

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 e-mailing 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

June 17, 2004

The Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees met on Thursday, June 17, 2004, at 1:05 p.m. in the Carolina Plaza Board Room.

Members present were: Mr. Robert N. McLellan, Chairman; Mr. James Bradley; Mr. Samuel R. Foster, II; Mr. William C. Hubbard; Ms. Darla D. Moore; Mr. John C. von Lehe, Jr.; Mr. Othniel H. Wienges, Jr.; Mr. Mack I. Whittle, Jr., Board Chairman; and Mr. Herbert C. Adams, Board Vice Chairman. Mrs. Helen C. Harvey was absent. Other Trustees present were: Mr. Mark W. Buyck, Jr.; Dr. C. Edward Floyd; Mr. Miles Loadholt; Mr. Michael J. Mungo; Mr. James A. Shuford, III; Mr. M. Wayne Staton; Mr. Eugene P. Warr, Jr.; and Trustee-elect, 14th Judicial Circuit, The Honorable William W. Jones, Jr.

Faculty Liaison Committee members present were: Dr. James R. Augustine, Chair of the Faculty Senate; Dr. William Bearden, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee; and Professor John Logue, USC Sumter, representative for the Regional Campuses. Members absent were Dr. Peter Graham, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee and Dr. Warren Carson, USC Spartanburg, representative for the Senior Campuses.

Others present were: President Andrew A. Sorensen; Secretary Thomas L. Stepp; Associate Provost John N. Olsgaard; Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Richard W. Kelly; Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer William F. Hogue; Vice President for Research and Health Sciences Harris Pastides; Vice President for Advancement T.W. Hudson Akin; Vice President for Human Resources Jane M. Jameson; Vice President for Student Affairs Dennis A. Pruitt; General Counsel Walter (Terry) H. Parham; Assistant Vice Provost for Enrollment Management N. Kip Howard; Vice Provost and Executive Dean for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education Chris P. Plyler; Chancellor of USC Aiken Thomas L. Hallman; Chancellor of USC Spartanburg John C. Stockwell; Dean of USC Lancaster John Catalano; Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, USC Aiken, Suzanne Ozment; Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, USC Spartanburg, Reginald Avery; Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, College of Nursing, Opal Brown; Assistant Treasurer Susan D. Hanna; Director of the Department of Internal Audit

Alton McCoy; Executive Director of the Alumni Association, Division of University Advancement, Marsha A. Cole; Professor in the Moore School of Business William T. Moore; Professor in the College of Pharmacy Eugene C. Reeder; President of the Student Government Association Zachery Scott; Information Resource Consultant, Division of Student Affairs, Ryan S. Webber; University Legislative Liaison John Gregory; and Director of University Communications, Division of University Advancement, Russ McKinney, Jr.

Chairman McLellan called the meeting to order and invited those Board members present to introduce themselves. Mr. McKinney stated that no members of the media were in attendance. Chairman McLellan stated that notice of the meeting has 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 McLellan stated that there were personnel matters dealing with honorary faculty titles, tenure and promotion and appointments with tenure which were appropriate for discussion in Executive Session. Chairman McLellan called for a motion to enter Executive Session. Mr. Bradley so moved and Mr. Wienges seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

The following individuals were invited to remain: Dr. Sorensen, Mr. Stepp, Mr. Jones, Dr. Olsgaard, Dr. Hogue, Mr. Kelly, Dr. Pruitt, Ms. Jameson, Mr. Akin, Dr. Plyler, Mr. Parham, Mr. Gregory, Mr. McKinney, Ms. Stone, and Ms. Tweedy.

Executive Session

I. Honorary Faculty Titles: Four requests for honorary faculty titles had been mailed with the materials for this meeting.

There were no objections; therefore, these four requests for honorary faculty titles would be presented to the full Board in Executive Session.

II. Tenure and Promotion Recommendations: Two lists of tenure and promotion recommendations had been mailed with the materials for this meeting. One list was for USC Columbia faculty, and the other list was for faculty from other campuses.

There were no objections; therefore, the names on the two lists of tenure and promotion recommendations would be presented to the full Board in Executive Session.

III. Appointments with Tenure: The following four requests for appointments with tenure had been mailed with the materials for this meeting:

A. Dr. Marianne C. Bickle would be awarded tenure at the rank of Professor in the Department of Retailing effective with her appointment as Professor.

B. Dr. Don Doyle would be awarded tenure at the rank of Professor in the Department of History effective with his appointment as Professor.

C. Dr. Marjorie Spruill would be awarded tenure at the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of History effective with her appointment as Associate Professor.

