

**The official minutes of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees are maintained by the Secretary of the Board. Certified copies of minutes may be requested by contacting the Board of Trustees. Office at trustees@sc.edu. Electronic or other copies of original minutes are not official Board of Trustees' documents.**

University of South Carolina

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee

November 17, 2005

The Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees met on Thursday, November 17, 2005, at 2:35 p.m. in the Capstone House Campus Room.

Members present were: Mr. John C. von Lehe, Jr., Chairman; Mr. James Bradley; Mr. William C. Hubbard; Ms. Darla D. Moore; Mr. Othniel H. Wienges, Jr.; and Mr. Miles Loadholt, Board Vice Chairman. Members absent were: Mr. Samuel R. Foster, II; Mr. Mack I. Whittle, Jr.; and Mr. Herbert C. Adams, Board Chairman. Other Trustees present were: Mr. Toney J. Lister; Ms. Rita M. McKinney; Mr. M. Wayne Staton; and Mr. Eugene P. Warr, Jr.

Faculty Liaison Committee members present were: Dr. C. Eugene Reeder, Chair of the Faculty Senate; Dr. Judith Alexander, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee; Dr. Marja Warhime, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee; and Dr. Noni Bohonak, USC Lancaster, Regional Campuses Representative.

Others present were: President Andrew A. Sorensen; Secretary Thomas L. Stepp; General Counsel Walter (Terry) H. Parham; Vice President for Human Resources Jane M. Jameson; Vice Provost and Executive Dean for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education Chris P. Plyler; Interim Dean of the College of Engineering and Information Technology Duncan A. Buell; Dean of the School of Law Burnele V. Powell; Associate Provost for Institutional Outreach and Dean of The Graduate School Christine Ebert; Professor in the Department of Exercise Science, Arnold School of Public Health, and NCAA/SEC Representative, Russell R. Pate; Public Information Office, USC Lancaster, Shana Funderburk; Public Information Officer, Office of Media Relations, Karen Petit; and Director of University Communications, Division of University Advancement, Russ McKinney, Jr.

Chairman von Lehe called the meeting to order and invited those Board members present to introduce themselves. Mr. McKinney indicated that no members of the media were in attendance.

Chairman von Lehe stated that notice of the meeting had been posted and the press notified as required by the Freedom of Information Act; the agenda and

supporting materials had been circulated to the Committee and a quorum was present to conduct business.

Chairman von Lehe stated that there were personnel matters dealing with recommendations for honorary faculty titles, transfer of tenure, an honorary degree nomination and midyear tenure and promotion recommendations which were appropriate for discussion in Executive Session. Mr. Hubbard moved that the Committee enter executive session and Mr. Loadholt seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

The following individuals were invited to remain: President Sorensen, Secretary Stepp, Ms. Jameson, Dr. Plyler, Mr. Parham, Mr. McKinney, Ms. Stone and Ms. Tweedy.

Return to Open Session

I. Report on NCAA Academic Progress Rate: Chairman von Lehe called on Dr. Russ Pate, NCAA/SEC Representative for the University who made the following comments regarding the NCAA Academic Progress Rate:

Thank you. I am pleased to have a few minutes to brief you on a new procedure that we are now operating under in monitoring the academic progress of student athletes.

As a brief background, I think you are aware that we are in an era that has been described as one of 'academic reform' in intercollegiate athletics. Our student athletes now operate under quite rigid and ambitious academic progress requirements. They must, for example, have accumulated 40 percent of the credits toward graduation in their first two years in a program; 60 percent by the next year; and 80 percent by the year after that.

We are this year phasing in a new NCAA protocol that applies academic progress standards to each team within each university's intercollegiate athletics program. I have circulated two documents: one has a couple of NCAA documents that describe in basic terms the APR System. I have also attached some information I recently pulled together that summarizes the academic performance of our student athletes in the last academic year. I will attempt to describe in very basic terms this APR System because I do not consider myself an expert on the technicalities of this system; however, I will do my best to respond to any questions you may have.

Student athletes have five years during which they can expend their four years of athletics eligibility. The APR System is built around the target of each team's graduating as a minimum 50 percent of its student athletes within five years. The system is based on a calculation whereby each student athlete can contribute to his or her team's pool four points per year: one point for each semester in which that person is academically in good standing and eligible and one point for being there.

Therefore, the system is designed to encourage retention in the system long enough for student athletes to achieve graduation and it is set up to encourage maintenance of good academic standing. For any student athlete who in a given academic year in both semesters maintains academic eligibility and returns to be a student at the University, the full four points would be accumulated.

That point system is applied to the team and in each year a target or criterion of 92.5 percent is to be attained. The figure came from the fact that in any one year retention at that 92.5 percent level if maintained for five consecutive years, would result in at least a 50 percent graduation rate.

Now there are 'teeth' in this system and they are applied on a team by team basis, not on a university-wide athletics program basis. If a particular team falls behind that standard, that team is in line for penalties that may involve loss of scholarships and other recruiting related activities. I personally feel that this is a very appropriate and important innovation in the oversight of our athletics programs within academic institutions of our type. While I am sure that there will be some fine tuning in this system as it phases in and as we learn about various elements of it, I think the system has been very carefully planned and studied. I think it is likely to be successful and in the long term to have a very positive impact.

President Sorensen commended Dr. Pate for the extraordinary manner in which he was handling his responsibility as the faculty athletics representative. "He is a man of unimpeachable integrity who is consistent and unflagging in his insistence that we adhere to excellent academic standards."

President Sorensen further directed the Committee's attention to the handout entitled *USC Student Athlete Academic Achievements, 2004-05* in which it was noted that the University led the Southeastern Conference with 76 freshmen student athletes on the academic honor roll. He credited that accomplishment in large measure to the individual coaches who understood the importance of recruiting

student athletes who were not only capable athletically but also committed to academic excellence.

