FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
October 2, 2002

I. Call to Order.

CHAIR ROBERT WILCOX – I apologize for running a few minutes late. I call to order the October 2\textsuperscript{nd} meeting of the Faculty Senate.

II. Correction of Minutes.

CHAIR WILCOX – You have before you the minutes (they are on the web also) from our September 4\textsuperscript{th} meeting. Are there any changes or corrections to those minutes? If there are none is there a motion for their approval? Seconded? Thank you. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. The minutes stand approved.

III. Reports of Committees.

a. Faculty Senate Steering Committee: Professor Sarah Wise, Secretary: No report.

CHAIR WILCOX – Okay there is no report from the Steering Committee. I will notify the Senate that the Steering Committee has nominated Sarah Wise (who is the Secretary of the Senate) as a faculty representative to the University Board of Visitors. That is not to be confused with the Board of Trustees. The Board of Visitors is a group of individuals largely from outside the University who are brought in to learn about what we do here and to spread the good word beyond to the State of South Carolina. There is a faculty representative on that group, and Sarah has agreed to serve a two-year term. I thank her for that.

b. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Gary Blanpied, Chair:

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – We have for your consideration on pages 10-25 items. The Moore School of Business has spent a year and a half working on changes for their curriculum. I want to take the curriculum change from section I on pages 10-17 as the first item. On page 16 there is a typo on the bottom right – across on the left is the nonapplicable (N/A) and the Systems Development (21 hours) is across from that – those items should not be there. Thus that should be deleted – those two lines. Approving this will create a new major in International Business which is on page 16. And, there are changes to many of the majors and new courses that we will take up.

CHAIR WILCOX – The motion is on the floor from the committee to approve at this point I. the curriculum changes in the Moore School of Business with the deletion of the materials related to Systems Development on page 16. It is now open for discussion. Is there discussion, recognizing that this does create a major?
PROFESSOR ELDON WEDLOCK (Law) – I would like to ask someone from the Business School to sort of give an overview of what this does. It might help us get through the outline there.

CHAIR WILCOX – Is there a representative from the Business School who can assist us?

ASSOCIATE DEAN ROD ROENFELDT (Moore School of Business) – I will summarize briefly the changes. We are adding one Accounting course. Years ago we had two Accounting courses, four to five years ago we took one of the Accounting courses out and that hasn’t worked very well and after going through a cycle of graduates we are adding an Accounting course in. We are adding the second Economic course back that we took out four or five years ago. We are upgrading the Management Science Computer course from 190 to 290. We are no longer requiring the University 101. We are revising the Accounting Major, the Finance Major, the Information Systems Major, and adding the International Business Major. Up until now we really don’t have a major in International Business we have more a collection of courses. It is more of an informal arrangement and we are trying to formalize that. That is the essence of the changes. I will be glad to answer any specific questions you might have.

PROFESSOR NANCY LANE (Languages, Literatures and Cultures) – I have a question about the International Business curriculum on page 16. The asterisk about IBUS 441, 442, 443 – the wording says: “At least one of these three courses will not be offered on campus….” To me that doesn’t make any sense. Does it mean that at least one will be offered off campus?

ASSOCIATE DEAN ROENFELDT – We are not going to be offering all of those courses during their cycle so we may be offering two of those three. If they want the third one there is a study abroad requirement and they can take that at one of our exchange programs.

CHAIR WILCOX – So it will not be offered on campus, but would be available abroad during that two year ….

ASSOCIATE DEAN ROENFELDT – Yes. Right.

PROFESSOR LANE – The wording as it stands now is not clear. Because you are promising that at least one and perhaps more will not be offered during any given two year period.

ASSOCIATE DEAN ROENFELDT – Which means they can take them as an exchange ….

PROFESSOR LANE – Does that mean that none of them will be offered?

ASSOCIATE DEAN ROENFELDT – Which is a possibility, and they only need one of those as part of the requirement.
PROFESSOR LANE – Could there be some kind of second clause added to make that clearer?

ASSOCIATE DEAN ROENFELDT – Do you have a recommendation?

PROFESSOR LANE – The wording that you just used for example.

CHAIR WILCOX – Rod, if it says “At least one of these three courses will not be offered on campus, but may be offered only abroad.”

PROFESSOR LANE – How about some wording like: “It is not guaranteed that all of three of these courses will be available. Students may have to take one or more abroad.”

ASSOCIATE DEAN ROENFELDT – That would be fine with us, with me that is not a problem.

CHAIR WILCOX – Do you have a motion Nancy?

ASSOCIATE DEAN ROENFELDT – I accept that as friendly amendment. I would do that or would it have to be formalized such that you have a formal amendment.

PROFESSOR LANE – I would be happy to confer with Rod.

CHAIR WILCOX – For purposes of a motion now, after “Most appropriate for study abroad” then your language would be “Not all of these courses will be offered on campus during the two years that the student may be taking major level courses.”

PROFESSOR LANE – If that is in fact the case.

CHAIR WILCOX – Isn’t that?

ASSOCIATE DEAN ROENFELDT – Yes.

CHAIR WILCOX – And, what else would you add to that?

PROFESSOR LANE – Perhaps the first sentence could be moved – “Therefore courses may be taken abroad.”

CHAIR WILCOX – How about if it says “Certain of these courses may be offered only for study abroad during the two years the student may be taking major level courses at least one of the courses will not be offered on campus.” Just add an extra sentence in there. Is this a problem that we need to cure?

PROFESSOR LANE – Yes, definitely.
PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – Well I would make a motion that the Senate note the problem and delegate it to a committee made up of you, Nancy and Rod.

CHAIR WILCOX – I would amend that even further to Nancy and Rod.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – Just because we need a tie breaker.

CHAIR WILCOX – We could that. If the Senate would like to approve it and there will be a committee on style to do this, if we understand the substance of the concern. Is that okay?

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – That’s perfection.

CHAIR WILCOX – Okay that would be the motion. Is there a second to that motion – well that would just be part of the overall motion. Okay. The motion then is on the floor for the acceptance of the curriculum changes, again the deletion of Systems Development and then subject to that committee of style finalizing the language on that one change. Any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. It is approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – On page 17, IA. Economics department a change in title and description of ECON 221, 222, and 224.

