FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 5, 2003

I. Call to Order.

CHAIR ROBERT WILCOX – For the ones who are here at 3 o’clock, let’s go ahead and start. This is the February 5th meeting of the Faculty Senate.

II. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR WILCOX - You have before you the minutes from the December 11th meeting 2002. Are there any additions or correction? Should I ask, have we begun to fix the attendance taking problems? That being the case, is there a motion for approval of the minutes as submitted? Second? All in favor signify by saying aye. The minutes stand approved.

I should mention at the outset here, if you are watching from afar, you may call 777-6073 to record your attendance over at the Faculty Senate Office. And, 888-531-0685 will hopefully connect you to us if you have a question or comment during the meeting.

III. Reports of Committees.

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

CHAIR WILCOX – Is there a report of the Steering Committee?

PROFESSOR WISE (Retailing) – No report today.

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

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – We have two items for your consideration on page 17, roman numeral I, College of Education, Department of Instruction and Teacher Education has two course deletions.

CHAIR WILCOX – The committee has moved roman numeral one from the College of Education the deletion of two courses. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? That is approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Roman numeral two from the College of Science and Mathematics, A. the Department of Biological Sciences and the Marine Science Program want to have a cross listing of BIOL 510 which is a change, a new course MSCI 510, and a new course MSCI 305.

CHAIR WILCOX – The two items moved by the committee, roman numeral two from the College of Science and Mathematics are, cross listings between the department of
Biological Sciences and the Marine Science Program and some new courses in the Marine Science Program. Is there any discussion of those proposals? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? They are approved.

This is a rare treat. We have one page today to approve. He assures me that we will make up for it next month, so enjoy it while we can.

CHAIR WILCOX – We are going to skip over for a moment the report of the Faculty Advisory Committee and go the Faculty Welfare Committee.

c. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Peter Graham, Chair:

PROFESSOR GRAHAM (Sport and Entertainment Management) – I have one matter to report on. The Welfare Committee has received a couple of inquires regarding the new health and fitness wellness center that is being opened soon. I have tried to allay fears that some people have expressed by indicating that the Solomon Blatt Physical Education Center will remain open and operating the same as it is now. The faculty who have privileges of working out there will still have that available to them but the new facility does have advantages to it – being brand new and larger and, of course, much more luxurious. Jerry Brewer is here today, to answer any questions that someone might have about that.

CHAIR WILCOX – Are there any questions that anyone has that Jerry could help us with today? I know from time to time there have been some questions here, and I asked Jerry to be here just in case there were any concerns that you all had. There is also a web site. I am not going to try and give you the whole web site address but we will put it in the minutes (www.sa.sc.edu/pecenter/strom.htm) and you can find helpful information there or from Jerry Brewer’s office. If there are questions, I would ask you to refer colleagues to this site and Jerry will pass out cards with that information. This is your opportunity, but if there are no questions that is fine.

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (Computer Science and Engineering) - Some colleagues have gotten announcements of tours, which have not been distributed to all faculty and staff, but I assume are open to all faculty and staff. Could you comment on these?

JERRY BREWER (Student Life-Director) – Yes, they are listed on the card. The web site listed has a comparison of the Blatt building and the Thurmond building. The Blatt building, as Professor Graham indicated, will operate exactly the same is it does now. Operations will improve because we will be able to relieve the overcrowdedness. We will also be able to maintain it and keep it cleaner. We will be able to do building improvements that we have not had the opportunity to do in the past. The tours of the Thurmond building are listed. Some of you have been in the building with us and it is an absolutely stunning building outside and it is twice as nice inside. It is aesthetically pleasing; programmatically it will challenge every person where they are in their fitness scale. There is an indoor track and several amenities that we have not had on campus
before. Please take advantage of the tours. Please let us know which you will attend to allow adequate room for everyone. I know the College of Engineering has arranged for a special tour for themselves this Friday afternoon. We are happy to do that if colleges or departments would like to do that.

PROFESSOR SUZANNE McDERMOTT (Medical School) – I am in the Medical School so we have to drive over to the Blatt Center. Will there be any parking for participants once the child care center goes up?

JERRY BREWER – You are talking about the Blatt building?

PROFESSOR McDERMOTT – Yes.