Chairman von Lehe inquired about the University's ranking as reflected in an article which had been published in a local newspaper within the past year; in that article, Furman University had been listed as number one in the state. Dr. Pate responded that the particular ranking in question was a preliminary application of the new system and was intended to ensure that key personnel at the various institutions fully understood the process. This yearly ranking procedure will be very public and the NCAA will release the findings.

Dr. Pate further commented:

I think there are two messages in the document that summarize our own program's academic performance. Clearly, from time to time some student athletes do have challenges academically; secondly, the approximately 500 student athletes in our programs are very good students. I think that is reflected in the team average GPAs and the frequency with which our student athletes achieve certain conference and national honors.

We do have improvements to make in certain specific areas, but across the whole program, I think our student athletes as a group are quite good students.

Ms. Moore asked if there was a standard of rigor in the curriculum of the various programs. Dr. Pate responded that approximately one year ago the University had reviewed the distribution of majors among the student athlete population. It was determined that they were disbursed throughout the University; there were no overwhelming clusters of student athletes in certain academic programs. "Clearly, our student athletes are required to meet the academic standards of the major program to which they are committed." A document outlining the exact distribution of student athletes in the various majors will be mailed to Board members for information.

II. Reports from Faculty Liaison Representatives: Chairman von Lehe called on Faculty Liaison representatives to update the Committee regarding various activities in their respective areas.

Dr. Gene Reeder, Chair of the Faculty Senate, advised the Committee that he will be attending a meeting of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. Composed of faculty senate representatives from various schools across the country, this national committee had developed best practice guides which could be incorporated into the athletics governance of a university. The University Athletics Advisory Committee was comparing that information with Carolina's Athletics Department policies "to see if they are consistent with, perhaps better than, or deficient relative to the standard and where we might be in voluntary compliance with these guidelines."

Currently, the committee was in the process of developing a dialogue with the NCAA and its Council of Presidents in order to become the faculty voice to this

organization. President Sorensen asked Dr. Reeder to report on the conference during the next meeting of the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee.

Dr. Judith Alexander, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee, indicated that this committee was in the process of reviewing potential USC Columbia *Faculty Manual* changes which she will bring forward for Board consideration in the spring. Mr. Stepp reminded the Committee that the Board had asked only to review faculty manual changes in June and December.

Dr. Marja Warhime, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, reported that during the most recent meeting of the Faculty Senate, the committee had submitted a resolution concerning the desirability of including a preventive care benefit in the state's basic health plans. This resolution, which had passed unanimously, requested the support of the President and the Provost as advocates; they had graciously consented to support the benefit. The committee hoped that the University, as one of the state's largest employers, would be in a position to influence the design of the state health insurance plan "at a time when many insurers increasingly recognize the cost effectiveness of preventive care."

In addition, the Faculty Welfare Committee was in the process of reviewing the availability of financial aid and tuition remission for dependent children of faculty and staff.

And, finally, the Committee had been asked to consider ways in which the Gateway Children's Center might be more responsive to faculty needs.

President Sorensen asked that General Counsel Terry Parham and Vice President for Human Resources Jane Jameson explore the possibility of the University's providing preventive care and tuition benefits to faculty and staff only as opposed to all employees in the state system (i.e., could the University promulgate policies which were "peculiar" to this institution).

Dr. Noni Bohonak, Regional Campuses Representative, noted that the Regional Campuses Senate will meet the next day at USC Sumter. Members will continue to review the Regional Campuses *Faculty Manual* for potential revisions which will be submitted for Board consideration in June. They were also examining scholarship and research issues as they applied to those campuses.

### III. Other Matters:

A. New Center Proposal: Center for Fuel Cells - College of Engineering and Information Technology, USC Columbia: Chairman von Lehe called on Interim Dean Duncan Buell who was proposing the creation of a formal structure to manage research in fuel cells primarily in the College of Engineering and Information Technology. He indicated that the University was engaged in several fuel cell research activities including an NSF funded I/UCRC

(Industry/University Cooperative Research Center) which had garnered 13 industry subscriptions with more proposed every year. In addition, international arrangements with two organizations (one in Korea and one in Germany) had been established. Also in the proposal was "below-the-line" recurring funding and three endowed professorships from state lottery money.

Dr. Buell reviewed the sources of financing which included a legislative appropriation of \$1 million per year; NSF funding which began in 2003 and will continue for at least 5 years before renewal; current industrial sponsorship totaled \$455,000 with more companies "coming on board" every year. It was anticipated that the Center for Fuel Cells would generate a profit during the term of the NSF funded project (at least the next five years).

Mr. Hubbard moved approval of the establishment of the Center for Fuel Cells as described in the materials distributed for the meeting. Mr. Bradley seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

B. Name Change: Children's Law Office, School of Law: Chairman von Lehe called on Dean Burnele Powell who commented that the name change proposal contained no monetary implications, but rather "huge implications in terms of raising the profile of the Children's Law Office." He was requesting that this office be redesignated the "Children's Law Center" to better reflect many current ongoing activities. In addition, the name change would promote interdisciplinary collaboration; would raise the profile of the center regarding its ability to advance research and secure funding; and would reflect the School of Law's ongoing and increased commitment to the building of community. Dean Powell indicated that this request was a very important step for a program which had been operating since 1995 and "doing tremendous work."

Mr. Bradley moved approval of the School of Law name change request from Children's Law Office to Children's Law Center as described in the materials distributed for the meeting. Mr. Hubbard seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

Since there were no other matters to come before the Committee, Chairman von Lehe declared the meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Stepp  
Secretary