IB. Accounting change in prerequisite and description of ACCT 222. Change in title and description of ACCT 225 and 226 plus a change in title, prerequisite, and description for ACCT 402.


CHAIR WILCOX – Okay they moved the approval of sections IA, IB, and IC various changes in prerequisites, course descriptions, and the like. Discussion? If there is none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. It is approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – There are typos in the next section in Management Science. In the “from and to” for MGSC 190 to 290 the title has Systems instead of System. And, in MGSC 298 the prerequisite in the “to” section has CSCE 101 and, it should be or MGSC 290 instead of and. Then we have change in prerequisite and description for MGSC 390. Change in title and prerequisite for MGSC 490.

International Business has many new courses and change in descriptions up to page 22.
CHAIR WILCOX – They have moved the approval of parts D and E of I with the typographical changes noted. Any discussion? There being none all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. They stand approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – II. College of Education, Department of Educational Psychology is deleting two courses EDEX 583 and 589. Plus a change in prerequisite and corequisite of EDSE 558.

CHAIR WILCOX – The committee has moved II. changes in the College of Education. Discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. They are approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – III. College of Engineering and Information Technology the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering has curriculum change, change in prerequisites in courses, and change in prerequisite and description.

The Department Computer Science and Engineering has a change in prerequisite and a change in prerequisite and description.

CHAIR WILCOX – They have moved III. various changes in the College of Engineering and Information Technology including a curriculum change and some course changes. Discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. They stand approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – IV. School of the Environment there is a new course ENVR 200 and 200L.

CHAIR WILCOX – They moved IV. changes for new courses in the School of the Environment. Discussion?

PROFESSOR LANE – Will this course meet the lab science requirement in the various colleges that require a lab science?

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Our committee expects that colleges will list this as one of their lab science courses.

PROFESSOR LANE – Is it a follow up to ENVR 101?

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – No. There is no prerequisite.

CHAIR WILCOX – If there is any further enlightenment involved with these courses, we will be happy to hear from you. Any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. One negative vote, but it is approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – V. College of Liberal Arts, Department of Government and International Studies change in title and description and deletion of two courses. Department of Naval Science a change in the grading. Department of Theatre, Speech and Dance a new course and a change in designator.
CHAIR WILCOX – Various changes from the V. College of Liberal Arts. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. They are approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – VI. from the College of Science and Mathematics, Department of Statistics are courses approved to be offered via telecommunications and the internet.

CHAIR WILCOX – Various courses in VI. have been moved. Discussion? Is this simply making these available by telecommunications/internet? These are existing courses?

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Yes they are existing.

CHAIR WILCOX – Okay these are existing courses that would simply be available by that means. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. They stand approved.

On VII. Experimental Courses we had some discussion on experimental courses. I am going to let the committee move it, we will vote on it. There still seems to be some confusion at this University as to whether we have to approve “X” courses. We are going to approve it or disapprove it and clarify that standing before we meet with you again.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – VII. Experimental Courses, College of Liberal Arts, Department of Art is an experimental course ARTH 563X.

CHAIR WILCOX – This would be approved only as an experimental course. If it is to be brought back as a regular course it would have to be approved again by this body. So those of you in Art History need to appreciate that. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. VII. is approved. Thank you very much Gary.

c. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Betty Glad, Chair:

CHAIR WILCOX – Is Betty Glad here? I don’t believe she is. I can tell you that the Advisory Committee has begun work on a number of things that she brought you up to speed on last time. They don’t have any business to bring before you at this point. As is typical this time of year, we are getting the committees working but the product is not done yet. They are looking at a couple of things that will be of significant interest to you this year. One of which is creating a policy to deal with tenure and promotion standards and procedures when departments or colleges are merged or eliminated -- how they are to be applied to the survivors of that transfer. They will have a policy forthcoming this year on that subject. There are several other issues that are in front of them as well. They are active.
d. Faculty Welfare Committee, Peter Graham, Chair:

PROFESSOR GRAHAM – The Welfare Committee has met and we discussed several issues. We are not ready to bring back reports on those issues at this point. However, we did meet with representatives from the Wellness Works group and I am happy to say that we are going to support one of their programs. We probably will provide support to others in the near future. But, the one we have elected to support is the flu vaccine program. For those of you want to take advantage of this program and have contributed to the Family Fund there is no charge for the inoculation. If you are not a contributor to the Family Fund, there will be a charge of $12, which is significantly lower than going to your personal physician. So I would urge all of you to take advantage of this particular program. We have had it for several years and it has been effective and we are pleased to be able to support it once again this year.

CHAIR WILCOX – Thank you very much. Any questions for Peter?

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

CHAIR WILCOX – Al Leitch is in class during this hour; there are a couple of things to bring you up to speed on. One of which is that the Faculty Budget Committee has been meeting with the Provost, with Rick Kelly (who is the Vice President for Finance), and with the Budget Officers of the University, discussing preliminarily the financial outlook for the University. I think you will hear more from the officers about that shortly. Obviously if there are mid-year budget cuts, there are going to have to be various responses to those cuts. The Faculty Budget Committee is attempting to articulate to the administration, as need be, our perception of the impact of various alternatives on the academic programs to the University. I will tell you at this point there are no specific proposals that have been put forth. To start with, there has not been a budget cut yet, which makes it difficult to address directly. So to the extent that you are hearing that there will be this or done, I think it is fair to say that the only definite action at this point is that the vice presidents of the University have been told that they need to essentially hold back 5% in some manner to address a budget cut. But with regard to issues of tuition or whatever else might be a response to this, essentially what I think the officers of the University would tell you is what they have told us, “Everything is on the table; nothing has been taken off the table; but nothing has been decided yet either.” We are still early in this decision. It is clear to everyone who has looked at the budget that another round of significant budget to the University will have an impact on the academic programs of this University in some manner. Whether it be the way in which our students are able to finance their education and maybe not come here, or whether it is in the impact on our life styles and our ability to do certain things - the classes we could teach and like - there is going to be some impact somewhere. The ability to handle this unnoticed has probably already been exhausted. So there are going to be some tough decisions. All I can assure you at this point, from the perspective of a faculty member on that committee, is we will do our best to articulate the concerns. If you have particular strong feelings on possible issues that you hear about, we certainly are willing to hear them. You can send them to me and we will articulate them on your behalf to the Provost
and the Financial Officers. They are in consultation with us; they are not asking us to make the decisions, but they are asking us for our reactions to things. So that is ongoing.

