professor Rollinson.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - It is on the back of your agenda. Should I read that Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR WILCOX - I don’t know if we need to. You can read the resolution part and then discuss it.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - The resolution is “Resolved that future budget cuts be absorbed vertically first by the administration and staff as opposed to horizontally across the departments and faculty.”

CHAIR WILCOX - Is there a second to that motion?

PROFESSOR MACK (ART) - I'll second it.

CHAIR WILCOX - There is a second we are now available for discussion. Professor Rollinson would you like to lead off the discussion?

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - This is a simple very straightforward and extremely reasonable resolution that we are aware that the faculty has really taken just about all the budget cuts, certainly we have in my department, we have been frozen and frozen out. This is simply a resolution that recognizes that we urge that budget cuts (and I am sure they are going to be coming next year) be taken on a different group - be chopped up - rather than the faculty.

PROFESSOR DOW - I understood from President Palms’ comments that there were 143 administrative positions unfilled and that 96% of the recent hires had been faculty lines. Can you provide more background to interpret those statistics so I can better understand your resolution?

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - He also said subsequently that most of the cuts had come from the academic area, not just using my department which is a very large one. We are just a little bit understaffed. We have been frozen and had hiring freezes that is all this reflects. We have not had similar cuts in the administration. I think that is exciting. I hope all 143 of those positions never get filled. But my resolution is for the people who have suffered in the last 4 years, primarily the faculty.

CHAIR WILCOX - Let me ask the Provost, I think you have some numbers as to how the percentages were allocated this last time, if you would share that.
PROVOST ODOM - I would like to correct Professor Rollinson. Non-academic units took the full cut. Academic units were spread out. The President said they went from one-half percent up. They actually went from zero percent. The Honors College was not cut at all. The periodical’s portion of the Library budget was not cut at all. Liberal Arts, including English took a half percent cut, Business a half percent, Engineering a half percent, Science and Math a half percent, Education one percent, and Music one percent. Every other college and every other non-academic unit took a one and one-half percent cut. The Provost Office, the President’s Office, every office on campus took the one and one-half except for those colleges that took a half or zero or one. Every dean has been asked to please write to me if they have mission critical positions to fill. I have received a very large number of letters from deans saying, “I need to fill these positions.” In every case I have recommended approval to the President and in every case that I know of, the President has recommended approval as well. In fact the Chair of the English Department recently told me they had made some wonderful hires this year.

PROFESSOR ROSATI (GINT) - I am just curious if we take the example of the Office of the Provost what kind of areas would the cuts be made in? I guess what I am really getting at is I am wondering about some of the salaries and the possibility of there being some cuts in salaries as opposed to necessarily personnel completely.

PROVOST ODOM - The cuts were taken in the operating budget.

PROFESSOR DANIEL FELDMAN (BADM) - I am on the Budget Committee and apparently we are supposed to hear the dean’s plans for spending primarily during the month of April. It is my understanding that the Provost’s Office has asked the deans to come in and give some more hard-core, specific data on administrative overhead and so forth. I am wondering if it wouldn’t be more prudent to either have the Budget Committee look into this or at least to get more hard data before we vote. I am particularly concerned about the word “staff” because I don’t know whether we are going to disproportionally hit people who make very low salaries. I think there are a lot of sort of open questions at least with the broad proposal on the table.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - That is an extremely good point. With my second’s permission I withdraw the motion.

PROFESSOR MACK - I agree.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - Thank you so much. I think you are exactly right. We need to find out data and what is going on.

CHAIR WILCOX - The motion has been withdrawn. Other new business.

PROFESSOR ROLLINSON - This is even less flammable. Thank you Mr. Provost. This has been referred to me, this business here that I have. That I would like to refer to the Faculty Advisory Committee, Mr. Chairman, for a report back to us. It is some business from Professor Carol Carlisle to and from the University Library. It is very
unpleasant stuff and it relates to the status of retired and emeritus faculty. And, I request if I can to just give this material to the Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee and ask for a study of apparently retired faculty don’t get ID cards for example. Just to get some clarification from this material.

CHAIR WILCOX - Why you don’t just give me that. It may be that it goes to Welfare better than Advisory so let me just give it to the appropriate committee chair. If you just hand it, I’ll take that.

PROFESSOR MACK - Please act quickly before I retire.

CHAIR WILCOX - I’ll refer it at least before I retire. I will give this to the appropriate chair. Other new business.

VII. Report of Officer.

PROVOST JEROME ODOM - The most important topic I would like to announce is that with the consultation of the Dean of Undergraduate Affairs, Dean of the Graduate School, Director of Undergraduate Admission, University’s General Council, CHE, and SACS we plan in the fall to implement an electronic version of the Undergraduate Bulletin as well as the Graduate Bulletin. We will print a number of copies of these as well but we would like very much to be able to move to an electronic version. What we are proposing is that we would have an on line updateable bulletin of record with any additions and revisions that would take place during the year highlighted in red. And, we would also provide an on line archived bulletin which is a version that would be frozen every August 15th. That would be, of course, available for every single year - the archived version. If you have any comments about that, I would certainly appreciate you sending me those. This is much the way we have done the Faculty Manual, it is an on line version as well and we found that to be very useful. So we actually could save some money by doing most of the bulletins on line. As I said there will also be a hard copy for those would prefer a hard copy.