JERRY BREWER – Well, parking is a unique challenge for all of us. We were speaking about that situation today. The parking places that are going away are meters or faculty/staff positions and they are going to assign more of the student lot to faculty/staff. Parking is a challenge. One good thing about the Wellness Center is that if you park behind the coliseum you can walk across the Blossom Street ramp and that is a very easy walk. I don’t think that will help you with the Blatt Center. Sorry.

PROFESSOR NANCY LANE (Languages, Literatures, and Cultures) – I have a couple of questions about activities that currently go on in the Blatt Center. Will Fit Place remain where it is?

JERRY BREWER – Yes.

PROFESSOR LANE – Will there still be aerobics classes and other kinds of classes in the Blatt Center?

JERRY BREWER – Yes to both of those. We have three studios in the new building and we will be able to offer programs in the current studio on the first floor of the Blatt building. The same type of offerings will be available at the Blatt Center. Probably those of you that like to work out at the 4, 5 or 6 o’clock classes, which are a little crowded, will notice some of that crowd moving to the Thurmond building.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR – I am just interested - is there information about the pool hours on that web site, as they are sometimes limited at the Blatt Center?

JERRY BREWER – One of the great advantages of the new building is that it is 100% dedicated to your recreation and your fitness schedule. There will be no scheduled activities there. There are an indoor and an outdoor pool at the new facility. They will be open during most building hours. The Blatt facility is shared with the intercollegiate swim program, academic classes and with age group swimming programs and it is closed for swim meets. That will not occur in the new building. If you are a swimmer and the building is open, the pool will be open that day for you as well.
CHAIR WILCOX – Any other questions? Jerry, thank you very much – we appreciate your coming.

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

PROFESSOR GLAD (GINT) – We have on this gray copy here the background for the report of the Faculty Advisory Committee - our unanimous suggestion. The four propositions that we are presenting to you read as follows:

“RESOLVED, that the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall appoint an ad hoc committee to prepare and submit to the Senate for its consideration, by the May 2003 meeting, a recommendation regarding the disposition of salary grievances from faculty members. Among the recommendations to be made by the ad hoc committee shall be the following:

1. A recommendation as to the composition and responsibilities of a permanent committee of other body charged with consideration of faculty salary grievances;
2. A recommendation as to the appropriate grounds upon which a grievance may be submitted;
3. A recommendation as to what information should be made available to such a committee by the University to assist the committee in its work; and
4. A recommendation as to the appropriate authority of the committee with regards to providing a remedy when a grievance is found to be meritorious.”

Now the background of this is that the Grievance committee chair told us that essentially they do not feel well equipped to really look into substantive salary grievance issues. Maybe procedural matters, but essentially they don’t have the kind of information and the time that would be requisite to doing a real inquiry into these kinds of matters. So they referred this to the Faculty Advisory Committee. Now the Faculty Manual states that the Grievance committee shall deal with salary grievance matters. So there we are we have a problem. We had a discussion in the Faculty Advisory Committee and we considered three alternatives:

First - that the Grievance committee be instructed to continue to deal with grievance issues and that we try to deal with their problem by providing them with or at least requiring that they get relevant salary information from the administration. And, hopefully the administration will cooperate with them. So that Grievance can have that kind of information. Maybe a subcommittee of people that have longer more overlapping terms could work on that. But that would probably involve some change in the makeup of the Grievance committee.

A second possibility is to refer issues to the Provost’s Salary Equity Committee but that committee is not elected in anyway by the faculty. So a Provost’s grievance committee without faculty input into it directly would have to be revised in someway.

Third is a salary committee where people would deal exclusively with these issues. Have the time and energy to focus on this important matter.
So those are the options that we discussed. At some point it was suggested that we take this to the Senate to get your feedback and that the chair of the Senate appoint a committee dealing with this issue and come back to us with some informed response. So this is the background for these proposals. And, since it is a committee recommendation, the motion is on the floor.

CHAIR WILCOX – The committee has moved the resolution that is before you as Attachment 2. It does not need a second as a committee report. Therefore the floor is open for discussion/comments.

PROFESSOR ROBERT CARLSSON (Business Administration) – Would it be possible for the ad hoc committee to conclude that the salary grievances should remain with the Grievance committee and the Grievance committee should just remain as it is constituted? Is that an option?

