I. Call to Order.

CHAIR ROBERT WILCOX - This is the May 2nd meeting. The President is going to try to make it back to be with us. He is not here at the moment so let me take the opportunity to say that if there is no objection from the body, we will prepare a resolution to be presented to the President at the summer meeting of the Senate, congratulating him on his retirement and thanking him for his service to the faculty and to the University. If there is no objection to that, we will proceed to draft an appropriate resolution.

II. Correction of Minutes.

CHAIR WILCOX - You have before you the minutes of the April 3, 2002 meeting. Are there any additions or corrections to those minutes? You will note that we had a quorum with excess of one at that meeting. Hearing none, is there a motion for their approval? All in favor. Any objection? They stand approved.

III. Reports of Committees.

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

PROFESSOR WISE - I would like to remind you that the summer Faculty Senate meeting will be Wednesday, June 26 at 3:30 p.m. in the Law School Auditorium. Thank you.

CHAIR WILCOX - And, if you are in town and available, please attempt to attend that meeting.

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

PROFESSOR PERSELS - We have six items for your consideration on pages 16 through 35 of the attachments. Item I. College of Engineering and Information Technology from the Department of Computer Science and Engineering two new courses. There is a correction to be made on the second course CSCE 582 in the description the words “Artificial Intelligence” should not be capitalized and the word “casual” as in “Probabilistic and casual modeling” should be changed to “causal modeling”. Caroline Eastman and I liked it better that way too but…. Then there are changes in prerequisites and a number of curriculum changes for the degree programs: Computer Science and Engineering - Degree Requirements, Bachelor of Science in Engineering - Major in Computer Engineering, Bachelor of Science - Major in Computer Information Systems, and Bachelor of Science in Computer Science a number of curriculum changes there.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved the adoption of item I. College of Engineering and Information Technology. New courses, changes in prerequisites and
changes in the curriculum. Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. They are approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - II. College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management, part A from the Department of Retailing first there is a curriculum change that runs for 2-1/2 pages and then on page 23 a new course RETL 562. Part B from the Department of Sport Management has 2 new courses SPTE 380 and SPTE 430. There is a correction to be made on the SPTE 430 strike the first sentence of the description: “Sport and entertainment possess unique challenges involved in marketing services the public.” That will just be struck and add to the second sentence: Basic principles required to promote a service marketing strategy “in sport and entertainment.” Then there are curriculum changes on subsequent pages from page 24, 25, to the top of page 26.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved the adoption of II. College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management changes in curriculum, some new courses, and again some changes in curriculum. Discussing of that proposal? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. II is approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - III. starting on page 26 from the College of Liberal Arts. A. Department of Art - change in title, prerequisite and description for ARTE 550. Change in title, number and description for ARTH 250 and a curriculum change for the Bachelor of Arts in Art History. There are a number of deletions of MART courses on page 27. Change in title for MART 321. Change in title, prerequisite and description for MART 341. Also a correction on the section “To:” part of MART 341 should be added in the crosslisting which was inadvertently left out it is the same. The MART 341 will still be crosslisted with MUSC 365. Change in title and description for MART 551 and 552. Then a curriculum change on page 28.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved III. A. Department of Art - which is still in the College of Liberal Arts - I thought you would note that. Any discussion to the changes under IIIA? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. They stand approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - IIIB starting on page 29 is approval of the new Comparative Literature Program. There are just a couple of stylistic changes on the proposed bulletin description under the Proposed column of the Overview about the 9th line down, a sentence beginning “Both major and minor ensure study in the student’s chosen foreign language…. a change has been suggested to: “Both the major and the minor ensure study in the student’s chosen foreign language.…”

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved IIIB for changes in the curriculum in the Comparative Literature Program. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. B is approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - IIIC starting on top of page 31 from the Department of Geography a change in curriculum and then on the bottom of page 32 a new course. The
title and hours were inadvertently left off of GEOG 570. The title of the course should read: Geography of Public Land and Water Policy. And, it is a 3 hour course.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved IIIC from the Department of Geography changes in curriculum and a new course. Discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. C is approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - IIID on top of page 33 from the Department of Government and International Studies a new course GINT 404 and three deletions. I think we can go on to IIIE from the Department of History a number of deletions and change in prerequisite for HIST 462. IIIF from the Department of Religious Studies a new course REGL 373.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved IIID, IIIE, and IIIF changes in the Department of Government and International Studies, Department of History, and Department of Religious Studies. Discussion?