The other budget item that is ongoing is value-centered management. It is progressing toward implementation. I can tell you from my perspective what has happened to this point largely is that the budget people for the University, led by Rick Kelly, and members of this committee have begun the process of putting together formats of information that could be presented in what you would call a budget report -- how budget information might be reported more effectively to make decisions at the University. It is encouraging as we deal with this to see that there probably are ways to get better financial information, that will assist deans and assist all of those who evaluate the costs of various programs and the like. The subcommittees of the value-centered management group are now taking what they have worked on – such as a model for allocating tuition to various colleges and programs -- they are taking that to various deans to get the decanal reaction from the college level. Does this look right from their perspective? That is the type of work that is being done at this point. Also there will be new groups of faculty, I think I am correct on this -- there will be heavy faculty involvement I have been assured -- in beginning to look at the next step, which is, once you have this information, what do you do with it? My sense is that our real concern in this room is, once you have the information, how do you put values on it and decide where to go from there. So that work is really just now beginning in this process.

Rick Kelly is here, he is the Vice President from Finance. I am not going to put him on the spot for a speech, but I think he would be happy to answer questions and perhaps articulate more clearly for you than I can where things stand. So if you’ve got any questions, let’s pass them onto Rick at this point. Is there anything you need to know or are you just baffled and would like a better explanation. Okay, Rick can you give them a better explanation than I can?

PRESIDENT ANDREW SORENSEN – Rob, I would like to suggest that you give me a chance to make my remarks because I am going to address it in general and have Rick respond specifically to questions. I’ll try and cast a framework against which questions can be asked. Is that acceptable?

CHAIR WILCOX – That will work, certainly. We will hear from the President and then we will have chance to talk direct. So we have got the people here who can answer your questions. Don’t go away this afternoon wondering what the heck is going on like I am. They can give you the best up to date scoop on the subject.

IV. Report of Secretary.

PROFESSOR WISE – No report.

V. Unfinished Business.

None.
VI. New Business.

CHAIR WILCOX – We are still early in the semester, we will get new business as we go.

Let me share a few comments with you and then I will turn it over to the President and the Provost. When we began last year, I laid out a couple things that I thought we needed to do. Obviously SDI was one of the big ones, and having this body serve in a role that was of use and value to the University, as an advocate for the academic programs, was a critical thing that we needed to focus on. I think that those two things this body handled very well last year. Personally, I will tell you that I thought the discussion of SDI was one of the highlights of my career in the Senate. I really thought it was a productive discussion. Not all of our advice was taken, but I think it was heard, and I think that was very important. This year we are going to be in the process of implementing some of those SDI changes and I think it is important for this body to continue to provide constructive advice and, where appropriate, constructive criticism of changes that are proposed. So there is an ongoing work of this group from last year.

I can also tell you in connection with that, I thought there were some frustrations. I thought we spoke as one voice with regard to mergers of units. I thought our voice got largely lost in the wind on that subject. That is going to happen from time to time, but I think that the more we focus ourselves on providing constructive advice with principled positions on the academic aspects of this University, the harder it will be to disregard the view of the faculty. And, in that regard I think we have made some real improvement. I will point out that this body, I think, has shown that our concerns are far beyond simply protecting our individual interests. We really are here for the good of the institution. I think it is important this year, as we do our work, that we keep that in mind as to what we are all about. When you hear that the faculty is looking out only for its own good, remind people of the some of the things that we have done. Just in the past year we approved new procedures for awarding endowed chairs -- not make it easier to get them, but to insure that the academic mission of the University was better fulfilled as chairs were awarded. Each year we have tightened tenure and promotion curricula within the various colleges. Each year we work in increasingly dilapidated conditions because we recognize that the funds we do have need to be spent on the academic programs, and sometimes that means that the walls don’t get painted and the trash only gets picked up once a week. We have done a lot I think as faculty, and I think we need to remind people of that. We lost a Faculty club this past year -- one of the few civil things on campus to go to. As unhappy as we are about its closing, I think most people recognize that a decision was made that the University should put its money into the academic programs, so it could not afford to continue its support of that club. As a result the club closed.

Also, we welcome change. When you hear that we are opposed to any change, remind people that we endorse many aspects of the SDI report. We criticized others, but we were not opposed to change. We continue to work with the University. One of the important things we are going to do this year is implement value-centered management. Another is to get these tenure standards when colleges merge, smoothed out. That is assisting in the implementation of change. And, I might point out that we proposed a
change last year in the antidiscrimination policy, and we continue to try effect that change for the University. We are not opposed to change in this body.

Immediately this year there is going to be a lot of discussion in the University of undergraduate admissions targets. We have talked to the President. We will continue to talk to the President. The Budget Committee has talked to the Provost, and the Admissions Committee will continue to talk to the President on this issue. These are significant academic concerns to the faculty and what we want to do is address these problems in academic terms. How do the admission decisions affect the academic quality of this institution? Pointing out, I think from my perspective, numbers are not as critical. Whether we have 4,000 freshmen or 3,000 is not so important, as why are we doing it. If we are increasing freshmen class to subsidize existing infrastructure, that is not a particularly good policy. That is going to reduce quality. If we are increasing the freshmen class to better fulfill our mission to the State of South Carolina and we are willing to put the additional resources in for the infrastructure to support those larger classes, as a faculty we may not have the same concerns and, we need to articulate that clearly to the institution. We are going to have to be vigilant, continuing to make sure that decisions are made for academic reasons, not purely for financial reasons or to please a private donor. We are going to have to be vigilant, to insure that our workplace environment does not deteriorate any more than it has -- to try to do the best we can to retain students and faculty, to attract the best, and to insure that they work hard when they are here.

