I. Call to Order.

CHAIR ROBERT WILCOX – I call to order the summer meeting of the Faculty Senate.

II. Correction and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR WILCOX – You have before you the minutes of the May 1, 2003 meeting. Are there any additions or corrections to those minutes? If there are none, is there a motion for their approval? Without objection they stand approved.

III. Reports of Committees.

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

CHAIR WILCOX – I don’t believe there is a report of the Steering Committee. Is that correct?

PROFESSOR WISE (Retailing) – No report.

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

PROFESSOR BLANPIED (Physics & Astronomy) – The committee has five roman numerals for your consideration on pages 24 through 29. Roman numeral one is in the College of Education, it is the Department of Physical Education a change in the bulletin. It goes from page 24 through 28.

CHAIR WILCOX – The committee has moved roman numeral I.A, the College of Education, a change in curriculum in the Department of Physical Education. The changes are noted in bold face. There are several of them at the very beginning, again on page 27, and at the very end on page 28 in the right hand column. Comments?

PROFESSOR NANCY LANE (Languages, Literatures, & Cultures) – I just had a query and this applies to the old wording as well as to the new. One assumes from adding up the hours that the curriculum requires not just BIOL 101 but BIOL 101L also. And, that is the same for other of the lab sciences that break out the lab separately. Is that right? Because it doesn’t add up to the same number of hours.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – BIOL 101 is now 4 hours.

PROFESSOR KAREN FRENCH (Physical Education) – Those do include the labs.

CHAIR WILCOX – They do include the labs?
PROFESSOR FRENCH – They do include the labs.

PROFESSOR LANE – You don’t require 101L any more?

PROFESSOR FRENCH – Yes, they include the BIOL 101, the lab and each of those sciences is a lab science class.

CHAIR WILCOX – So would you enroll separately in BIOL 101 and 101L? Or is it a combined course?

PROFESSOR BRIAN HELMUTH (Biological Sciences) – It is now combined into one course. It used to be that you registered for 3 credits of lecture and 1 credit of lab now it is 4 credits of lab and a lecture.

CHAIR WILCOX – Okay so it is a combined course, it is not a separate course. Any other comments on those changes? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? They stand approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Roman numeral two in the College of Engineering, the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, we have a new course.


PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Roman numeral three in the College of Liberal Arts, section A the Department of Arts has a change in curriculum in the undergraduate bulletin and a change inn title, cross-listing, prerequisite, and description of a course.

CHAIR WILCOX – Roman numeral III.A the College of Liberal Arts, the Department of Arts.

PROFESSOR LANE – I am sorry. Once again in the new curriculum the Media Arts core courses -- in the current configuration there were 5 courses for 15 hours and in the proposed configuration there are 4 courses to total 15 hours. How is that possible?

CHAIR WILCOX – The point made is that the proposal removes MART 210 from the group, but shows the same number of hours. Is there any one from Media Arts or from the Department of Art here who could answer that?

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – The one hour did go into a course but I don’t remember which one. I think it was 201.

PROFESSOR LANE – Could we send that back?
CHAIR WILCOX – Could we approve it with just the caveat to ensure that the number of hours is an accurate reflection there?

PROFESSOR LANE – There is concern in the Liberal Arts Dean’s Office about whether they mean 15 hours or whether they mean fewer hours.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED - It is 15 hours. One of the courses the lab section became part of the course and it was changed to 4 hours.

PROFESSOR LANE – That still doesn’t add up to 15.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – It is actually 2 in 1.

PROFESSOR LANE – That still doesn’t add up to 15.

CHAIR WILCOX – There is a motion to refer roman numeral III.A back to the committee for the consideration of the number of hours. Any discussion of the motion to refer? Does that need a second? Is there a second to that? It has been seconded. Any discussion?

PROFESSOR CAROLINE EASTMAN (Computer Science & Engineering) – This III.A appears to be related to IV because there are courses being cross-listed. I have a question concerning the fact that the two cross-listed courses do not have identical titles, which seems somewhat a deviation from a long history of practice here. I don’t think that is a good precedent. I think perhaps the committee should consider this as well.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – They are dropping the cross-listing because of their difficulty in keeping the wording the same. So they are going the other way because of that.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN – I apologize for my comment then.

CHAIR WILCOX – All in favor of the motion to refer III.A back to the committee for further discussion signify by saying aye. Opposed? It is referred back to the committee to report back in September on that please.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Roman numeral III.B was tabled and we brought it back for consideration at this time.