CHAIR WILCOX – The intention of this resolution is that that would be an option. Options could range from, a recommendation the faculty shouldn’t be involved in salary grievances, to a recommendation that grievances should stay where it is, to an idea that we should come up with a new format for doing it. They would all be options of the report.

PROFESSOR CARLSSON – As I was reading number one, it seemed that that might not be consistent with recommending that the Grievance committee keep doing what it is doing, which certainly should be an option.

PROFESSOR GLAD – We have to take some action because the grievance committee right now does not want to deal with substantive salary issues. We can’t just simply drop it. The provision for grievance is in the Faculty Manual.

CHAIR WILCOX – My charge to the committee would contemplate that as an option that they could come forward with.

PROFESSOR ELDON WEDLOCK (Law) – That question raises the issue of what the Faculty Grievance committee is doing presently on salary grievances. If you look at the Faculty Manual, we don’t feel as if we have the kind of power to, shall we say, intrude into administrative decisions. We can only get things from departments and colleges administration by requesting it. We don’t have any authority to subpoena, if you will, information of a statistical and comparative nature. Moreover the Grievance Committee as it is constituted now operates in a quasi-judicial capacity rather than in a more legislative capacity of weighing works of various values, which is generally done in the administration and accomplished there. If you want to leave this in the Grievance Committee, we need to do something to enhance the authority of the Grievance Committee to get the information we need to make decisions. On the other side of the coin, we don’t really feel competent as a group of people that are elected to make the kinds of decisions that need to be made, given the varying directions of departments and
colleges and where they might want to go how they might change direction. We don’t have even the statistical or, I would say, the political expertise on our committee to make these judgments. So both on the front end – not being able to get the information to make the decision – and on the back end – having the capacity to make the recommendation, we end up doing nothing at all. That is the situation.

CHAIR WILCOX – Other comments?

PROFESSOR EDWARD GIESKES (ENGL) – I was wondering if we could add some language to the number one recommendation to sort of broaden the considerations that this ad hoc committee could ask another committee to undertake. To say something about looking at university salary issues in general not just particular cases.

CHAIR WILCOX – If you would like to offer that as a motion to amend, please give us the specific change that you suggest.

PROFESSOR GIESKES – To change the last sentence of number one from “….with consideration of faculty salary grievances” to “….with consideration of individual faculty salary grievances in particular and university salary issues and policies in general.”

CHAIR WILCOX – There is a motion offered from the floor that paragraph one of the resolution be amended so the last part would read: “…. charged with consideration of individual faculty salary grievances in particular and university salary issues and policies in general.” Is that correct? Is there a second to that motion? The motion has been seconded. Discussion of the motion to amend?

PROFESSOR EASTMAN – The addition of this charge strikes me as something that would overlap with the current charge to the Faculty Welfare Committee which I think is charged with looking at that sort of thing. And, it would also result in considerably more work. Any of these committees, this ad hoc committee, the Grievance Committee, and any related committees are an enormous time sink. You have to be dedicated to serve on one of these committees, and it will have an impact on the time you spend on teaching and research. If we put too much in one committee, it will be harder to get people to serve on it.

CHAIR WILCOX – Other discussion of the amendment? Ready for a vote on the amendment?

PROFESSOR GLAD – May I just make a comment here and this is for Professor Wedlock. The professional women on campus, with the cooperation of the administration, have gotten breakdowns for each department in terms of the low salary in each rank and the high salary and the median. So at least we have had that kind of cooperation and that kind of information is available at this point. Also the Chancellor’s Committee does have information projecting what the potential salaries of people should be in terms of time and rank and other variables that I am not acquainted with. If they are
making less than expected, then there is a process where they refer it back to the departments for explanation. So that process is already in place; but it deals essentially with gender and race issues. It would be useful, however, in seeing men who are also not meeting these standards. So I think there is already in place some processes which are used which enable committees to deal with these salary issues. If a committee is appointed and looks into this and finds out that it is impossible to do it - that would be their recommendation. I also think that if they find that one committee is having too big a burden and they want a separate committee or if they want to load it into Welfare that is something that they could consider after talking to the relevant people, and talking to the administration and finding out what they are willing and able to do.