And, finally, I said this last year and I just want to repeat it again because I really think we need a way to do it and we haven’t made much progress in terms of overtly addressing it -- we must be vigilant as a faculty to the integrity of this University. I think it is really important that we continue to find ways to articulate our expectations for academic integrity both among students and faculty. It is a pet project of mine. I will continue to raise it. I don’t raise it because of a crisis that I see, but I raise it because I think in all the mission of the University, all will be for naught if we don’t concentrate over and over again on insuring that things are done with integrity. I have had comments made to me by a few faculty that caused me concern over the past year. They expressed frustrations with the sense they got of what the community believes is appropriate behavior; and I think we need to find a way as a faculty to put those issues in the forefront, so that nobody comes to the University, for even the shortest period of time, without leaving with a sense of “Boy that is an honest, straight place, where people work and do good stuff honestly, and the degree that you get from here is worth everything it says it is.” We may not have a problem on this University, but I think one of the things that we can do is really accentuate that concern. So those are the things I see coming up this year. A lot of it is carrying over from last year, but we continue to grow as a faculty that is going to govern the academic life of this school. If we do that, we will be listened to – trust me.

VII. Reports of Officers.

CHAIR WILCOX – Mr. President, I welcome you.
PRESIDENT ANDREW SORENSEN – Thank you very much Mr. President for the opportunity to be with you.

I would like to begin with some phenomenally good news and in doing so give tributes to the faculty who are completely responsible for the good news. Today was it was my pleasure to host a news conference to announce that Dr. Frank Berger of the Department of Biological Sciences is the principle investigator of grant from the National Institutes of Health to look into causes and prevention of colon rectal cancer for a total of more than $11 million. This is the largest grant in the history of the University of South Carolina. Dr. Berger and a very large group of co-principle investigators, all of whom where introduced at the press conference today, are to be saluted for this terrific accomplishment. It is a remarkable collaboration among four colleges within the University of South Carolina-Columbia, the Veterans Administration Medical Center, the South Carolina Cancer Center, and the Medical University of South Carolina, with the University of South Carolina faculty on the Columbia campus taking the lead. It is an absolutely extraordinary accomplishment and, for those of you who know Dr. Berger, I would request that you pass along to him and to his colleagues your hardiest congratulations. It is a really remarkable accomplishment. Colon rectal cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths in South Carolina and the fourth leading prevalence of cancers of all sort in the State of South Carolina. So here we have, I believe, a remarkable situation in which we have first rate basic research going on that is linked with clinical prevention, to help people who are suffering from cancer or who are at risk for contracting colon rectal cancer, with research opportunities for undergraduate students explicitly interwoven and research opportunities for graduate students. It is a way in which the tripartite mission of the University of research, teaching and outreach can all be intertwined in one project, and I fervently hope that we have more and more of these kinds of grants funded.

We were also recognized by the Pew Foundation as one of only 13 institutions of the approximately 3,500 institutions of higher education in the United States for the programs that we offer our first year students. Not just University 101, but all the experiences that we offer – the infrastructure, the support apparatus we have. And, there were only 2 of the 13 institutions which are research universities, and that is a remarkable distinction. So I salute all of you faculty who are involved in not only in University 101, but in welcoming our incoming freshmen students. Whether it be in classes that you teach, or in counseling/advising with them or working with them on various extra curricular/co-curricular activities. It is indeed a welcoming place. I spoke to all of the Baptist students last night, who asked me to meet with them, and this is one of dozens of groups I have met with who express their profound gratitude for the warmth and the welcome from University administrators and University faculty. So I thank all of you for creating that kind of environment.

U.S. News & World Report introduced a new rating category entitled programs that really work and, again, this addressed how universities and colleges involve incoming students -- how they support them, how they make them feel welcome.
This was more narrowly focused, as universities were invited to submit one program. We submitted University 101, which we have not only on this campus, but on campuses throughout the system. And the University of South Carolina was ranked number one in the United States in that category. Two days ago I went to the University of South Carolina-Salkehatchie campus. They have two campuses, and I went to the one in Allendale and a group of students from University 101 came to meet with me. I agreed to do a karaoke song with them on my next visit. So if there are reporters there I am confident that they will find its way into some television program, although I would prefer that it not -- but such is the life of a university president.

We also received a number one ranking for our undergraduate program in International Business - number one in the United States. So I salute those of you in the Moore School of Business who teach in that program. And, if you aren’t teaching in that program or you aren’t in the Moore School of Business, please congratulate your colleagues who enabled us to have the number one ranking.

We also have some good news for the other campuses that are part of this University of South Carolina and some of them may be watching courtesy of the televised transmission. University of South Carolina at Aiken was number one among the comprehensive colleges in the south. University of South Carolina at Spartanburg was number four. Again two of the top five comprehensive colleges in the south were campuses of the University of South Carolina. So I am deeply indebted to all of you for all you do to help us to establish prominence for the things that go on here in the field of research as well as in the field of teaching and the field of service of welcoming our students – making them feel involved and comfortable at the University.

I’d like to salute a couple of other groups of researchers. There was a competition recently for Centers for Public Health Preparedness -- a matter that is very dear to my heart. I feel our nation is ill equipped to deal with the weaponization of biological agents such as the smallpox virus and the anthrax bacterium. Four centers were created throughout the United States that will receive a minimum of $1 million per year for an indefinite period. Our School of Public Health was selected as one of those. Professors Feigley and Richter are the co-directors of that program. So if you see them, please convey to them your appreciation for what they do. Another example of externally funded research that involves students in teaching and equipping people in communities to deal more adequately with the prospect of bio-weapons being used by terrorists to attack us.