CHAIR WILCOX – I believe it was actually referred back to the committee rather than tabled. So it is appropriate for the committee to bring it back. This is a course where there was discussion earlier as to whether the Department of Computer Science and Engineering signed off and I understand you have received a letter from them is that correct?

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Yes.
CHAIR WILCOX – Is there any discussion? They have moved roman numeral III.B, the Department of Philosophy, new course PHIL 321. Any discussion?

PROFESSOR EASTMAN – After perhaps overly extensive discussions we signed off on this course with the understanding that the two occurrences of “problems” in the description would be changed to “issues.” And I have documentation related to this, and I would like to move that the two occurrences of “problems” in the description be changed to “issues.”

CHAIR WILCOX – It would be then …….environmental issues, issues related to advances in information technology….. There is a proposed amendment to the motion, can the committee accept that amendment or shall we put it to a vote?

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – We were unaware of that part of it. All we got was the letter of concurrence so our committee was unaware of that change.

CHAIR WILCOX – That being the case the motion is made to change the word “problems” in both instances to “issues.” Is there a second to that motion? It has been seconded. Any discussion of that change? All in favor of the change signify by saying aye. Opposed? Now the original motion as a amended is on the floor, new course PHIL 321 but with …..environmental issues, issues related to advances in information technology…… Any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? That course is approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Roman numeral four in the School of Music they want to change the cross-listing to drop the cross-listing.

CHAIR WILCOX – A change to drop the cross-listing from MUSC 365 of MART 341. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? That is approved.

PROFESSOR BLANPIED – Roman numeral five the College of Science and Mathematics, Department of Mathematics has a new course 587 which is cross-listed with the one just approved for Computer Science and Engineering.

CHAIR WILCOX – This is the approval of a new course -- roman numeral V.A has been moved by the committee. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? Roman numeral five is approved.

In roman numeral III.A we had referred back to the committee the entire part and Gary points out that the change in title, cross-listing, prerequisite, and description of MART 341 were separate from the problem that was identified. Procedurally, Mr. Parliamentarian, can we have a motion to take those up at this point having just now sent the whole thing back?
PROFESSOR GREGORY ADAMS (Law) – Any member can move to reconsider the vote to recommit that.

CHAIR WILCOX – I think a motion might be appropriate to recommit the curriculum changes of III.A only to the committee and to put on the floor the change in title, cross-listing, prerequisite, and description for MART 341. Is there a motion to that effect? We have a motion. Is there a second? Okay. That puts MART 341, just that part of the proposal of III.A on the floor. Is there any discussion of approving that course change? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? That is fine. Then the curriculum part has been referred back to the committee. Thank you.

c. Committee on Admissions, Professor Don Stowe, Chair-Elect:

PROFESSOR STOWE (Hospitality, Retail, and Sports Management) – Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Committee on Admissions, we present part A. from the College of Nursing. This is a substantive change in their transfer admission requirements.

CHAIR WILCOX – The committee has moved section A. a change in admission requirements in the College of Nursing. The substantive change being that you must have a cumulative 2.75. My understanding is this is -- to put it colloquially -- a truth in advertising change that this is designed to better inform students of the reality of what is expected of them. The committee has moved that, is there any discussion of that change? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? It is approved.

PROFESSOR STOWE – In concert with the Scholastic Standards and Petitions committee we present part B which changes for the College of Pharmacy both some internal as well as well external standards of admission.

CHAIR WILCOX – Both committees have moved the approval of section B. We will consider it as a single proposal. Certain portions of this were in Scholastic Standards and Petitions and certain portions of this come out of Admissions, but we will consider it as a single section – B. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? Section B is approved. Now Jane you get your shot at doing the one that just your committee did.

d. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Professor Jane Olsgaard, Chair:

PROFESSOR OLSGAARD (Libraries) – The Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions brings before you one item. The change appears on page 32 and is a change from the College of Nursing in the progression requirements in the undergraduate bulletin again from 2.50 to 2.75.