D. Dr. Richard Webb would be awarded tenure at the rank of Professor in the Department of Physics and Astronomy effective with his appointment as Professor.

There were no objections; therefore, these four requests for appointments with tenure would be presented to the full Board in Executive Session.

Since there were no other matters appropriate for discussion in Executive Session, Chairman McLellan declared a return to Open Session.

Return to Open Session

I. Program Proposals/Modifications:

A. Center for Nursing Leadership - College of Nursing, USC Columbia:

Chairman McLellan called on Dr. Opal Brown who stated that the Center for Nursing Leadership offered a variety of programs to increase the leadership capacity of the nursing community; this proposal would incorporate several existing programs and would provide an opportunity to add others. Programs currently offered included the Amy V. Cockcroft Nursing Leadership Development Program which had graduated 75 individuals during the past 10 years; participants from across the country attended this one year program to discuss and learn about their particular leadership styles. At the conclusion, each person was assigned a project which must be completed in the respective community; recently, it had been approved for graduate credit at the University.

Another program which the Center offered was the Nursing Summit, a one day workshop presented annually. Experts gathered to address issues of common interest to the nursing community and to nursing education.

And, the Viana McCown Lectureship presented various programs to nursing alumni and the community.

It was anticipated that additional innovative programs would be developed to influence nursing and health care as well as health care policy. Chairman McLellan noted that sources of funding would include the reallocation of existing funds; donations; and the Viana McCown Lectureship endowment.

Mr. von Lehe moved approval of the Center for Nursing Leadership program proposal as described in the materials distributed for the meeting. Mr. Wienges seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

B. USC Spartanburg: Chairman McLellan called on Dr. Avery who explained that USC Spartanburg was seeking Board approval to offer the following three campus programs at the University Center of Greenville because of an increased demand in the community:

1. Bachelor of Arts in Middle Grades Education Program

Modification, University Center of Greenville: Mr. Foster moved approval of this program modification as presented. Mr. Bradley seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

2. Bachelor of Science in Special Education - Learning

Disabilities Program Modification, University Center of Greenville: Mr. Bradley moved approval of this program modification as presented. Mr. Foster seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

3. Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice Program

Modification, University Center of Greenville: Mr. von

Lehe moved approval of this program modification as presented. Mr. Bradley seconded the motion. Responding to Chairman McLellan's inquiry about employment opportunities, Dr. Avery indicated that many of the graduates were finding positions in law enforcement because of increased security issues in this country. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

II. USC Aiken Faculty Manual Changes: Chairman McLellan recognized Dr. Ozment who reported that USC Aiken was requesting Board approval of several *Faculty Manual* changes. Most were editorial; substantive changes had been listed in a cover memo to President Sorensen and had been included in the materials distributed to Committee members. Of particular note was a new policy which addressed the interim evaluation of tenure track faculty. A third year review of those individuals was required to provide these individuals a cumulative assessment of their progress.

Mr. Foster moved approval of the USC Aiken *Faculty Manual* changes as described in the materials distributed for this meeting. Mr. Bradley seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

III. USC Columbia Faculty Manual Changes: Chairman McLellan called on Dr. Olsgaard who explained that the proposed USC Columbia *Faculty Manual* changes primarily reflected facility and organizational structure changes and provided clarification of existing policy.

Ms. Moore moved approval of the USC Columbia *Faculty Manual* changes as described in the materials distributed for this meeting. Mr. Foster seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

IV. Enrollment Management Proposal: Chairman McLellan recognized President Sorensen who made the following remarks:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I want to present to you the enrollment management plan that I outlined in less detail at our Wampee Retreat. One of the advantages that this plan has is that it offers a long range strategic enrollment plan based on fiscal, demographic, and competitive realities.

Last year, as you know, we had a very lively discussion around the plan for the coming year. It occurred to me with the support of numerous members of the Board of Trustees, that rather than having a long and sometimes arduous discussion of enrollment every year, it would be more sensible and enormously more beneficial strategically for us to develop a multiple year plan; so, this is the plan I am presenting to you.

We had a group of specialists from Noel-Levitz, arguably the leading enrollment management consulting firm in the United States, come and do a very careful and thoughtful evaluation of our enrollment program. They suggested that there are three separate elements of developing an enrollment management plan and developing the leadership which is necessary for its implementation.

The Board of Trustees needs a long term commitment to an enrollment plan as well as a long term commitment to a fiscal plan to support successful outcomes. The President, with his team, needs to design high quality broad strategies to achieve the established enrollment plan and then the Board of

Trustees and the President, in harmony and in collaboration, need to identify the performance indicators to determine success outcomes.