Donna Richter a professor in the School of Public Health also is the principal investigator on a program to develop aids community awareness programs throughout the United States -- a grant of $2.5 million, again linking research, teaching, and outreach in really very remarkable ways. So I thank those of you whom I have recognized, and I know many of you are engaged in comparable activities. I would welcome the opportunity to salute you, to commend you publicly as well as well as privately, if you will make those opportunities available to me.
I also want to thank all of you for teaching a record crop of 3,562 incoming freshmen. We had to hire a number of adjunct faculty to make that possible. I know classrooms are crowded and that we did not have adequate housing for them when they arrived on the campus. Because of the opening of 600 beds in the Greek Village we will be able to accommodate 100% of all those students in University facilities effective January 1, 2003 so that no students will be required to live in hotels. Some of them may have gotten so habituated to having a swimming pool downstairs, cable TV, and queen sized beds (as opposed to the 3-1/2 x 6 foot bed that I slept in when I was a freshman in college dorm) that they may decide to stay there. But if they do that, that is their own choice it is not because we are requiring them to or we don’t have space available for them. We have just broken ground for a 500 bed residence hall on the West Quad that will be behind the Universities computing center. It will be facing Wheat Street parallel to Blossom there, and we will be able to accommodate 500 students there. So we are looking to improve our capacity to accommodate our students living on campus.

A note about the Faculty Club, Mr. Chair. I am very pleased to report to you that I have turned the Faculty Club over to the faculty. The Faculty Club so called was not operated by the faculty; it was operated by a firm that was not an integral part of the University of South Carolina on a contractual basis. Given my concern for fiscal prudence I eliminated the $200,000.00 a year subsidy to the Faculty Club and turned it over to a faculty group – the faculty of Hotel Management under the direction of Professor Carl Boger. They will be opening that club soon and it will be opened four days a week. There will be no club membership fee required. All you do is pay for what you eat. The faculty want to use it for a laboratory for students in the Hotel Management program. I encouraged them to do so, and I am delighted that they did that. So that is an example of increasing faculty governance and making availability to all of you so don’t have to pay a management fee. You can come in there and eat unsubsidized meals. So it is a wonderful opportunity, and I look forward to being there myself and hope we will all be dining there together.

Now a word about enrollment management – we are evolving a balance between the optimal size of the incoming class. The ability of our infrastructure to accommodate our students and then the financial ramifications and it is a complex set of issues of multi-varied analysis where you have numerous variables operating simultaneously. Dr. Odom and Mr. Kelly are working with the Budget Committee and Dr. Pruitt as well, to discuss these issues and attempt to resolve how to balance all of these. On the one hand there are some people who feel we ought to increase dramatically the size of the incoming class because of the moral imperative they see of being available to all the citizens of the State of South Carolina. We have another group of people who would like to see the SAT scores rise and have us be more selective, noting what happened at Clemson University, a sister public institution and how they dealt with that issue. We have what I feel is a moral imperative to be available to students irrespective of race and income. That is yet another set of issues that we have to combine and determine how we can accommodate students once they come here. Students today when they come to universities and colleges think about things like the rec center, the tennis courts, parking, and those kinds of issues and the quality of the residence halls. I know that from helping move students
into Maxcy Hall for the first day of class. Students and their parents give me gratuitous analyses of the quality of the carpeting and the paint on the walls. I am familiar with this. So I don’t have any predetermined ideas about what to do and I covet and cherish the faculty input and have assured the Chair that that will happen through the Faculty Budget Committee as well as the Admissions Committee. And, I welcome your suggestions as we proceed.

The VCM task force to which Chair Wilcox alluded to, and he is a member of that committee along with several faculty senators -- I have not received a report from that committee. I don’t have a spy there giving me weekly stories about their progress or conspiracies or anti-conspiracies. So I am looking forward to receiving their report but one of the desires that I have is to push down the decision making regarding a lot of the maintenance of facilities and operation of the University. The faculty are already responsible for that with the respect to determining admissions criteria, promotion and tenure standards, and recruitment of faculty members, but we need to consider the possibility of doing that in terms of financial governance and I’ll let Mr. Kelly speak to that. But should we, for example, give each dean a utilities budget at the beginning of the year and say, “You have $731,957 for utilities and when that money is spent chum, lock the door and turn the lights off because you can’t pay the bill.” But conversely if you can spend only $702,000 then you can keep the difference between what you have in your budget and the $702,000.

Several people have asked about the bow tie tours. You will notice today that I am not on a bow tie tour. I want to meet people throughout the state, so one of my desires in doing the bow tie tour is to meet as many South Carolinians as I possibly can. I am devoting eight days in their entirety from early in the morning to late at night to going around in a 14 passenger minibus that is designed to carry people around our campus to do tours of the (which my staff have affectionately dubbed it the Rooster Roadster) to go into the highways and byways of the State of South Carolina. I have gone to and will continue to go to Civic Clubs, to speak to Rotary Clubs, to Kiwanis Clubs, and to Chambers of Commerce. I am going to high schools, middle schools, elementary schools, and going to churches and temples. I have numerous purposes. One is to meet people from South Carolina. We have eight campuses throughout the state and I haven’t lived in South Carolina previously and I need to meet South Carolinians and get to know people and give them an opportunity to know me if the choose to. I want to listen to people, I want to hear what South Carolinians want from the University. I want to hear how they expect this University to serve the people of South Carolina. I take the opportunity to present my vision for the future of this University. I am aggressively recruiting students. There is a picture of me at the Rock Hill High School with a couple of tee shirts in my hand, throwing tee shirts out into the crowd of 493 screaming high school seniors from Rock Hill who were gathered to take their senior class picture. I persuaded the principal to give me an opportunity to try to persuade them to come to the University of South Carolina. And, my staff was very nervous because they didn’t think my athletic prowess was enough to get the tee shirts up into the crowd, but I actually did reasonably well. It is amazing what a 5:30 bike ride every morning will do for your arm. So at any rate I want to recruit students, I want to enhance our University’s prominence
throughout the state, and I want to try to keep the University of South Carolina in the public consciousness of South Carolinians.

Finally as for the budget cut, as Professor Wilcox said, nothing is definite. But I have asked each of the vice presidents to sequester 5%. One chairman in the legislature told me that he thought it would be a 4.6% cut and another prominent legislator said that it’ll be over 5%, but I am not sure. But as an intermediate step each of the vice presidents has assured me unequivocally that he or she has 5% sequestered against this anticipated cut. We have no tuition increase planned for mid-year, as Professor Wilcox said. But, as he also said, I cannot eliminate any possibility, because if it should turn out that after this budget cut, whenever it is announced, we get another one in the year, then I need to be able to consider other sources of revenue to offset that. That, Mr. Chair, concludes my remarks and I will be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIR WILCOX – Are there questions for the President? Let’s not disappoint the President.