CHAIR WILCOX – The College of Nursing change in progression requirements has been moved by the committee. Is there discussion? If there is none, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? Very well that is approved. Thank you.
d. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Betty Glad, Chair:

PROFESSOR GLAD (GINT) – We have no proposals for action today but I do want to report a couple things to you about which you have concerns. We have received a report from the Registrar’s Office looking into the possibility of a 2-day teaching schedule. She has consulted with other universities and there are some difficulties – in educational and in terms of room use - going to a general program of 2-day usage. Faculty Advisory committee has decided not to make a recommendation on this. We will just send back the information that we have collected to the Provost’s Office and let them take it from there.

I do want to read something in terms of a more important issue which I think has been nicely resolved in the Steering Committee meeting just before this meeting today. I do want to read it to you because it is complicated and I can state it more succinctly this way:

The Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) met on Tuesday, June 10, 2003 and discussed the following events:

FAC’s recommendation for revision in the Faculty Manual to deal with the issue of promotion and tenure after unit reorganization was approved at the General Faculty meeting on May 1, 2003. When that recommendation was forwarded to the Academic Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees on June 6, it had been substantially revised.

New provisions, added by the administration, deleted the statement that ordinarily these new criteria and processes shall be in place before reorganization is completed. And, faculty members hired prior to 1995 were given only three years to opt for the standards to be applied to future promotions, those under which they had been hired, or the new ones.

The latter provision as I stated to the Board of Trustees Subcommittee contradicts the current Faculty Manual which reads as follows:

“No change shall be made in the university wide tenure and promotion regulations except by vote of the full voting membership of the university faculty or by the direction of the Board of Trustees. In no event shall any change in tenure and promotion regulations be made retroactive for faculty hired before January 1, 1995, unless the faculty member choose otherwise.”

On June 10, the FAC agreed to express its concerns about both the time limits imposed and the bypassing of the faculty on this important matter. On June 13, I wrote a letter to the Provost reflecting our concerns.

Professor Wilcox, who is a non-voting member of FAC, then consulted with the Provost’s Office on this matter. The provost, as I understood it, subsequently (and he has confirmed this at our meeting today) agreed to extend the grace period for persons hired before 1995 to 5 years, beginning count on the date that the new promotion and tenure
guidelines are formally approved. There was also a pledge to consult more closely with faculty on such matters before changes are made. University counsel will look into the legal status of this new recommendation and report back to the Provost’s Office and FAC, as I understand it.

The President has agreed to refer this matter to the faculty at its fall meeting. It will not be submitted to the board of Trustees at this time. Are there any questions? Thank you, Mr. President for your flexibility on this issue.

CHAIR WILCOX – In that regard I would like to point out the Provost’s Office was in communication as soon as there was a revision proposed. They forwarded that to us prior to the meetings and I appreciate very much your communication of that with us. I also appreciate very much that the concern largely in this case has been one that focused on the process of making sure that the faculty has signed off on changes before they are presented to the Board. And, again I appreciate the President’s willingness to hold this until after the September Faculty Meeting in order that faculty can consider this change in due course. I very much appreciate that – thank you sir.

e. Other Committees – No reports.

IV. Unfinished Business.

CHAIR WILCOX – Is there any unfinished business to come before the body? One matter of the past several meetings were discussion of the student attendance policy. As a result of those discussions, we have forwarded that issue to the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions to consider that when they reconvene in the fall. They may decide to come forward with no proposal, they may decide to come forward with a revised proposal, they may come forward with the same proposal. We have referred that to that committee to take a second look at that whole idea and they will report back to the Senate in due course in the fall on that subject.

V. New Business.

None.

VI. Reports of Officers.

PRESIDENT ANDREW SORENSEN – Thank you very much Professor Wilcox. I am very nearly completing my first year in office. I think of myself as living in a series of concentric circles. The most immediate circle that I live in, apart from my family, is the University of South Carolina family, then the greater Columbia area, then the State of South Carolina, then the community friends both of the University and of the State who are scattered far and wide. I am very grateful that my wife and I, Donna and I, have been accorded an absolutely remarkable reception by all the people in these ever expanding series of concentric circles. The friendliness, the enthusiasm for the University, the loyalty to Carolina is a truly extraordinary. I just returned from a fund raising trip to Michigan and to Illinois where I met with many Gamecocks. Their enthusiasm for this
institution is truly remarkable. So I thank all of you for the reception that we have been accorded.

I have proposed a number of initiatives during my first year in office, and I have been immensely gratified by the reception of the faculty to these various initiatives.