What I am proposing is that your yearly evaluation of me includes an assessment of the enrollment plan so that it becomes part of the evaluation of my own performance.

There are four factors I would submit of inescapable importance in developing an enrollment management plan. First, and these are in no particular order of priority, is institutional capacity; that is, can the University accommodate the students who are identified in the plan? Second, does the enrollment management plan facilitate improving the academic reputation of the University? The presidential search committee made it abundantly clear to me that the Board of Trustees expected and, indeed, demanded that I set 'improving the academic reputation of the University' as one of my goals. That was very explicitly and consistently conveyed to me.

It is also important to have an operating budget that will enable the enrollment plan to be implemented. And, finally, a plan necessitates a long term fiscal responsibility.

The plan I am presenting to you today will require your commitment to goals that will be expressed in 2010. Thus, we have a six year commitment beginning with the Fall of 2004. I am asking you to make the commitment in fiscal year 2004 for the program that will begin in 2005 and that will continue for six years. This is the long term fiscal responsibility that must be in place.

What are the elements of the University of South Carolina enrollment plan? There are obviously a huge number, but I would like to present three elements that currently we do not have as specifically or as articulately as I should like.

First of all there is the element of holistic admission. Currently, for undergraduate admission, we compare the grade point average and the SAT score. Those two factors are put into a multiple regression and they can be inversely related; if a student has a very high SAT score, it can offset a low grade point average. Conversely, a very high grade point average can offset a low SAT score. But we do not consider other factors and many of you have quite justifiably and appropriately pointed out that we do not consider factors such as the high school leadership accomplishments or the extenuating circumstances in some families when there is a death in a family. Holistic admissions allows us to look at a number of factors other than test scores and grade point average. The Supreme Court decision regarding the University of Michigan's affirmative action program specifically alludes to holistic admissions; therefore, we have Supreme Court approval for an opportunity to look at a number of factors together.

We also need to continue being attentive to diversity in order to balance access with excellence. We are obviously concerned about accommodating African Americans, but the fastest growing ethnic group in the state of South Carolina is the Hispanic/Latino population; we need to be sensitive to the admission of students in this ethnic group.

And, then, I also want to introduce legacy as a factor in holistic admissions. That is, did a parent or grandparent of a child who is applying attend the University of South Carolina? A holistic admissions process allows us to include that consideration as a factor. If you approve this, you will be broadening the criteria substantially by which we evaluate applicants for admission.

In order to do all of this, we need to determine the optimum size of the undergraduate student body; we need to articulate to all constituents our recruitment philosophy with benchmarks to track performance. If you approve this management plan, I will be instructing the people who develop our recruitment materials and our recruiters when they visit high schools this summer and fall to let people know precisely what our philosophy is. For example, if we include legacy admissions as one of numerous elements in our admissions decisions, applicants have a right to know that.

And then, finally, we must develop a long term fiscal plan to support the achievement of the program. I have to make sure that we have the money to pay for this. In fact, it will be relatively expensive if we do this.

Therefore, we need to articulate a long term financial aid plan based on merit and need. One hundred percent of the lottery scholarship programs that we have (the Palmetto, Life, and Hope Scholarships) are all based on merit or academic achievement. There are students who desperately need the financial aid assistance; right now, we do not have as much money available in scholarship support for needy students.

I had a meeting yesterday about a program entitled "The College Summit" which is a nationally distributed program designed specifically to appeal to young people who have grown up in very poor circumstances. By utilizing the lottery scholarship money which is so abundant and so enticing, the University risks the possibility of forgetting about those students who are desperately poor and cannot come here unless they have need based aid. As an

element of my enrollment management plan, I am going to increase the amount of money that is distributed because of need.

We must focus on retention rates, that is, do freshmen stay here as sophomores, and so forth? We are at about a 60 percent graduation rate which means that 60 percent of the students who enroll as freshmen receive a bachelors degree within 6 years. I want very much to see that figure increase. I have put in my enrollment management matrix, of which you have received a copy, an increase in graduation rates.

I am also focusing on student/faculty ratios. We have had a 3,000 student increase from the Fall of 2000 to the Fall of 2004. As we have done so, the size of the full time tenured and tenure track faculty has remained stable. Consequently, on average, we have more students that each professor is responsible for teaching. I am going to propose to reduce the student/faculty ratio so that we will have fewer students per faculty member. We are at 16.4 now and my proposal will reduce that number to 15.