PROFESSOR GREG ADAMS (Law) – Last year this body adopted for the second time a resolution urging the President to add a ban on discrimination on basis of sexual orientation and I understand that resolution has been forwarded to you.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Yes, sir.

PROFESSOR ADAMS – Do you have any plans to act on that?

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – I do indeed. I have met with a group of students to discuss this. I am going to discuss it at the next meeting of the administrative council and I anticipate that we will respond to that in the near future. I cannot give you a precise time.

PROFESSOR ADAMS – Thank you.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – You are welcome.

CHAIR WILCOX – Other questions? You did too good a job of explaining. Thank you sir.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Thank you.

CHAIR WILCOX – Mr. Kelly stick around, because we may still get to you at the end of this.

PROVOST JEROME ODOM – Thank you Mr. Chair. Just a couple of things that I want to discuss. I wanted first of all to reiterate something that Rob said. And that is that we have worked closely with the Budget Committee already this year talking about primarily the financial aspects of our enrollment management plan, as well as a potential budget cut and how we might try to deal with that. I always also meet with the Faculty Advisory
Committee when they ask me to. Those are the two primary committees that I work closely with. So if you have concerns that you would like to pass on to them that they address, please feel free to do so.

I want to bring you up to date on two dean searches. We had two searches this year that we were trying to accomplish and that was dean of the Law School and dean of the College of Social Work. With respect to the dean of the Law School, we worked this summer, we got out information early, we got back a lot of inquiries, and I think we have an excellent pool of candidates. The committee has worked to narrow those down to a smaller number and we are moving forward. I hope that we will be bringing candidates to campus later this semester. With respect to Social Work, I met with the faculty of the College of Social Work after listening to several of them privately and proposed to them that Leon Ginsberg who is the interim dean serve not only this year but next year. And, that we initiate a search next year for the following year. I then invited the faculty to make comments at the meeting as well as later through e-mail or telephone calls. They did so and I think most of the faculty were totally on board with what I proposed to them. So Leon Ginsberg will be the Interim Dean this year and next year for the College of Social Work.

A number of people have asked me about the Endowed Chairs Centers of Excellence program from the state lottery funds. Let me tell you what I know at this point and then I’ll be happy to answer any questions that you have. As you probably already know the Legislature in Act 356 set aside $30 million in lottery funds to be used for an endowed chairs program for the three research universities. They also created a nine member board, three of those members appointed by the Governor, three by the Speaker of the House, and three by the President of the Senate. These folks would be appointed, would have a chair, would establish by-laws and would establish criteria deadlines, formats for proposals and so forth. Where we are today, eight members of that board have been appointed. Senator McConnell still has one more appointment to make. The acting chair of that board is Harry Lightsey who is a former dean of the Law School here and a former president of the College of Charleston. He was one of Governor Hodges appointees. The first meeting of the board is scheduled for October 17. At that time they will elect a permanent chair, it is my understanding, and they will also vote on by-laws for the committee. One of the things that I think is very encouraging is that President Sorensen and I met with Mr. Lightsey and Mr. Lightsey invited the three research universities to get together and jointly propose basically the guidelines, the criteria, and so forth for these proposals. Just again to remind you that the proposals can be between $2 million and $5 million to the state. Whatever you are granted you are expected to match dollar for dollar through the university. The proposals can be joint proposals from two or three of the research universities – Clemson, USC, and MUSC. The board primarily is charged with receiving the reviews of the research proposed from an external panel of experts. They are also charged with ensuring that the matching funds and the matching funds as I said dollar for dollar have to be new non state dollars. I should say non tax state dollars that are generated after January 1, 2002. One of the most important things that this board does is to try to relate the proposal to economic development in the State of South Carolina. That is going to be very, very important I
think as we present these proposals. I have asked for the titles of proposals from deans within the University and the deadline was yesterday. It appears that we will have about 15 proposals from the University of South Carolina. Now we will have to look very closely at those in some kind of an internal process. The President and I talked about that this morning and we will have to formulate some kind of a procedure for an internal process. We have to be able when we submit this proposal and it goes out of the University we have to show that the matching money is available for that. And, that is going to be very important. The President has met with the deans. He has said that he feels that at least part of the commitment he should generate if he needs to do that. So we are not at this point clear how many proposals we will submit from the University. I don’t think we will be submitting 15 from the University but we have to look at the criteria. The Commission on Higher Education has been charged with staffing this whole program. Rayburn Barton has put Dr. Gail Morrison of the CHE in charge of this. She met with several of us recently to start putting guidelines together. We have a meeting of the three provosts and the vice presidents for research at the research universities to work on this further later this month. That is the status of that.

Some of you have asked me about a bond bill this year in the legislature. The answer is we do not know whether there will be a bond bill or not. I think it is going to depend in large degree to probably what Senator Leatherman of the Senate would like to do. If you remember two years ago the House passed a bond bill, the Senate chose not to. There was not a bond bill last year but we are hearing that there is a good chance that we will have a bond bill this year. If that is the case, Rick Kelly and the President and I in consultation with other people in the University have talked about what we should submit for a bond bill. Right now we are looking at the following:

1. We still need to continue our work on what is called Gibbes Green. As you know we did Sloan College on Gibbes Green now occupied by the Department of Sociology. We totally renovated that building. Slightly off Gibbes Green but part of what we consider Gibbes Green was Callcott College. The Department of Geography has moved back into newly renovated facilities there. We still need to look at LeConte. We still need to look at Barnwell. We still need to look at Hamilton. We also need to look at Petigru. Petigru was part of that. Our new college formed from a combination of Journalism and Library Science has been promised Petigru College with perhaps an addition built onto Petigru to house studios. So we need to look at the Gibbes Green area.

