Attachment A

Dr. John Palms' Comments to the
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate
September 10, 1993

Good morning. How is everybody. Sorry I was late. I had to say goodbye to the football team and someone gave me this bumper sticker. ... (laughter)...

We are in a pretty good mood on the campus here in Columbia. I hope it is the same for you on your campuses. I hope you had a refreshing summer and were able to rejuvenate yourself, for those who were able to get away and enjoy a little more leisure thinking time which is so important.

Norma and I had a chance to get away for a couple of weeks. I did not call the office for 16 days for the first time in the history of my life, and it cleaned out the cobwebs. In fact, we were accused of getting face lifts because there were just no wrinkles at all when we got back.

It is a good time. It is exciting to walk on our campus and see the students back. I know you feel the same kind of excitement. There is nothing like it when they arrive. In spite of all the problems that we are dealing with, to see a new crop of students is really very exciting.

Here on the Columbia Campus I know the Provost is very, very elated that the freshman class's SAT scores are up 36 points on the average. This has got to be a record in this country for a major flagship institution to raise its freshmen SAT's by that much. The out-of-state students, SAT's which are usually below the average of in-state students', is up to 1020.

Last year at this time we had 2000 inquiries for next year's class and right now we have 24,000 inquiries. If we can translate that into support from the legislature for faculty salary increases for all of us--somebody said the other day, Palms, all you have to do is win eight more football games and you can get the faculty salary increases. This happened! This is the way South Carolina works. It is a real challenge for us, as I know it is on your campuses. We fought all last year to restore $30 million to higher education. You would think it was a gift of additional money but it was really money they took from us the year before and we fought to get it back. $10 million of that money was for the USC system.

And we are starting off fighting for the money again this year--that $30 million was one-time money that was made available, so our major task and top priority is to get our faculty salaries and staff salaries up and get that $30 million as a regular part of the

allocation to higher education. It is not going to be easy because of all the debt and obligations that the state has. So we are already working with the leadership of the legislature to see to it that this is a priority. There is a general feeling still in this state, particularly among the business community, that higher education is fat in comparison to the other needs of the state--Medicare, Medicaid, prisons, K-12--and that somehow we need to structure ourselves like business is structuring itself to be more efficient and more effective. I think we are all trying to do that, and we have enough examples on all of our campuses where we are trying to work as efficiently and effectively as possible. We need to continue to provide evidence for that. As I told the Columbia Campus at the first senate meeting, and some of your campuses were represented there, I think the best thing that we can do this year is to continue to gain the confidence of the citizens of this state and the legislature by being exemplary in what we do. First, the way we teach--to have satisfied undergraduates who feel comfortable in their classrooms, who feel nurtured and mentored and cared for. There is nothing like that being reflected back to the parents, back to the representatives, back to the legislature. If we teach well, we do our scholarship well, and we provide our service, we will secure their confidence. Our office has requested anecdotal information or good data on how all of our campuses contribute to economic development and also help in K-12 education. We are going to put a document together and submit it to the business community as well as to the legislature to make clear as to what a tremendous impact we have throughout the entire state. That's the agenda. It is pretty simple.

Those are some of the major priorities that we have.

I know we are anxiously reviewing the role of this committee that is now going around to some of the campuses to look at our so-called two-year education. They were on the Beaufort Campus yesterday. I haven't received a report. John, I don't know how that went yesterday.

(John Duffy replied.)

Good. I think you know what our position is on our Regional Campuses. I have stated it many, many times. We're for cooperation and want to try to avoid duplication. We are opposed to the technical schools getting overly involved in baccalaureate programs. I think that is going to be supported by the manufacturing industry in this state in a major way. You've seen that we were just trying to get Mercedes into the state, and they wanted a commitment that we were going to continue to provide that kind of education. That's important. I think there is a continued concern on who is responsible for remedial work that is not being accomplished in the high schools, and as I told you, we're all doing that work.

If you compare us with higher education around the world, about 10% of our high school graduates couldn't get into some of those European Universities. We are all involved with remedial work. The question is at what level should we be doing it in the colleges? You are probably as much involved in that as the technical schools. So that is an issue that probably ought to be discussed--what is the role for the Regional Campuses and the technical colleges as far as doing remedial work that prepares people for higher education in general? I think that committee will visit, whatm three more campuses, John, and then?

John Duffy: They will visit Sumter, Lancaster, and York.