There is a meeting of the Board of Trustees tomorrow. We will be presenting the budget for the coming academic year beginning July 1st for the 2003-2004 fiscal year. We are proposing a 15% increase in tuition. I wish that we did not have to do that, but our budget has been cut by $61 million since last July 1st. A 15% increase in tuition will generate $18 million. So there is a $43 million difference between the magnitude of the cut and the amount of relief that the tuition increase will afford. I am embarrassed by the fact that we are not proposing faculty and staff salary increases. Any study of faculty and staff salaries comparing us with our peer aspirant institutions indicates that we are very much below our competitors. That is indefensible. I have continued to rail against the legislature for the huge cuts. I have received numerous calls and e-mails from the legislators protesting the fact that I keep calling attention to that phenomenon. I have told them as soon as they start funding us adequately I will cease calling attention to these cuts and I will praise them for their good works. I never give a talk without calling attention to the massive deficits that have been visited upon us and speaking openly and candidly about the unfairness of these cuts. I shall continue doing so until that situation is remedied.

I have asked the Provost to create a committee to consider the feasibility of the merger of the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Science and Mathematics. I will be meeting with them soon to give them their charge. I have asked the Provost to convene at least two public meetings so that people who are not members of the committee can be sure to have an opportunity to express their opinions to the committee. I am assuming, Mr. Provost, that they will also make an e-mail address available so that people may communicate with them via e-mail if they have strong feelings on that matter one way or another.

We just recently received from the U.S. Supreme Court their ruling on affirmative action. I am delighted that the Supreme Court ruled that race may be considered as a factor in admissions. The affirmation of that practice at the University of Michigan Law School is commensurate with the practice of our Law School. The University of Michigan undergraduate admissions, has a point system in which they evaluate applicants on the basis of points given for various categories like SAT score, grade point average, and some points were given for race. We do not have that kind of weighting system at the University of South Carolina. We use a whole host of characteristics and extra curricular activities in evaluating candidates for admission.

I am absolutely delighted that the National Science Foundation designated our University as its very first Industry/University site for Fuel Cell Research. It is a very exciting prospect. We are having conversations with the scientists and engineers at the Savannah River Technology Center because as Westinghouse Corporation is ratcheting
down their employee pool, we are hoping to collaborate with scientists there who are interested in developing fuel cells and use of hydrogen as an alternative source of fuel. When I was in Chicago last Friday, I visited an alumnus of the University of South Carolina who owns a company that manufactures fuel cell components. They have plants throughout the United States, Mexico and Germany, I am hopeful that we will persuade companies like this (that are already supporting us marvelously) to increase their support of our scientific research. Currently, a group of 11 corporations give us $1.2 million a year to take advantage of the intellectual property generated by our research scientists in this exciting field. I am hopeful that we will expand these activities in fuel cell technology. On Monday I am going to be spending all day at the Savannah River Site talking with Westinghouse officials as well as the Director of the Savannah River Site Technology Center for possible increased collaboration, and increased support from both private as well as federal sources for our research.

I once again salute the faculty for the dramatic increase in external research support for grants and contracts. The year before I became President, the University generated $109 million in grants and contracts externally. This year it is already over $130 million although we do not have the final numbers, what a dramatic improvement. The College of Liberal Arts had the most dramatic increase in terms of the number of dollars raised by its faculty, and I salute especially those of you in Liberal Arts for that dramatic increase in grant productivity.

We had an interesting meeting yesterday to distribute the $30 million dollars for the Centers of Excellence. I am pleased to say after some deliberation and some to-ing and fro-ing, the University of South Carolina emerged with funding for a chair in Nanotechnology and sharing a chair with the Medical University of South Carolina for a chair in Brain Imaging. We have an exciting opportunity through these combined programs to create $13 million in endowment for chairs in these respective areas. We are actively recruiting a professor in Nanotechnology who is a member of the National Academy of Sciences. He is at another university currently, but we are hopeful that this infusion of funds will make it attractive not only for him, but that he will also attract other colleagues. We already have colleagues who are here who want very much to work with him, but also he will attract young faculty members as well as post-doctoral fellows, graduate students, and undergraduate students. I have spoken with several undergraduate students and graduate students who are currently working in this area who are really excited about our prospects. I can’t help but think about the difference in geopolitics if we had absolutely zero dependence on fossil fuels. It would be absolutely spectacular if our University could be involved in a leadership role in the transition to greater reliance on fuel cells.