CHAIR WILCOX – An amendment is on the floor. Further discussion on that? Okay, let us vote on the amendment. This is the language to modify number one as proposed from the floor. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? I read it as carrying. So the amendment is approved. We now are back to the consideration of the full resolution as amended. Any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? The resolution is approved. I will undertake to appoint a committee. It will be a relatively small committee, I am thinking, probably only five or six people on this committee. The purpose of this committee will be short lived. This is not the committee that will undertake whatever tasks in the future. I would ask you to assist me in that process if you have interests or know of someone with an interest particularly with being on the ad hoc committee – feel free to contact the Faculty Senate Office or contact me in the next couple days. Within a week or so I hope to have this committee appointed. So I need it fairly quickly, but if you are interested, please do let me know. Anything else from Advisory?

e. Other Committees. No other reports.

IV. Report of Secretary.
None

V. Reports of Officers.

PRESIDENT ANDREW SORENSEN – Thank you very much Mr. Chair. I would like to begin by reporting briefly on two searches that are going on.

The Law School search committee sent me four names as candidates for the Dean of the Law School. I selected Professor Robert Hillman from the University of California at Davis as the person whose vision for the Law School was most highly congruent with my own. He was here last weekend. I was told by a number of faculty in the Law School that the visit seemed to go well and negotiations are continuing.

The search committee for the Vice President for Advancement also sent me several names. I have asked two people to return. Hudson Akin who is from Ball State University, was here the last few days. Phil Mazzarra who is from St. Joseph’s Hospital Foundation in Atlanta will be here later this week. I am eager to complete the process of
selecting one of those two so we can get on with the business of advancement. It is particularly of great concern to me because I have been on the road a lot trying to raise money for the University. I have been modestly successful, I got my first million dollar gift for the University since I came. But we need many, many more million, multi-million dollar gifts. So I am working feverishly to secure those gifts but I need help. If any of you would like to volunteer to help me raise money, I welcome your appointing an ad hoc committee of people to help me, Mr. Chairman.

I am consolidating governmental relations, public relations, alumni affairs and development all in one office creating a new office of Vice President for University Advancement to replace the Vice President for Development. I don’t think we do as good a job of marketing who we are as we could, as we ought. I don’t think we brag enough about all the wonderful things that our faculty do as effectively as we ought. We don’t interest young people as effectively and as well as we ought. I spent a lot of time the past couple of weeks talking to high school football players and their mothers and fathers to interest them in coming to the University. I suggested to Coach Holtz that I should go on the payroll of the football staff because I have spent a lot of time with Mr. Demetrius Summers – just to pick a random example. So I believe that if we spend as much time recruiting non-student athletes as we spend recruiting student athletes, we would have a wondrous and most impressive array of candidates to be here.

Yesterday the Mayor and City Council of Columbia convened a technology summit. I was asked to speak as was Dr. Harris Pastides, our Interim Vice President for Research, about the University of South Carolina’s role in technology an expanding public/private partnerships. Events leading up to this summit have been proceeding for seven months that I know of. The City Council of Columbia was approached to give $50,000 to recruit a firm. Another group called the Greater Midlands Business Council, comprised of about 35 CEO’s and people of that ilk in the midlands put up about $100,000. I assure you no University money was put up. That combined for $150,000 to secure the firm of Craig Davis & Associates, who are the people responsible for the development of the Centennial Campus which is adjacent to North Carolina State University campus. That is the model that we have been pursuing. We have developed a plan to have 5 million square feet of space that will be near the campus. We are looking at three sites. I will be presenting that report to the Board of Trustees later this month. I assume your Chair will be present for the presentation. If the Board of Trustees will give me permission to proceed with making the plan more concrete, I will bring it to the Faculty Senate at your next meeting. We already have investors lined up who say they want to help us with the construction of buildings. Once I get approval from the Board, those discussions can begin in earnest. We are anticipating beginning construction of 500,000 square feet of research space before the end of this calendar year. So by December of 2003 I expect to have holes in the ground and architectural plans approved and construction to begin on those 500,000 square feet of space.