The Columbia Campus is still involved in a three-pronged approach to assessing itself. We finished the analysis of all of our academic programs last year with the Future Committee under the direction of the Provost. That results in the reallocation of about $16 million on this campus. It also has resulted in a three-year budget plan for the Columbia Campus, so that there won't even be budget hearings this year. We decided on a three-year plan based on that committee's work.

I know that same kind of analysis is going on on many of the campuses.

We also have a master plan analysis going on about the facilities on this campus, and we should include the other campuses and do that there as well.

And then, finally, we have a study going on of the administrative operation--the infrastructure of the whole system, things that are not directly related to the academic operations: the operations of the physical plant, the operations of our financial system, the operations of our maintenance, the operations of our warehouses, the operations of billing and receivables, and all of that. We are asking whether we can do that more effectively and more efficiently, and we do have outside help for that.

We've had some briefings on the progress of that and hopefully that is going to be concluded during this semester and see if we can maximize the resources that are being allocated--whether there are any savings that we could redirect towards the academic programs.

We are busy with some searches. We've got, what seven searches here on this campus? Five deans and a couple of associate provosts. I know we've got a new dean at Sumter, Les Carpenter. Where is he? Is he here? Les, stand up for a minute so everybody can see you. Welcome. We are pleased to have you. You've gotten good press so far in Sumter. That is a little bit important in this state by the way.

We have a search going in Lancaster since Pete is leaving. Also,

where is (Jim) Edwards. Officially now you are a Dean (at USC Union). And then since Pete decided to go on the tennis tour, we've got a search going on up there in Lancaster. That is going to keep us busy.

One thing we are finding out in these searches is that we haven't searched out-of-state for a long time on some of these campuses and then on our own campus. Every candidate that we had in for the dean of the business school is making a lot more money than the current dean. Every candidate that we have had in as a finalist for the Honors College is making more than the Honors College dean. Every finalist we have had in for the Spartanburg chancellorship was making more than the sitting chancellor. So that is an awakening,. If you compare our salaries this year with the institutions with which we like to compare ourselves, we have some major challenges. As you know, North Carolina is now giving their faculty raises. Georgia, I think, is giving 6% raises to their faculty; their lottery is giving them another 10% to buy equipment. And Alabama is giving raises; Tennessee is giving raises; so we are tracking that data and feeding that to the legislature as well. That is a real concern I think for all of us. I would be glad now to entertain any questions that you have about anything going on. If I can't answer them, James is here, also. Yes, sir?

John Logue? (Sumter): What is the current status of the System Academic Advisory Committee that was proposed a couple of years ago to unify communication at the academic level within the System?

Palms: We are going to reactivate that. James, do you want to speak to that briefly?

Moeser: I hope that we can convene that committee this month. We are right now trying to determine exactly what the membership of that committee is. I think this Senate has delegated a person and we should have two from Spartanburg and two from Aiken and I am not sure what the number from Columbia Faculty Senate is, but we intend to put that committee together.

Palms: Yes, sir?

Robert Castleberry (Sumter): At the Columbia meeting you indicated, if I understood correctly, that beyond the $10 million that was finally returned to the System, that there may be an additional pot of money that will be fairly competitive.

Palms: There is about a $60 something million--I don't like to call it the something. If they had better information particularly on the economic recovery, there wouldn't have been this money--it all would have been allocated. But anyway, it was more than they predicated was going to come in, so that $30 million goes to higher education, and there was also $500,000 that came off the top that went to scholarships for private institutions. And then the rest of it is up for designation by the legislature, and we can be as competitive for that money as anyone else. These are one-time monies. We are trying to put our case together for how we might be able to use a portion of that ourselves. I am talking about ourselves meaning the entire System.

Castleberry: My question related exactly to that aspect. To what extent are the needs of the Regional Campuses getting funneled in to that decision-making process?

Palms: I certainly would like to hear from the campuses as to how they might use such a one-time allocation. We put together a System request for that money. I will work with John to work with the Deans to see what we might put together. We are trying to get some prognosis of what would be reasonable to request. Obviously we can't request the whole thing. The prisons are going to be there; health care is going to be there; K-12 is going to want to have something. The people in economic development probably want some of that to entice some industry that they are negotiating with to come to the state.

John Catalano (Lancaster): We were told that we wouldn't have representation on the Future Committee because it wouldn't affect our campuses. We were told we wouldn't have representation on the committee to select the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education because this would be a Columbia job and it wouldn't affect our campuses. At the same time we see the Future Committee is going to affect our campus, and the Associate Provost is going to affect our jobs. That person's responsibilities included looking at our T&P files. I understand that you are going to have to redo that search. Are we going to get some representation on that committee this time?