I presented to Secretary Bob Faith of Commerce and his staff this afternoon our proposal for a research campus. Secretary Faith expressed publicly his interest in working with us in approaching the legislature. He feels that if we could have the Governor’s Office, the Governor’s Cabinet, and the research universities all working together as a team on matters that we could agree on, we probably would be more successful with the legislature than we were this past year. We were enormously
successfully in the House of Representatives, but we were singularly unsuccessful in the Senate. So we are beginning to work immediately to determine strategies that might make us more effective in the Senate. I am meeting later today with a prominent leader in the Senate to begin developing proposals as to how we might work together more effectively. It is imperative that we improve not only the economic climate in this State, but also the well being of our respective universities and thus we can get the kinds of funding for your salaries that you richly deserve. This kind of antagonistic situation in which we find ourselves currently is neither good for us nor for the State.

I am highly pleased with the quality of applicants for admission in the fall of 2003. Last year we had 31 National Merit Finalists enrolled as students here. This fall we are certain of 56 National Merit, National Achievement, National Hispanic finalists scholars enrolling. That is nearly a two-fold increase. The quality of the Carolina Scholars, the Honors College, the McNair Scholars is extraordinary. Of course, we have the continuing obligation to make our classes and our faculty accessible to people who are “academically challenged” as well. We have 13.5 thousand applicants for 3.4 thousand openings in the freshman class 13,500 students want to get into the freshman class, and we are building our budget around 3,400 students. So that is truly gratifying.

I appreciate the support that all of you have given the University during the past year. I consider it a real privilege to be the President here. I hope all of you have a very good summer. I am going to spend the weekend with our two sons, daughter-in-law, and our only grandchild. I have spoken with my wife twice today because I miss her and I miss our family very much. My wife has told me that our 18 month old grandson is unusually talented, has remarkable hand/eye coordination, muscular dexterity, and is uncommonly handsome. To that I say he obviously takes after his mother. I will be happy to respond to any questions. Yes, Professor Lane.

PROFESSOR LANE – Yes, thank you. When you meet with the Board of Trustees tomorrow, I certainly hope that you will raise the issue of the maximum number of hours that a student can take for one tuition fee. I am very concerned about reading in the paper that along with the 15% tuition increase the Board proposed a 15 hour cap on full-time tuition. I work in advising in the College of Liberal Arts and it is impossible to advise a student to take only 15 hours in a semester. Every student at the University has to take a certain number of 4 hour courses. Even in Liberal Arts the minimum number is 2 and most have to take at least 3. In the College of Science and Mathematics and the College of Engineering it is much heavier. I am very concerned that 15 hour limit on a full-time tuition fee is grossly inadequate. I would urge you to urge the Board of Trustees to raise it to at least 16 hours if they can’t give us 17 hours.

PRESIDENT SORENSEN – Professor Lane, you will be delighted that I have anticipated your question. I have requested approval from our Board of Trustees to make it 16 hours, and I believe they will in fact be endorsing 16 hours. Professor Lane, the principal problem we have is that we have a huge number of students enroll in courses that they do not intend to take. They are absolutely flagrant about that. They shop around and enroll only in courses with professors they like. At the end of the drop/add period, they drop
those courses they don’t like, which precludes other students from enrolling. Thus we have developed a modest economic disincentive for them doing that. However, they can take more than 16 hours – they pay $80 per credit hour so they can take an additional 3 hour course for $240. If you only take one 3 hour course, it costs you $720. So we are offering a 67% discount on hours that you take over 16. It is also, quite frankly, another way to address the enormous budgetary problem we have.

Other questions? Thank you all very much.

PROVOST JEROME ODOM – Thank you very much Mr. Chair. Let me just follow up on one of President Sorensen’s issues.

First of all let me congratulate Joan Stewart for being named President of Hamilton College. As Dean of Liberal Arts, Joan did an excellent job and I enjoyed working with her very much.

Just so that you are aware of who the committee members are who will be examining the merger of these two colleges. The committee will be co-chaired by Pat Maney from History and Madilyn Fletcher from the Baruch Institute. The members from the College of Liberal Arts are: Susan Cutter from Geography, Karl Heider from Anthropology, Steven Lynn from English, and Ron Prinz from Psychology. The members from the College of Science and Mathematics are: Chaden Djalali from Physics and Astronomy, John Spurrier from Statistics, Bob Thunell from Geological Sciences, and Sally Woodin from Biological Sciences. We hope to be able to have the initial meeting of that committee soon so that the President can charge the committee. It is a little bit difficult since we are in the summer and people have different travel plans.