Given our fiscal stringency and the fact that our budget was cut by $33 million since I became President, a mere seven months ago, it is important to emphasize that the money is obviously not coming from our own coffers. We are developing a number of
private/public partnerships where private investors will pay for the construction of facilities. We are approaching the legislature for some bond money, and also asking people to give money for the building of buildings. I have had a lot of experience with enticing people who have a lot of money to give to buildings in which their names will be featured prominently. We desperately need additional research space. I am told frequently as I visit various parts of the campus how cramped we are, how inadequate our quarters are. There seems to be a great deal of enthusiasm in the business community, among legislators, alumni, and members of the Board of Trustees for this project. I, too, am excited about it and I am hopeful that it will be approved and that it will see fruition in the near term. A copy of the presentation that I gave yesterday is on my web page, if you are interested in reading what I had to say there, although I must say that The State did a good job of describing accurately my comments.

The day before yesterday we had the ground breaking for the Child Care Center. There is another public/private partnership working with Gateway Academy to develop a facility in which we will provide child care to children of faculty/staff/students and also to members of the community as well. We will have space dedicated to research in exactly the same facility for these very charming children. We have a one-year and one-month old grandchild, our first, and so I am reliving all of the wonderful experiences that I had as father of two young children. Our day-care children sang a song “The More We Get Together the Happier We’ll Be” and at the conclusion of the dedication ceremony I asked all the adults to join me in singing that song together. So yesterday when I was faced with this group of very somber and serious technology business leaders with whom the nerd quotient is moderately high, I suggested that we all stand and hold hands and sing “The More We Work Together the Happier We’ll Be.” The reason I did it is that there is a serious message; we have got to work together, and we can’t get this project done alone, especially when we are in these destitute financial straits with the legislature. We have to get more money and we have to get a can-do spirit. The attendees at the technology summit loosened up a little bit and I have been told there was a little buzz, a little enthusiasm; they thought maybe this guy is a little goofy, but maybe we can get things done together.

The Palmetto Institute has been working with three research universities – Clemson, MUSC, and Carolina – to pull out of the Commission on Higher Education feeling that the bureaucracy is cumbersome. I have been told that there are 110 full-time employees at the Commission on Higher Education and a lot of our staff feel that the kinds of regulations and hoops they make us go through are needlessly complex and daunting. So we have been working on this proposal and lobbying the legislature for it. Of course, if we pull out of the CHE we must (because of our human propensity) have somebody to oversee us. We are going to have a Research Oversight Committee (ROC) which will have a Board of Trustees. We recently had a good meeting with the Governor explaining to him what it is that we wanted to do, how we proposed to do it. We had an interesting discussion about the composition of the membership of the board. He did not promise support of it, but he is clearly intrigued.
I am spending a lot of time with the legislators lobbying for relief from the legislative impediments. If this research campus is going to materialize here is one possible scenario we will have: I will go to a developer and I will say, “We have a city block that consists of four acres and this can accommodate four 100,000 square foot buildings, I would like you to build a building on our property.” I emphasize that this is a hypothetical scenario, so don’t go tell your friends and neighbors that this is what we are going to do; this is merely something we could do. So I’ll say, “Have I got a deal for you. You pay for 100% of the cost of constructing the building on our land and you can use half of the building and we’ll use half of the building. At the end of 30-year period, the building is ours. What a deal!” When the state legislators wrote the regulations governing use of state buildings, they didn’t envisage somebody like me coming along making these kinds of proposals. We also have to change the way we construct buildings. Our process now is to hire an architect to do elevations – how the building looks. Then after we get the elevations done, we begin raising money and hire an architect to design the building. After the architect does the specifications, we review the plans, then we send out a bid for a contractor. We select the contractor and then we build the building. Now why don’t we do those things in parallel? Because of this process, we spend an extra year and a half during which time the cost of construction materials escalates. It would make things much easier if we could do that. I spent a couple of hours today in the State House explaining this problem to our legislative leaders. I must say I am very pleased by the response. People aren’t promising me how they are going to vote, but they aren’t throwing me out of their respective offices.

It’s important to note that our research universities are doing this in concert. Today, for example, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Clemson University and I and the principal lobbyist for MUSC visited several legislative offices together – arm in arm. The staff and the legislators are incredulous. They wonder, “What is going on? You have people working together.” It is exciting. Maybe we’ll be able to get this done.

I want to conclude with some brief excerpts from my Vision and Mission Statement. I will be presenting this at 5 o’clock at the Russell House Theatre today and the entire speech is on my web page right now. I am going to give you a highly truncated presentation.