PROFESSOR CHARLES MACK (ART) - This is going too smoothly. I was just wondering if there is an explanation for the deletion of the History courses for instance. I mean “Germany from Luther to Frederick the Great” seems like a nice area to cover. I just wonder why it is being dropped.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - Our understanding is that they are no longer being offered and have not been so for sometime.

PROFESSOR NANCY LANE (FREN) - My question is about the HIST 426. Is it just that this course is being eliminated and the crosslisted course LASP 447 remains?

PROFESSOR PERSELS - This is all the information that I have at this time.

PROFESSOR LANE - Can anyone from either one of those programs answer that?

CHAIR WILCOX - HIST 426 is crosslisted with LASP 447 and the question is whether LASP 447 would continue? Is that correct?

PROFESSOR LANE - Yes that is correct.

CHAIR WILCOX - Is there anyone who can advise us on that? Is the motion of the committee then simply to strike HIST 426 at this point and as far as we know LASP 447 would continue as a course until we heard otherwise?

PROFESSOR MACK - Is there an implication here on the area of language concentration? Because you are required to take these courses in particular areas to satisfying “cultural awareness.” Isn’t there an implication here if we drop a German course from the German language? And Portuguese from Brazil? I mean there is an implication isn’t there for a restriction on the cultural awareness package?
PROFESSOR PERSELS - There may well be but these courses are no longer offered. This is part of the follow-up to an action that was taken under last year’s Committee on Curricula and Courses to clean up the books for all courses that have not been offered within 5 years or 10 years. So this is the History’s response to this call. We did remove one course that they wanted to delete that was still being offered on the branch campuses. But we have had no objection to these courses before and found none.

CHAIR WILCOX - Any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. IID, IIE, and IIIF are approved.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - IV from the School of Music a change in description for MUSC 365 and the crosslisting has been inadvertently left off of both of these. This is crosslisted with the MART 341.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved IV, change in description in MUSC 365, with addition of a crosslisting with MART 341.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - I do not know anything about Music but it looks like MART 341 and MUSC 365 had the same original description. But when MART 341 was changed (that has already been approved by this body) that to me looks like a distinctly different course description than MUSC 365. Can anyone from MUSC to explain this?

PROFESSOR ANDREW GOWAN (MUSC) - In fact we did speak with Media Arts and the instructors that teach the courses have conferred and are satisfied that although the wording is not identical that the common elements are in fact in place for the crosslisting.

PROFESSOR WALT HANCLOSKY (MEDIA ARTS) - Speaking for Media Arts, we did have that discussion and that is verified.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (CSCE) - It has generally been the practice of this body and, I think, it was at one time in the procedures for Curricula and Courses that crosslisted courses must have identical wording in the description. I see no good reason to make an exception in this case. Are there any other crosslisted courses which do not have the same description at this time?

PROFESSOR PERSELS - Not to my knowledge. I think you are right - my goodness my proofreading has been off.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - I would suggest that this should be tabled until this can be sorted out.

CHAIR WILCOX - Is that a motion to refer it back to the committee?

PROFESSOR EASTMAN - Yes, to refer it back to committee.
CHAIR WILCOX - There is a motion to refer this back to the committee -- that would be the change in MUSC 365 and I suppose by reference also the change in MART 341 would be included in that consideration. And, that has been seconded. Discussion on any problems that would cause. We will vote on the motion to refer those two courses back to the committee. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. Those are referred back to you all, and you are meeting tomorrow so you can take it up.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - We are meeting tomorrow. I hope I prepare for my courses better than I have obviously prepared for this meeting.