Two searches that are currently under way. The Vice-President for Research in Health Sciences search committee will start reviewing applications next week July 1st. The search committee for the Dean of the School of Law has had two meetings. They have had their advertisement appear in The Chronicle and Black Issues in Higher Education as well as a number of list serves and they are currently making phone calls and receiving applications.

Finally I have tried to keep the Senate apprised of the progress of our Children’s Center. If you have been by the building on Wheat Street, you can see they are making great progress. We hope to have the children from our current center move into the new center the first or second week in September. Then the following week we will have the children from ETV move in as ETV closes their Children’s Place. And, finally then the center will be open to the public at large. We currently have as of last week about 120 spaces already filled of a possible 200 and the toddler and infants class already has a waiting list. So we have great expectations for that. The second floor is proceeding well. That will be research floor as I previously reported. I will be happy to answer any questions as well.
PROFESSOR RUTH RILEY (Medicine Library) – Provost Odom, on the Vice President for Research in the Health Sciences position, could you just clarify the reporting line for that and the purview of the position?

PROVOST ODOM – That person will report the President. That person’s first responsibility is dealing with research matters for the entire campus but at the same time the second priority is to have the deans of the five health sciences units report to that individual particularly for research purposes. That person and I will work together with respect to academic matters for those five units.

PROFESSOR RILEY – I did not see the job ad so I don’t know the qualifications for the position. I was just curious will the person require an MD?

PROVOST ODOM – They do not have to be an MD. No. That ad is in The Chronicle and if you will just contact Debbie Owens in my office I know she will be happy to send you a copy of the ad.

PROFESSOR RILEY – Thank you. I also had a question about the endowed chair that we are sharing with MUSC on Brain Imaging. Which department of USC is that?

PROVOST ODOM – Psychology. Gordon Baylis I think was the principal investigator on that proposal here.

PROFESSOR RILEY – Thank you.

VII. Good of the Order or Announcements.

PROFESSOR PETER GRAHAM (Sport and Entertainment Management) – I think it would be appropriate for the Faculty Senate to send a letter of congratulations to the coaches and athletes on our women’s track team who came in third nationally this year, and to our baseball team who placed sixth in the nation at the College World Series. These young ladies and gentlemen should be congratulated not only for their athletic accomplishments but more importantly for the outstanding manner in which they conducted themselves as University ambassadors.

CHAIR WILCOX – If there is no objection, I will have the secretary prepare such a letter.

PROFESSOR JERRY WALLULIS (Philosophy) – Does the chair himself have anything to report from the meeting of the Southeastern Faculty Senate Chairs.

CHAIR WILCOX – If you would like, yes. As you all know I missed our last meeting as I was meeting in Nashville with them. A couple of things out of that meeting that I think are significant. One is that the chairs of the senates of the various Southeastern Conference schools are going to meet on at least an annual basis -- not always to talk about athletics. We felt that it would be very beneficial, using what we perceived to be
the Big 10 model – to pursue the idea of the conference having affiliations other than just the athletics affiliations of its constituents. At our meeting we had an opportunity among the chairs to talk about issues of governance and things like that. I think it would be very beneficial, as we share common problems and solutions to have that contact through the year.

Also with regard to athletics particularly -- one of the outgrowths of that meeting is that I have had conversations with Russ Pate who is our Faculty Athletic Representative about several things. The SEC Senate Leadership group is looking into proposing standards to be adopted through the SEC, and hopefully the NCAA, in terms of the selection of Faculty Athletic Reps. It is a presidential selection. We want to be sure that the person remains a Faculty Athletic Rep. We happen to have a very good one here. I am very pleased with him, and I have assured Russ of that. But that is one of the things that was on the table from several schools to talk about. At some schools the Faculty Athletic Reps still are heavily influenced by the Athletic Department and we felt that we need to make sure they were truly Faculty Athletic Reps. So along those lines Russ has agreed that he will come at least once a year to this body and keep this group up to date on what is happening in the NCAA and the Athletic Department here as an information source. There needs to be better communication on that front.