Our vision for the University of South Carolina can be succinctly summarized in three words: "Excellence in Engagement." "Excellence" because the vigilant pursuit of excellence must—and will—characterize all that we do. "In Engagement" because our excellence is not manifested in ivory tower detachment from the eleven communities throughout the state in which our eight institutions are located, but rather in the immersion of our faculty and staff in their commitment to scholarly discovery. They, in turn, actively encourage our students to follow their example of engagement in our communities as a critical dimension of the pursuit of learning. We are already demonstrating that engagement in serving the Palmetto State. Our faculty and students are living and working in the Low Country to preserve the diminishing marshlands and fragile ecosystems with their haunting beauty. And, if you haven’t been down to our research facility in the Baruch Institute and other facilities we have, I heartily encourage
you to do so. They are building Habitat for Humanity homes in byways across the region. They are operating clinics whose aim is to reduce deaths from preventable diseases such as AIDS, adult-onset diabetes, and colorectal cancer.

In all these endeavors, and in literally hundreds of others too numerous to mention, the time-worn distinctions between research, teaching, and service are woefully inadequate to reflect the ingenious ways in which scholarly discovery is woven into the tapestry of learning and outreach. Whether we think of the music professor developing an innovative way of teaching my fellow trumpet players or a molecular pharmacologist designing a more effective cancer drug, we envisage a faculty fully engaged in scholarly pursuits that cannot be sustained indefinitely in solitude.

With "Excellence in Engagement" as our guide to the overarching relation of teaching, research, and service, our University’s mission (and now I move into the mission statement) will focus on five areas: relating university growth to economic development, bringing coherence to our educational institutions, expanding our outreach activities, enhancing the diversity of our university family, and cultivating a sense of community. And, I will later today speak about each of these in modest amount of detail and then the greater detail in this document.

As he looked at the disintegration of British society nearly four hundred years ago, the noted English poet and clergyman John Donne observed: "Tis all in pieces, all coherence gone." Millions of Americans intone that very lamentation as we speak. But if we dedicate ourselves unswervingly to the mission of increased attention to teaching, enhanced by a more ambitious research agenda—with both teaching and research intertwined in reaching out to the state and region, the coherence in implementing that mission will bring together the University of South Carolina family in ways we have hitherto only dimly imagined. And the impact on our state and region will be recognized far and wide.

As we pursue the vision and mission I have outlined here, we are mindful of our mandate to educate the whole person. The total experience we provide for our students, both in and out of the classroom, should be geared toward building morally strong yet sensitive citizens who are willing and able to provide leadership in their respective communities, their state and their nation. During every basketball game, that I am able to attend, I stand with the students. You note that I don’t say sit because we don’t sit during the games, we stand. And, some of our students need to hear what I have to say about their sensitivity and their morale example.

The University of South Carolina will continue to serve as a driving force in shaping the Palmetto State for the twenty-first century. We can create a place where economic activity makes this a place where the brightest and best want to live; a place where people are talking about great school systems, terrific universities, and meaningful career opportunities; and a place where responsible government is working hand in hand with its taxpayers to preserve our remarkable natural resources for future generations.
Thank you. I’ll be happy to answer any questions you might have about anything I have said or anything I failed to say.

CHAIR WILCOX – Are there questions for the President? Mr. Provost do you have anything to add to that?

PROVOST JEROME ODOM – My list was going to be short – Child Development Center, search for the Dean of the Law School, and Endowed Chairs and it has just gotten two items or one item shorter.

Let me elaborate just a minute on the Child Development Center because that was really something that we have waited a long time for and we have discussed that in this body several times. This will be a 25,000 square foot facility, two-stories. It will have a capacity of 200 children, 170 will be there from all day and then 30 will come in after school. It will be operated from 6 in the morning until 6 at night, five days a week, 52 weeks a year. The second floor is primarily a research based floor and a number of faculty responded to my request to sit down and help us design the second floor. We have faculty from Music, from Art, from Psychology, from Public Health, from Medicine, from Nursing, and several other units that gathered together with Arlene Andrews and the Institute for Families in Society to work very hard on a plan for the second floor. The partnership that the President talked about – the building is about a $4.1 million building – the first floor and that includes the roof will be paid for by Gateway Academy and the second floor primarily the internal furnishings will be paid for through the good graces of private donors. We are very excited about this. We are very hopeful that the Center will open in September. One of the nice things about going through a private partnership like this is that you do not have to go through the bureaucracy of the state. So you don’t have to go through a bid process and so forth. Mashburn Construction, who has built a number of these Gateway facilities in other locations in South Carolina and North Carolina will be building the building and they started yesterday. And, we fully expect to be operational in the fall and that is good news for a lot of parents and a lot of young children.