The lamentable situation we have right now is that there are many students who have to wait until they are seniors to enroll in freshman English classes or introductory Spanish classes. This situation has absolutely nothing to do with the size or number of classrooms. Quite frankly, it diminishes the quality of the education we offer.

What distinguishes us from the other institutions? It is the quality of the education we offer and the ability of the faculty members to interact with the students. Faculty members are becoming increasingly distressed by this dramatic rise in admissions. Therefore, I am suggesting that we pay more attention to student/faculty ratios; that we hire more faculty; and that we reduce the number of students per faculty member.

In addition, I am using transfer students to adjust total capacity. I am going to present to you the minimum goal for growth every year. I suspect that if the University continues to be perceived as highly attractive, it will grow more than I have proposed in the enrollment management plan. If that occurs, I am going to have to lower the number of transfer students we admit because many of our students transfer from our four two-year schools as well as from the three four-year schools. However, as those schools improve in their quality, and each of them is, fewer students who begin at Aiken, Beaufort, or Spartanburg will choose to transfer here. These campuses are already beginning to see an increase in their retention rates.

President Sorensen presented the proposed enrollment management plan through the year 2010 to position the University of South Carolina as a top 50 public university. In the Fall of 2000, 15,266 undergraduate students were enrolled at the University of South Carolina; this number had increased to an estimated 18,150 for the Fall of 2004 or nearly 3,000 additional students during that period of time. More than half of the growth (55 percent) had occurred since beginning his term as President of the University. Of that number, 80 percent were South Carolina residents; this year it will increase to 81 percent. Out of state admission will decrease from 20 to 19 percent.

In the Fall of 2000, there were 2,542 freshmen; 3,450 were anticipated for the upcoming fall semester. The number of resident freshmen had increased from 1,945 to 2,522 during that period; non resident freshman enrollment had increased 386. Total freshman enrollment for the South Carolina Honors College was 253 students in the Fall of 2000; 275 will attend this fall. President Sorensen was proposing to raise that figure by 10 per year.

For the overall freshman enrollment, President Sorensen was projecting a 50 student per year increase with a proposed total University enrollment increase of 75 per year; he emphasized that these proposed figures were absolute minimums.

As suggested by various Board members and others, President Sorensen was recommending an "Arts and Sciences Scholars Program" (between 1250 - 1325 SAT

score) for those students who were not quite at the Honors College level. Those individuals selected would receive special recognition and financial aid; anticipated was a total of 300 students in this category in the Fall of 2005 with a projected increase of 25 per year.

President Sorensen indicated that African American freshman enrollment had decreased from 426 in 2000 to the current projected total of 385 for 2004; proposed was an increase of 15 per year.

It was anticipated that the 4 year graduation rate for the upcoming fall semester would total 41 percent. President Sorensen was proposing an increase of both 4 year and 6 year rates by 1 percent per year.

On campus housing capacity had grown by 1200 because of the construction of the Greek Village and other residence halls which were opened recently. That total would decrease if the Board approved the destruction of the Honeycomb housing; however, if the University decided to purchase one of the existing hotels under consideration for that purpose, available campus housing would most probably increase substantially.

In 2000, the student/faculty ratio was 14 to 1; currently, that figure was 16.5 to 1. President Sorensen was recommending a decrease in that figure of $\frac{1}{4}$ percent per year by hiring additional faculty; it was hoped to establish a ratio of 15 to 1 by 2010. That proposal will be presented later today to the Executive Committee as part of the budget plan.

President Sorensen explained that *U.S. News and World Report* evaluated SAT scores by comparing the 25th percentile to the 75th percentile (25 percent of students had scored below a certain figure and 25 percent had scored above). In 2000, 1,000 students had scored at the 25th percentile and 1,210 at the 75th percentile; for this fall, 1,030 students scored at the 25th percentile and 1,250 at the 75th percentile. It was proposed to raise that figure by 5 every year on the lower and upper ends.

The yield for 2000 (students who were accepted and chose to attend the University) was 43 percent; for this fall it was anticipated that the yield will be 41.9 percent. It was proposed to raise that figure $\frac{1}{2}$ percent per year.

As requested earlier, President Sorensen commented about the proposed demolition of the Honeycomb Towers. Removal of these facilities would have both an economic and an institutional impact; on campus housing would be reduced 935 beds (\$1.2 million generated annually). Also to be factored into that figure was the cost of relocating, renovating, or constructing 20,000 square feet of office space for the Housing Offices currently located in the Towers. The deferred maintenance cost to upgrade the sprinkler and fire alarm systems would total \$4 million; those

upgrades did not address the structural condition of the decades old buildings. And, too, President Sorensen pointed out that various private housing facilities located close to the campus were available to students.