V. College of Science and Mathematic from the Department of Physics and Astronomy a change in University Bulletin, a change in prerequisites (this is all on page 34), and change in prerequisite and description. Item B from the Department of Statistics a new course - STAT 582.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved V changes in the Department of Physics and Astronomy and the Department of Statistics. Discussion?

PROFESSOR DAVID TEDESCHI (PHYS) - I would like to make one change to the prerequisite for PHYS 514. It says: “Prereq: a grade of C or better in PHYS 207 and 208.” I would like to amend that to read “Prereq: a grade of C or better in PHYS 207 or 208, or in PHYS 212.”

CHAIR WILCOX - Would it be PHYS 207 and 208? Or PHYS 207 or 208?

PROFESSOR TEDESCHI - It would say: “….in PHYS 207 and 208, or in PHYS 212.”

CHAIR WILCOX - So PHYS 212 would be a substitute for 207 and 208 is that correct?

PROFESSOR TEDESCHI - Correct.

CHAIR WILCOX - That motion has been made to amend PHYS 514 by adding the language “or PHYS 212” at the appropriate location. I suppose that needs a second. Is there a second to that motion? That has been seconded. Discussion of the amendment? We shall vote on the amendment to change that language that the addition has noted. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. It stands amended in that manner or the motion stands amended.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN (CSCE) - If we are not going to do casual computing, statistics should probably not do casual statistics either. So the same changes that were made for CSCE 582 should be made for STAT 582.

CHAIR WILCOX - We will make that change in STAT 582 from “casual” to “causal.” Are there additional comments? We will make that by committee approval. Any further discussion of the entire motion? Moving on V signify by saying aye. Opposed. It is approved as amended.
PROFESSOR PERSELS - VI. Experimental Courses - A. College of Engineering and Information Technology/Department of Electrical Engineering course ELCT 554X. And, B. College of Science and Mathematics/Marine Science Program course MSCI 205X.

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee has moved VI. Experimental Courses in the College of Engineering and Information Technology and the College of Science and Mathematics. Discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. They are approved. Thank you Jeff.

PROFESSOR PERSELS - The body will relieved to know that this is my last meeting as Chair of the Committee on Curricula and Courses. I will be wine-tasting with students in France at the June meeting. So the new Chair of the Committee on Curricula and Courses, Gary Blanpied will be taking over as of that meeting. I would just like to thank the body for its civility and patience and with a special thanks to Jeanna Luker, Jodie Morris (in the Registrar’s Office), Barbara Blaney, and Peggy Pickels for all of their help without whom we could not do anything. If I did anything right, it is thanks to them. If I did anything wrong, it is my fault. Thank you.

CHAIR WILCOX - Thank you Jeff. It is a lot to keep track of. We appreciate your work.

I would also mention with regard to curricula and courses that the trustees at their last meeting very casually mentioned that they hoped that the faculty could have a complete list for them of all the overlapping courses for, I think, the fall. I would suggest to them, if I had even responded to the request, that that would be something difficult to do. What are we going to do? We will make a decision this summer as to what strategy we might use to identify potential duplicate of courses and begin the efforts both to avoid creating new duplication and try to resolve existing duplications to the extent they exist. I think it is something of a Herculean task. Maybe the Board underestimates the difficulty of doing some of those things. But this summer I intend to gather input, particularly from people who have served on this committee that Jeff chaired this year and try and to come up with a method by which to tackle that problem to some extent. As you know that was part of the SDI recommendation and it falls within the faculty’s governance to undertake that. So we will at least see how to address the problem over the summer. Obviously it will be somewhat of a long haul to address but just to let you know it is coming up.

c. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Daniel Feldman, Chair:

CHAIR WILCOX - I believe Dan has already made his report and I do not think there is any further business from there. If I turn it over he will take over the whole meeting and I don’t intend to let him do that.
d. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Daniel Sabia, Chair:

PROFESSOR SABIA - Faculty Welfare has a resolution for you to consider today. It is the last page of the agenda - page 36. What I thought I’d do is make a couple of preliminary remarks giving you some background and then perhaps open up discussion by making some substitute remarks about sort of the purpose and the meaning of the resolution. Maybe before I do that I should ask somebody to move that we consider it?