The other item that I wanted to brief you on very quickly has to do with our Centers of Excellence Endowed Chairs program. We submitted five proposals to that committee last Friday. Three proposals from only the University of South Carolina; one proposal from USC, Clemson, and MUSC; and one proposal from USC and MUSC. If all of those proposals were successful, we would receive $15.5 million from the $30 million pot from the lottery. We fully expect at least two of those proposals will be successful and they were two $5 million proposals. We have to match that with $5 million. That is what the President has been very busy doing in terms of trying to raise money. That requires private funds and we are hopeful that those will come through. Those two were in nano technology and in photonics. A third proposal only from here had to do with establishment of a center for tourism development. And, the one from the three universities had to do with regenerative tissue – involving people in our medical school. The one with MUSC and USC had to do with neuroscience involving faculty in
our Psychology Department and faculty at the Medical University of South Carolina. That is my report and I’ll be happy to answer any questions.

PROFESSOR JERALD WALLULIS (Philosophy) – With regards to the Child Development Center, will there be representation on this board from faculty parents and also the community?

PROVOST ODOM – Yes and I should have mentioned that. In the agreement that we have with Gateway Academy, Jerry, there is a governing board consisting of five people - three from the University or three appointed by the University and two by Gateway. I am going to start out on that governing board. Nancy Freeman in the College of Education who has been very involved in the Child Development Center for a long time will be a member. And, Ken Washburn who was a former PTO president, he and his wife – Julie – have two children in that center right now. So the governing board will have a parent on it. The advisory board will be appointed soon and we want that advisory board to involve parents and teachers.

CHAIR WILCOX – I would like to offer the appreciation of this body to the Provost in regard to the Child Development Center. He has worked very hard on this these last two years. I know some of you have been in various meetings and probably on different sides of issues at times with him, but he has put a lot of effort into it. I think he is probably quite fulfilled that the ground has actually been turned now, because it has been about two years. So I very much appreciate his support of that project. (Clapping)

VI. Unfinished Business.
None.

VII. New Business.
None.

VIII. Good of the Order or Announcements.

CHAIR WILCOX – I have a couple of announcements to make. One of which is that we are back down to one permanent staff member in the Faculty Senate Office, Jeanna Luker, is working to accommodate all the demands on her over there. It may mean from time to time as a practical matter that if you have a meeting over there that is late in the afternoon you may have to go out the back door. Some things like that. It may mean from time to time that if you have spoken at one of these meetings you may find a little shorter turn around on getting your minutes back just because she won’t be able to do it as quickly. As she is trying to balance the concerns of the T&P committee has well. We do have a temporary employee in there now for awhile. We are working to figure out some other arrangements. In the current climate it is unlikely we will hire a replacement full-time for Debra Brown who moved over to the College of Mass Communications and Information Studies. So we are going to be working it out a little bit over the next few weeks. So if you please, when you are dealing with Jeanna, it is not her fault. Appreciate what she is trying to accomplish over there, and help her out as best you can.
For those of you have not had lunch at the McCutchen House, I recommend it to you. They are doing a very nice job. It is about a $9 lunch. I told people today that I had a $9 lunch at one of our nice restaurants downtown yesterday and a $9 lunch today at the McCutchen House and I highly recommend the McCutchen House lunch in comparison. It is a good meal. For those of you who worry that can’t get a nice vegetarian meal, they always have vegetarian entrees. They have all sorts of good things over there. You will be asked at the end of your meal to grade your waiter or waitress. So it is kind of fun. I have yet to see anybody not get all 5’s on their report card, but the opportunity is there. It is an academic experience for them as well as a good lunch. I commend it to you. You will be perfectly comfortable taking people over there as guests. You will enjoy the meal. It is Tuesday to Friday during the school year, 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.

A finally thing, I remind you the President mentioned he his giving the State of the University speech over at the Russell House Theatre at 5 o’clock. So if you wish to hear more from him that is available to you. Is there any other business? Hearing none is there a motion that we adjourn? We stand adjourned till our March meeting. Thank you.