There are a number of dean searches underway right now. I won’t go through all of those. The one that is most important I think to the entire faculty we have invited 3 candidates to campus for Dean of Libraries and we are making available an hour for each of those to address the General Faculty. We will be publicizing that time and place and would appreciate the faculty of the entire university to take part in this interview process. It is a very important position as we all recognize. Other searches that are on going right now are Journalism and Mass Communications, Library and Information Science, Law, Social Work, and the University Press is also in the process of interviewing for a new director.

President Palms mentioned Brandon Fornwalt as a USA Today Second Team All American. As usual our students are now starting to rack up some nice honors. Brandon is a Carolina Scholar. Rachel Moyle who is a junior from Rockville, Maryland is a finalist in the Truman competition. I don’t see Senator Shelley Smith here but she has
worked tirelessly with the Truman students and Rachel will be a wonderful representative for us in the finals. I think I announced earlier that we had six Rotary Scholars and also four of the five students we nominated for Fulbrights have made it past the first round. That is the best we have ever done in that particular competition.

Finally I have said several times and I really hope that I mean it this time. We are so close to closing negotiations on a Child Development Center. I have the final contract on my desk. We just have a couple of things we need to iron out and I hope we can do that before Monday. As soon as we sign the contract, building permits will be applied for and hopefully we will see a building start to emerge on Wheat Street. One of the things that I need is faculty input into a design of the second floor, which is to be the research floor. There are a number of people who have indicated their interest in helping with that including people in Public Health, Music, Art, and in a number of other areas. But if you or any of your faculty are interested in being involved in that planning process, I would welcome your input to that. I’ll be happy to answer any questions.

PROFESSOR MACK - Can you give us any idea on the progress of the Presidential Search? We keep hearing rumors.

PROVOST ODOM - No, really I am not involved in that process. The last thing that I heard was the same thing that the Chairman heard at the retreat. That was a presentation by William Hubbard saying that they had about 200 applications. They are going through those and they are getting closer. I would hope that soon we will hear some announcement of finalists.

PROFESSOR ADRIENNE COOPER (ENGR) - Could you say a little bit more about the Child Development Center? I know there were concerns about the teachers and whether they would be grandfathered.

PROVOST ODOM - That is one of the things that we are going to have to come to some conclusion on pretty quickly. What we did is we looked at the entire staff. We took a 10 year time with the University as being a time when we would simply draw the line and say that people with 10 or more years would be members of the University family. With those less than 10, and it turns out when I say less than that, all of the other staff had less than 4 years service to the University. All of those people will be offered employment with Gateway and that is what we had to do. Now it would have been nice if everybody could have been a University employee. One of the problems that I am dealing with right now is that the Child Development Center is running in the red and last week the number was $197,000. By years end I project that we are going to be $250,000 in the red. I have to find that money some where and I don’t know where I am going to find it. We have to be able to break even with this center in the end. That has to happen. So there are a number of different things that will happen but I think that I have gone through all of the records with Gateway. I know that there are problems with their benefits package compared to our benefits package. Our benefits package is wonderful, believe it or not. But we simply had to say everybody with more than this number of years experience will
be employed by the University and everybody less will be offered employment by Gateway.

PROFESSOR COOPER - Did you get a sense of what impact that will have on the quality of the Child Development Center if you have significant percentage of the teachers as hourly employees? I may be wrong about that, but that was the understanding that the teachers have at this point.

PROVOST ODOM - Well, that is one of the things again that we are trying to iron out. They will not be hourly employees employed by Gateway. I met with 2 representatives from Gateway yesterday to go through that. There will not be an hourly situation.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON - I have two questions regarding the Child Development Center and the contract. Is NAEYC accreditation a part of the contract? And, last time you gave us a report you mentioned the possibility of ETV joining in. Is ETV part of the contract?

PROVOST ODOM - ETV is not part of the contract because they choose not to be. I do expect to hear fairly soon that ETV is going to close their center. However, the new director of Educational Television did not want to enter into a formal agreement with us. On your other question, accreditation is a part of the contract and if for any reason accreditation should be lost then we can terminate the contract. I think that is one of the most important things that we have going for us that we have to maintain.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON- I want to thank you for hard work you have done on behalf of the children’s center. I think your work is commendable. Unfortunately the business of its running in the red, I think, points out a greater challenge for us in the state which is that early childhood’s that are quality do cost money. And, I do see that as critical to the future of this state that we get a commitment to provide quality early childhood programs. But thank you so very much.

PROVOST ODOM - Thank you. (Applause.)

CHAIR WILCOX - Thank you Mr. Provost.

VIII. Good of the Order.

PROFESSOR RICHARD CONANT (MUSC) - Did we vote to have the President and Provost speak at the end? I don’t remember doing that.

CHAIR WILCOX - I did that. I was told last week I could even make our votes unanimous so I changed the agenda as well. If anybody feels strongly either way, that was a sense was to try that and they were willing to do it as they are generally here for the full meeting. You know which of them gets to stay if one of them is going to stay.
IX. Announcements.
None.

CHAIR WILCOX - I wish you all a good spring break and we stand adjourned until our April 3rd meeting.