CHAIR WILCOX - The committee makes the motion.

PROFESSOR SABIA - So I make the motion. Is there a second? Oh - we don’t need a second. Okay.

So let me say a few things about it beginning with some preliminary remarks. I just want you to know that throughout the spring semester the Welfare Committee has been discussing not just the role of faculty in reorganization processes and decisions but also the effects of reorganization on tenure and promotion. The result of its deliberations regarding the former of these matters is the resolution that is before you. Regarding the latter of the matters, that is the issues of tenure and promotion that can be raised by the reorganization of academic units, the Welfare Committee has drafted proposed changes to the Faculty Manual. Those proposals are now in the hands of the Faculty Advisory Committee and also the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions. Faculty Advisory as you know has jurisdiction on proposed manual changes. I simply hope and expect that the Welfare Committee will monitor the ongoing consideration next year of those proposals. I will say something about this in my annual report for the committee, which appears in the fall agenda.

The other preliminary point I want to make is that the recent SDI experience has been the occasion for Welfare’s interests in both of these matters. But I would like to emphasize that it has been only that. Long before there was an SDI process and report there were both suggested and implemented reorganizations of academic units. And, as long as we are an ongoing institution proposals for reorganization will continue on occasion to arise. So SDI brings to our immediate attention the importance of the question of the role faculty should play in reorganization and it provides one experiential base concerning how the process might work. But the resolution is not seen by Welfare as a direct response to, or as a disguised critique of, how reorganization was and is being dealt with in the context of SDI. The central question that we posed to ourselves was not what role the faculty played in reorganization proposals in the past year? The central question we posed was what role should it play in reorganization now and in the future? So those are my preliminary remarks.

Now let me say something about the substance of the proposal. I thought I would just put this in the form of some obvious questions that if I were you I would be asking. So I am going to raise four questions and quickly answer them.
First is the resolution, merely advisory? Yes, of course it is merely advisory. The resolution seeks to assert the substantive or as philosophers might say in this context the epistemic authority of the faculty. And, it does so precisely because the faculty lacks the formal authority to make reorganization decisions on its own. The underlining supposition, of course, is that those who are empowered to make these decisions would do well to consult with the faculty when they contemplate change. Because the faculty are well positioned to provide information and advice regarding the possible advantages and disadvantages, costs and benefits of reorganization at least on the traditional missions of the University.

The second question I is to whom is this resolution addressed? The Welfare Committee intended that it be addressed to the President of the University. And, that the President make it part of or integrated into the University’s Policies and Procedures.

Third question, probably the most important, is the resolution needed? I would provide a couple of answers or considerations that are pertinent to this question. Certainly there have been complaints made in a variety of quarters regarding inadequate consultation with the faculty during the past year on reorganization proposals and claims have been asserted about less than transparent decision making by some administrators in some instances. Relatedly the Welfare Committee noted that the Senate expressed something like the concerns implicit in the resolution when it responded to the SDI report both verbally in the spring meetings and also in the written resolution that the Senate passed. The committee likewise noted that in his summary report to the Board of Trustees the Senate Chair more than once reflected on the insufficient opportunities given the faculty to provide meaningful and timely input into recommendations made by the SDI Committee. Including its recommendations regarding reorganizations. On the other hand there are clearly differences in perceptions and experiences that faculty have about these matters. The Welfare Committee is aware of and I can attest from personal experience that some administrators and Board members certainly seem to take faculty input quite seriously, and this perhaps especially so after the Senate meetings and resolution. The very fact those meetings were held suggest that faculty concerns can always be voiced and at least sometimes will get a respectful hearing. So Welfare’s view on this I think it fair to say, is that it believes this resolution deserves consideration by this body not so much because many faculty believe the process needs to be improved but for a rather different reason. Namely, because there is no process. This brings me to the final point about the necessity about of the resolution. As far as Welfare can tell there is no general policy. There are no extant expectations or guidelines regarding the faculty’s role in the development and resolution of reorganization proposals. For this reason there surely does seem to be a need for this resolution or for some resolution like it. If one supposes that the reorganization of academic units is an important matter that affects the academic missions of the University for good and for ill and, if one supposes that the faculty should have a role in decision making regarding such a matter, then the resolution or to repeat a resolution of some sort does seem necessary. The absence of a policy means that a role for faculty is not formally recognized, that it cannot be guaranteed, and that it is likely that the actual role faculty will play will be variable over time and across
different administrators. Just this perhaps explains variations in faculty experiences during the past year.