2. The Law School has been one of our priorities – a new law school. And, we will ask for money for a new law school.

3. We are currently getting ready to start a new School of Public Health adjacent to the plaza on Assembly Street. We will ask for money for that.

4. Now that Chemistry and Geography who were temporarily in Jones Physical Science Center have moved out we need to look at renovation of Jones. That is an asbestos project. We do have some asbestos money but we need to do a lot more work in the Jones Physical Science Center.
5. We are asking for a small amount for the Moore School of Business to be matched by a much larger amount from the Moore School through private donations.

6. We also are looking at projects at Aiken, Spartanburg, Beaufort, Sumter, and Lancaster for a bond bill.

Clearly we don’t expect to get all of these but we can’t even be told no if don’t ask for them. So those are the ones we are looking at right now. That concludes my report and I’ll be happy to answer any questions that I can.

CHAIR WILCOX – Are there questions for the Provost?

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – I was asked by a colleague to ask you about the article that appeared in the Chronicle of Higher Education in which one of our colleague’s classes was being criticized for the guidelines for discussion. Do you have information for us on that subject beyond what appeared in the Chronicle?

PROVOST ODOM – What I can tell you is that I have been in fairly long and extended conversations with Professor Weber as has Dean Stewart, Women’s Studies is in that college. We understand totally where she is coming from with respect to her feelings and this is documented well back into mid 1980’s with respect to how she uses these guidelines to create discussion in her class. At the same time we understand concerns that people might have with those guidelines, the way that they are written and worded. Over the weekend Professor Weber and I talked at length and she is certainly willing to put at the top of the guidelines that: “These guidelines are for this class only and they are intended only to enhance discussion within this class.” The President has written a letter to FIRE, the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, telling them what we are doing and we will also be corresponding with the Chronicle.

CHAIR WILCOX – Are there any more questions? Thank you sir.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – Not to monopolize but I wanted to hear from Mr. Kelly.

CHAIR WILCOX – That is where I am headed. I gave them my confused version the President gave them some of his outlines, could you maybe bring the group up to where in your perspective as chair of this group as to where we stand with value-centered management?

RICHARD KELLY (Chief Financial Officer) – I clearly support where the President is on this. One of the things that is interesting about value-centered management is that it is nothing more than a budget in process. And, if I asked each of you today to describe the budget in process that we have right now before we use value-centered management, my guess is that many you would not know. The SDI Committee was looking at “How do we know what we spending our dollars for?” It was obvious to us that the budget process that we have in place today doesn’t provide that kind of information. Step back with me
just a moment and say that two years ago 38% of our budget came from the State and 24% of our budget came from tuitions. Of that 62% we put it in a pool and then colleges would over the years, come to us and say that we need this much money for this and the budget was created. Actually what we were spending the money for was never really measured toward productivity or outcome for what we were investing into. That is not to suggest that there was something wrong with that it is just the fact that as those dollars started shrinking. As Dr. Sorensen talked about it if we sustain a 5% budget cut (which I feel it will be minimum of 5%) that will be $8 million off the Columbia campus alone. That is $8 million on top of the almost $19 million that we absorbed last year and if you go back to the year prior to that although we did not sustain a cut what they did was kept us level from the previous year. So we are at four years now, partially due to inflation and partially due to budget cuts of declining income or revenue coming to this University. It makes it imperative for us to be able to look at the data as we are allocating the dollars and the scarce dollars that we have. Over 800 vacancies exist on this campus right now and they exist because they are not funded.

Value-centered management is nothing more than a budget process that would tell you where your revenues are coming from and where your expenditures are going. It shows it by department. You can drill down. You can go down to whatever depth you want to. It is a process that provides you the data that you need to see. We have divided into really three sources of revenue. One would be tuitions or dollars coming to the University – largely tuitions. The second part of the equation would be service units where we provide you a service and we are just paying for it. And, the third being research – research dollars that are coming into our University. So the first model that we created was a model that says based on the number of students that sit in your classrooms, how does that compare with the budget that you have approved this year with the dollars that you are collecting for tuitions? So we did it at 75%, 25% split. 75% going to the teaching unit and 25% going to the enroll unit if they should differ. So then we had a model, we had at least a model to look at what was going on. So that was the first phase of this and we’ve done that. We know right now based on the budget that any college has or any vice president has, we know right based on the number of students that they are teaching what we have to do to supplement that to make that budget whole. That was the first information we provided to the President and we have at least seen that part of the equation. We also provided that to the deans and we showed it to them. All of sudden their was a startled look on one dean’s face and he said “But you know this is kind of askewed version of what we were all about. Because we were not focusing as much on teaching as we were on academic research.” So there in lies the second piece of the equation that we have laid into this puzzle and that is research dollars. So if there is a small amount of money coming into a college that shows for tuition or teaching, then is there a corresponding number that is exceptionally higher as a result of research. Setting your priorities that way. As the President says, the third element we are going to lay in here will be the service units. We will like we have to be accountable in our service units because the way it works right now is that this University gives Business and Finance $20 million to operate these facilities and then we go about doing it. Now as the President said if we give each of you a utility budget and once that runs out it is over with that is in your court. The way we have it right now is if the utility budget runs out it is
really in our court. So we have to push and pull borrow from this one, rob from Peter to pay Paul to keep things afloat. What it has shown quite honestly is if you take $20 million (and I know these figures by heart now) $10 million of our budget is for maintenance and operations of our facilities and $10 million is for the utilities to provide the heating and cooling and lights for our facilities. If you take the square footages of our facilities on this campus and you divide it into that $20 million what you are going to find is that we fund our facilities/operations about $2.25 a square foot. Now there is no building in South Carolina that you can operate for $2.25 a square foot. If you go across the street to any of the office buildings and I’m not talking about laboratories, or auditoriums like this, I’m just talking about to a bare bones office building; the minimum it costs you is $4.50. That is the minimum of what it costs you. You start adding to it laboratories, special conditioned areas and stuff like it just goes higher. So you can see that one of the problems that we are facing and VCM will identify this, we will start seeing what the problems are associated with our budgeting process.