What the group did formally was endorse some directions that the NCAA is taking with regard to academics. You all may not follow this on a regular basis, but the NCAA has approved changes that will require athletes not only to meet admission standards and basic grade point averages, but they will have to actually make progression toward a degree in order to participate. Twenty percent a year is essentially the way it goes. So that in order to be a fifth year red shirt senior you have to be 80% of the way through your degree. We felt that was a very good direction of reaffirming that these were supposed to be athletes. I mean that is true. They are supposed to be students as well as athletes. I was thinking Vanderbilt there for a moment there I apologize. But one of the realities of that was is we realized that if mishandled it will put pressure all through the university not only the pressures that are there now but there will be continuing pressures to make sure these students are meeting progression requirements. It brings in a lot of issues with junior college transfers as to how those things will be handled. The NCAA is taking this fairly seriously and coaches that do not meet these standards on a regular basis their teams will become ineligible for bowls, they won’t go to the college world series, and coaches could ultimately end up getting fired by their institutions. So one of the things that we need to do as a faculty is ensure that internally we have the mechanisms in place to make these reforms work they way they were intended to work. So the group that met there that this was a good direction that the NCAA was going but then it was going to fall back on each institution to be sure that we actually made it work the way it was suppose to. There were lots of issues on the table along those lines.

As we continue to meet I think it would be helpful for this body perhaps from time to time be involved. I spoke on behalf of Rob Wilcox, who happened to Faculty Senate Chair at USC. I did not purport to speak on behalf of the Senate or the Faculty of the University. I recently was asked by this coalition of Faculty Representatives which is
right now the Big 10, the PAC 10, and the SEC to endorse a resolution opposing the merger of the ACC on grounds that it was contrary to the objectives that the NCAA is expressing – that it fostered commercialism, that it was driven by commercialism, at a time when the NCAA is purporting to try and get away from that. So there were objections to this merger that it was for all the wrong reasons. I did not send in a vote yes or no on that. I did not feel like I really had enough information about what was driving the ACC merger. I have my personal views, but I did not feel like I had enough to vote. From time to time there will be issues like that – that may well be ones that this body might like to have come before it to join in. They are trying to provide support for Dr. Sorensen and his fellow presidents to continue with the academic reforms. I think what you are hearing from this group is a voice saying you are going in the right direction, don’t back up at this point. So from time to time this body may wish to join in that.

PROFESSOR LANE – I would like to ask for a report on the status of the committee to gather information and report about salaries.

CHAIR WILCOX – Yes, that committee has met several times this summer. We will have a report at the September meeting.

PROFESSOR LANE – Can you tell us who is on this committee?

CHAIR WILCOX – Professors Ward Briggs, Cathy Castner, Timir Datta, Bill Thesing, and myself. I think what you will see is a recommendation to have a faculty grievance committee that would engage in what would essentially be a paper process of grievance and then a response and a reply. This committee would then consider the grievance. We are looking at the information that would be available and that type of thing. The committee would either render a view that they did not see a basis for a grievance or they would recommend to the president that the matter be addressed.

PROFESSOR LANE – Does the committee have the access to the relevant salaries?

CHAIR WILCOX – What the committee is anticipating is that each individual has access to institutional data regarding their position with relation to others in their department. Statistically where do they lie and that would be a part of the duty of that individual would be to request that information from the University as a starting point – this is where I lie - that I am statistically out of line with where my expectation would be. Those statistically reports that the University prepares do not take into account in any large measure or really in any significant measure at all the subjective quality of the persons work. They are very much objective. How long you have been in rank. That type of thing. So there is a second half of that equation. So that would be there starting point. And, one of the things that we feel this committee can do along with the Welfare Committee is on an annual basis insure that whatever information is publicly available the faculty are aware of it. That people know what they can have access to. Some information I can’t request about you but I could go request about me. But if I don’t know it is there….so a part of this will be spreading the word about what is available as
well as handling the appeals. The sense was that that is the starting point to resolving a
grievance. Letting people know where they stand. Other questions?

PROFESSOR GLAD – I just want to make a motion. I want to thank you for your skill
and dedication in managing this show. I think you have done a marvelous job.

CHAIR WILCOX – Well I appreciate that. Thank you. (Clapping) At your September
meeting Jim Augustine will be standing here. He will holding the gavel. I will have
peacefully transferred whatever power this office holds – which I don’t know is a lot.
But I thank you very much for the opportunity. It has been a real pleasure for me and
some very interesting work. I thank you for the opportunity and for one last time – is
there a motion to adjourn.

If there is no objection, we stand adjourned until the September Faculty Meeting.