The last question, what exactly does the resolution envision in terms of process? This is a question that actually can’t be wholly answered because the resolution is in the view of the Welfare Committee more a statement of guidelines or ideals or expectations than it is a detailing of some imagined process. What is suggested in the first instance is that reorganization proposals be explicitly documented with respect to their expected costs and impacts. And, thus clearly and fully explained and justified. Secondly, the resolution asks that faculty be consulted and that consultation occur ideally before proposals are formally advanced. Third, it is suggested that consultation include those faculty directly affected by a proposal and the general faculty. The general faculty might be members of this body or one of its standing or ad hoc committees. Finally the resolution states that when both the general and the directly affected faculty oppose a proposal for reorganization that the proposal be dropped unless the proposal is made in response to some genuine financial emergency. This is perhaps the most bold feature of the resolution but it seems to the Welfare Committee a justified one. If both the directly affected faculty and the general faculty conclude that a proposed reorganization will not advance or not enhance the traditional missions of the University, then one should conclude that in all likelihood the proposal will not in fact do so. And, if it will not do so, it should be given up.

Those are my comments. Open for discussion, questions.

CHAIR WILCOX - The floor is open for discussions or questions. There is no discussion. Are we ready for a vote? All in favor of the resolution signify by saying aye. Opposed. The resolution is approved.

PROFESSOR GREG ADAMS (LAW) - Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the minutes reflect that the vote was unanimous on that?

CHAIR WILCOX - Without objection the minutes will so reflect.

e. Faculty Budget Committee, Professor Robert Leitch, Chair:

CHAIR WILCOX - Al would you like to make a short report for us please?

PROFESSOR LEITCH - I hope you can hear me I am fighting bronchitis right now.

CHAIR WILCOX - It will be a short report I can tell.

PROFESSOR LEITCH - I get to bring the bad news. Last fall we had a 4% budget cut and this spring we are going to have another 2-1/2% budget cut. As in the Fall several areas have been spared budget cuts: Law Enforcement and Safety, Rent, Institutional Transfers, the Honors College, the Library in the area of books and periodicals, General
Institutional Support, Energy and Utilities, and Scholarships. Those are the areas that are not going to be cut at all.

Except for those areas there is a 1% budget cut across the board and then there is another 1-1/2% to total 2-1/2%. Of that additional 1-1/2% the central administration is going to absorb around 1%. Then the Information Officer, Liberal Arts, Moore School of Business, Engineering, Science and Math, and University 101 and what is called Facility Services Operating Budget will be cut ¼%. And, the other areas will be cut ½%. This is what makes up the 2-1/2% budget cut. We are probably expecting more cuts by fall; maybe another 2.8%. That totals over 9% in one year. That is a lot. So we’ve got some problems.

In addition I would like to update you on what the committee has been doing this last year. We spent a lot of time, as you have, looking at the SDI report and in particular value-centered management. We have discussed all the issues that we have talked about in here. Next year we are going to spend time monitoring the implementation of this process. So we are going to keep on top of what is going on. We are also in the process of reviewing, with the Provost, what are called the Strategic Plans from each academic unit and the branch campuses. As part of this process we have asked the administration to ask the different deans and unit heads to address the issue of administrative overhead. Most of them have done this. Most of them have included in their report some way of addressing this problem. I think we are making some progress in this area. Also as part of our discussions, the Provost has agreed to track the trend in administrative overhead overtime and to challenge the deans and unit heads next year to make some progress in the area of staff faculty ratios. To sum this up we are making a little progress in this area.