I said this to Jerry the first day I walked in really blindly to an SDI meeting and Jerry was talking about value-centered management and he asked me what my thoughts were. And, as a financial person I like value-centered management because it lays out things crisp and clear so you can see what is going where and how its being spent and what is the return on your investments and those kind of things. But what I told Jerry and I never will forget this was, “It is going to show how grossly underfunded we are in several areas on this University.” I told a lot of you, as I look around this audience when I interviewed for this job as the chief financial officer I was amazed at the number one question I faced the most comments about was the condition of our facilities. They talked nothing about budget. They did not talk about research or anything like that. It was the deplorable conditions our facilities. So this value-centered management is going to allow us to start focusing our dollars and you can see where they are being spent. I am not sure if that gave you a complete explanation of what you wanted. But it is matching expenditures and revenues and we realize that at some point we will have to do subsidies. It will lead us to the point of what Rob was talking about. There are two committees that we are trying to put together right now made up largely of faculty. One of them will be what kind of guidance can this committee recommend to the President and Provost as you look at this data what should you be looking for, how should you be trying to guide these decisions based on the data that you have. And, the other one will be to go back, and this is large piece of this equation, when you think about value-centered management, it is revenue and expenditures. A lot of our expenditures are based on existing budgets. We need to go back and look at existing budgets. Look at the finance budget and say, “Is $20 million adequate for facilities?” “Is it too much?” “How did we get to $20 million?” Because $20 million has occurred over years and it is much like state government’s budget -- it just builds on itself. So you have got to go back at some point in time and test what your current budget is. That will allow the President, the Provost, and the trustees of this University with your input to set the priorities of how we spend our dollars. Does that get close?

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – It begins to but what I hear you saying is that take -- the facilities budget, we need to double the facilities budget in order to operate the campus.
But Rob was saying earlier was that we have been putting up with these, some would say, insufferable conditions, like in LeConte for example, in order to maintain an academic value in the programs to students who have to inhabit those buildings. That is where push comes to shove it seems to me. How are we going to increase the revenues in order to increase the facilities budget and at the same time maintain, at least, the academic values. Where are we going to find the money to do that? How does value-centered management help us do that?

RICK KELLY – Well value-centered management in and of itself won’t help you do it. It will identify the problems and it will give you data so that you can look at setting priorities and what can be done and what can’t be done. I say it won’t help you do it. Having the data, having the knowledge of if enrollment is low, research is high or vice versa those are the kind of things that you need to know. You need to be able to talk through the Provost and President need to talk with the deans about what they expect out of production in those areas and I think that will help.

PROFESSOR WEDLOCK – I am hoping that will also help you frame our arguments it would seem to me. To tell people, perhaps, as to what we are actually accomplishing and what we do not have.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – You hit on a really critical point because the situation that we have now is that when I talk to legislators, talk to foundation presidents, talk to prospective donors (all of which I am doing on a regular basis) and I talk about the inadequacy of our facilities, I am not able to quantify the degree of inadequacy. If I talk to a CEO, and I frequently do that, and I say this is how much we have available for utilities and maintenance and it turns out it is a third of what she or he has for his or her corporation; the power of my argument is enhanced enormously. But right now we don’t have that data. We don’t know what it costs us to operate. We just know it in total. So I spoke the Rotary Club in Sumter recently, for example, and the President of the Rotary Club who identifies himself as a staunch enthusiastic Gamecock says, “You guys are awash of money down there.” I say “What do you mean we are awash in money?” Well he said “You got the $40 million Strom Thurmond physical fitness center going up. You got the X million area being built. You are all talking about a convention center down there and you got cranes all over the place and million and millions of dollars are being spent.” Of course it gave me the opportunity to tell him exactly where the money is coming from for each of those projects. And, then I talked to you about a new residence hall (for example) will be paid completely by renting out the rooms in the residence hall. The Strom Thurmond fitness center is paid for 100% by our students - out of their fees. So if I have data like that it helps not only me but all of us who are engaged in raising money saying this is the nature of the problem that we have. But now when I go out and talk about the inadequacy of facilities I just say we’ve got mold in some of our residence halls and we’ve got bricks falling down and it is musty in the library and I can say those kind of things and show them pictures. But these data will help me make a more powerful argument to our funders.
CHAIR WILCOX – As we’ve dealt with value-centered management this year, my
perception of what it is has changed dramatically from what I understood it to be as we
talked about it last spring. What I am hearing a lot of and seeing in the committee is that
it is data gathering and data reporting. The big issue still to be decided is, how do we
make the decisions of priorities? And, that to me is really the faculty interest all a long.
As I am understanding it more and more, that it is not a value-centered management
decision; but that it is a decision that is going to be made differently because value-
centered management puts different information in front of the decision maker. So I
think the important thing is to keep our eyes on the priorities we determine, once we get
this information.

PROFESSOR LANE – I had a question about the possible ways of charging students
tuition. Is there any discussion of differential credit hour rates or of charging students per
credit hour? Differential rates depending on which classes they are enrolled in?

RICK KELLY – I don’t know if I am the right one to answer that maybe Jerry could help
me with it. This University does charge differential in our graduate programs. We have
not sought to do that in our undergraduate programs. Would it be that you think that we
ought to do that it shift the burden more to higher productive colleges? I am not sure
what necessarily the benefit of that would be.

PROFESSOR LANE – I was just asking. If we are talking about sending tuition
revenues here or there, how they are going to be calculated?

RICK KELLY – Right now we calculate doing it by credit hours. I am sorry I
misunderstood your question.

PROFESSOR LANE – A student taking 12 hours pays the same tuition as a student
taking 17 hours.

RICK KELLY – Right now.

PROFESSOR LANE – Is that under discussion?

RICK KELLY – Yes.

PROFESSOR LANE – That was my question.

PROVOST ODOM – That in fact was a recommendation of SDI. That we look at
charging by the hour.

PROFESSOR LANE – That’s why I wanted to ask where you were with that.

RICK KELLY – I am sorry I didn’t understand.
CHAIR WILCOX – Is there further discussion? Is there anything for the good of the order? Or announcements? Is there a motion to adjourn. I can always count on that. We stand adjourned until our November meeting. Thank you.