Mr. Wienges asked if the University could improve academically without restricting enrollment. In response, President Sorensen indicated that he was recommending an enrollment increase and to raise the academic level. He hoped to continue to grow the size of the University while maintaining the standard for providing a high quality educational experience.

Mr. Staton asked if the University had available need based financial aid; approximately \$350,000 per year was available. President Sorensen commented that it was very important to balance access with excellence. "We want to give them an excellent quality of education, but we want to make sure that it is accessible to everyone so that the University does not become a place where only middle and upper class students come." Currently, 600-700 students had qualified for this assistance. It was noted that 69 percent of these students had earned a 3.0 or better G.P.A.

Dr. Floyd expressed disappointment regarding the proposed increase of students per year. He believed that the University had a greater responsibility to the state and should increase the freshman class more than 50 per year. Dr. Floyd further pointed out that several years ago the graduate school admission rate had been decreased to accommodate a larger undergraduate admission.

Discussion ensued regarding the size of the freshman class. Responding to Mr. Buyck's remark that the size of the next incoming freshman class had been reduced, Chairman Whittle stated that it was a reflection of the "ability to retain the undergraduate population which is an endorsement of an improvement in the undergraduate studies at the University." And, further, he noted that the Fall 2003 freshman class was the second largest in the history of this institution.

Dr. Pruitt commented that the University's retention rate had increased 4 percent since 1999, partially because most of the students were full-time; the average age had dropped from 22 to 21. Students were required to pass 30 hours each year in order to maintain their lottery scholarships.

In addition, President Sorensen referenced the proposed holistic admission process which will rely less on high SAT and grade point average scores as benchmarks; rather, this process "will democratize the incoming freshman class and cast a wider net" in order to consider factors other than high academic scores.

Ms. Moore expressed concern about the challenge of hiring at least 25 additional faculty per year to lower the current faculty/student ratio of 16.5 to 1. She believed that such a task would also provide an opportunity to change the

face of the entire University. In addition, replacement of those faculty members who will retire during this time frame would also factor into the equation.

President Sorensen remarked that Vice President Pastides had presented to him an innovative plan to hire 100 research faculty; anticipated was the possibility of hiring 550-700 faculty during the next six years. "That will have a dramatic impact which can potentially transform this University."

Mr. von Lehe was encouraged by the fact that the in state/out of state ratio would remain the same as previously (80 percent vs. 20 percent) so that "we are still trying primarily to educate South Carolina students." Mr. Adams was pleased that South Carolina students were meeting the challenge of the University's increased admission requirements; "we have been able to recruit and get good students right here in South Carolina and keep them here."

Mr. Bradley shared Dr. Floyd's hope that "this institution will be able to educate every young South Carolinian that we have the financial and academic ability to educate and I will continue to hold that theory. I believe that the administration has done a fine job of weighing all the factors at play."

Mr. Bradley moved approval of the proposed 2005-2010 enrollment management plan as presented. Mr. Foster seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

V. Other Matters:

A. Report on Palmetto College: Chairman McLellan called on Dr. Plyler who updated the Committee on the status of the Palmetto College initiative; several months ago he had presented this concept during an Academic Affairs Committee meeting. He reiterated that the Palmetto College was a means by which the University could offer upper division coursework and certain needed baccalaureate degree programs at the four two-year regional campuses which were only authorized to award associate degrees in arts and in sciences. Many of those graduates who wished to pursue a four year degree were unable to leave their respective communities.

Assessments were currently being conducted at these campuses to determine which baccalaureate degree programs were needed. In addition, the University was installing a \$1.5 million "wide area network" to offer these programs via distance education. Also under consideration was the possibility of offering web based and "face to face" courses.

Dr. Plyler commented that this initiative was a very ambitious undertaking which would ultimately require the involvement of many individuals. It had taken four years to reach this point and, with the support of this administration, extensive progress had been made. Recently submitted to the President and to the

Provost was a report outlining a plan for the implementation of the concept. Conversations with the Columbia faculty, the libraries, and the essential elements of the infrastructure will begin in the near future to ensure that a well developed proposal will be presented to this Committee for consideration.

Dr. Plyler noted that the Palmetto College initiative was "another opportunity for outreach and extension by the University of South Carolina and a means of showing the great efficiency that this system offers to the citizens of the state."

B. Adjournment: There were no other matters to come before the Committee, and Chairman McLellan declared the meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Stepp
Secretary