PROFESSOR CHARLES ALBER (GERM) - Is the total amount of money, as I have heard advertised involved, $18 million? And, is that tallied with your figures?

PROVOST JERRY ODOM - If you include the School of Medicine, it is $18 million. If it is just the Columbia campus, it is $15.7 million.

CHAIR WILCOX - That would be from the beginning of this fiscal year.

PROVOST ODOM - That is correct. If I could just make one comment about what Al said, Rick Kelly (our chief financial officer) has set up a committee to start this process of value-centered management both in terms of some people visiting other campuses and people here being involved in the tracking. I think three of the faculty budget committee members are on that committee as representatives of the faculty.

PROFESSOR LEITCH - Several of the Budget Committee members are on the Value-Centered Management Committee so we will be involved in the process.

CHAIR WILCOX - Professors Feldman, Wallulis, Al and myself have all been appointed and Caroline Strobel have all been appointed to serve on that panel to assist in that.
PROFESSOR LEITCH - Other questions?

CHAIR WILCOX - Thank you we appreciate it. Take care of that voice.

f. Other Committees: None.

IV. Unfinished Business.

CHAIR WILCOX - I will point out that the President’s Response to the SDI Report, his report to the Board of Trustees is available on the University web site. If you go to the web site, you will see it prominently on the homepage there. You can review it at that point. He takes each proposal and adds his comments to it. You will see that there are some that were accepted as proposed, some that were rejected out right, and a number with variations. So I think you may have read in the media and talked to some people, I think it is very helpful to read the entire report to see the nuances of his report to the Board. So I would commend that to those of you who have been following the SDI stuff to go to the web site and review it there.

V. Reports of Officer.

CHAIR WILCOX - Do the officers wish to make additional reports? No, okay.

VI. Good of the Order.

CHAIR WILCOX - For the good of the order, if I may add my personal thanks and congratulations to Dr. Palms. I will tell you a little anecdote. When I had been on the faculty about 5 years Dr. Palms came to be President. I am not quite sure how it happened, and I have never asked him, but at some point on one of his visits to Charleston, he apparently picked up the phone, called the Wilcox family, and got hold of my mother. He said “This is Dr. John Palms, I am the President of the University of South Carolina.” And, to this day my mother calls me when she sees something I’ve done in the Faculty Senate; she says “Why are you being mean to that nice man?” (Laughter) But it was a touch that was very much appreciated in my family, sir, and I would like to offer the congratulations of the Senate on your retirement, sir. (Clapping)

VII. Announcements.

CHAIR WILCOX - Jim Stiver from the Honors College asked that I inform the body that friends of Jim Oliver, who was the long time Chair of the Philosophy Department, are invited to a remembrance for Jim immediately following this meeting. His wife, son and friends will be in the Faculty Lounge of Gambrell Hall until 5:30 p.m. So you are invited to that.
VIII. New Business.

PROFESSOR ERIC HOLT (SPAN) - I understand that the Wellness Center is on its way to nearing completion. I have heard a rumor that only students will be able to use it without a charge. That faculty and staff will have to pay some kind of membership different from the current arrangement I believe. I was wondering if anyone could address any of that?

CHAIR WILCOX - That is not inconsistent with what I have understood but Jerry could you address that?

PROVOST ODOM - That is indeed the case. The students as you know are being assessed a fairly hefty fee to use that and before anybody else, faculty, staff, or alumni are allowed to use it without paying anything we want to see what the usage will be. I would point out that right now faculty at the Blatt Center do pay a fee if they want a locker and the Blatt Center will continue to be available as it has been. But we really need to see what the usage is and those people who are paying for it should come first.

PROFESSOR HOLT - How long do you expect that to take?

PROVOST ODOM - I really don’t know, I’d say at least a year.

CHAIR WILCOX – Note, as he said, that the financing came from a charge on the students to pay off the bonding on it. So that is justification for this. Other business? There being none we will meet again June 26th. Is there a motion to adjourn? We stand adjourned.