Moeser: There will be an internal search, limited to tenured members of the faculty in Columbia or the Regional Campuses and it will be open to Regional Campuses faculty and I assure you--I confess that I was wrong on that one. And the elimination of Regional Campuses faculty on that search committee was not by intention, it was by oversight and I confess to that. And I see your point--I concede it fully. Because I also agree that that position is as critical to the Regional Campuses as it is to Columbia and you will be represented on the search committee and you will be eligible for nomination for the position. On the first point, however, I still disagree. I don't think the Future Committee had any impact--there were no Regional Campuses funds, at all, impacted by decisions of the Future Committee. Those were strictly Columbia A budget. If you had been willing to make a 12% contribution to the pie... (laughter) ...

Catalano: ... The Future Committee, although it may not affect our budget, it certainly will affect our ability to offer certain courses, for instance, in the area of Applied Professional Sciences. It will affect us in our ability to transfer students into Columbia programs that might not be there for them. In those ways it is going to affect us very strongly.

Moeser: What I think, in fact, I will concede that point with regard to Applied Professional Sciences. And I am only speaking

for myself now. I think there may be programs in that college which we may want to discontinue at Columbia which in fact might be augmented at one or more campuses. I speak, for example, of the Office Administration Program. I know that is a big program, for example, at Lancaster. If that program were, and that decision has not been made final, but I think that theresome of the decisions that were made with regard to Columbia academic priorities could have positive spill over on the Regional Campuses, especially if programs were moved essentially off the Columbia budget and into the Regional Campuses.

Catalano: I don't disagree with the findings of the Future Committee. In fact, I think they did a wonderful job. But I think they are going to impact our campuses and I would sure like to see some representation on the committee.

Moeser: The impact would be indirect and not direct. I mean the point that I was making was that in fact there are colleges in Columbia that weren't represented on the Future Committee and they did have a direct cause and impact. They had to pay up front and so it was a very insignificant in terms of representation at that point.

John Gardner: James, you've already appointed Regional Campuses representation on the search committee for one of the two Associate Provost positions?

Moeser: That is correct.

John Gardner: That's already been done.

Moeser: And that will be done in the future for all associate provosts.

Palms: I hope you appreciate the sensitivity of where we were last year at this time even trying to begin such a process of "give me 12%." Then we want to talk about reallocating money. "Well that's fine for everyone except me. You're not getting my money." So, it took a long time to build some trust on that committee. I think the Future Committee outcome this year can definitely be reflected by the other campuses again and see how it is going to impact in a more direct way. I am sure it will have an impact and maybe there will be some adjustments on the other campuses and we will look to you to do that.

Jane Upshaw (Beaufort): We're concerned, always, with the Commission on Higher Education.

Palms: Thank you. Me, too. (laughter)

Upshaw: And we'd like to hear how we can help in what's being done to influence the replacement of Jack Whitener on that Commission

and what we can do to help with that--so we have friend there.

Palms: Well, we spent a great deal of time last year getting to know the Commission better. Our Board was present at number of the Commission committee meetings for the first time and the whole Commission's meetings. We are interested in Jack Whitener's replacement. He was a placement from the Greenville/Spartanburg area. Currently we have at least two people who are University of South Carolina graduates from that area who are interested in the position. One is the chair of our Board of Visitors. Another one is related to one of the members of the Board of Trustees, so we are going to lobby for that. We have been in contact with the Governor on this because he finally makes the appointment, but it is a recommendation made by the local representatives of that area. There is also another vacancy that is a Governor's appointment that has not been made and we are trying to influence that also. But it is important to get somebody who is an advocate for the University. That you very much. We are concerned about--to put it mildly. You know, we get a request from the Commission, because we are going to change the nature of our graduate geography program.....yes, we are changing some of the requirements for the Ph.D. in Geography, and we get notice from the Commission that it will be treated like a brand new program. 'You have to come back before us as though it's a new program.' I mean it is just absolutely ridiculous.

Last year, you know, we worked hard to get regulatory relief from the Legislature. And we got about two-thirds of the relief that we sought--how you go out on bid, what kind of bonding companies you have to have, some whistle-blower legislation, just a number of things. We really got about two-thirds of what we asked for.

I think this year we are going to ask relief from the Commission on Higher Education. (laughter)

I can make a list of things that are so redundant. We get accredited by a professional organization, and we get accredited by the Southern Association, and then we come in and the Commission has to accredit us. It is the biggest waste of money. I'm going to have my Gore plan for restructuring higher education in the state. It is just not a time we need to be overburdened by bureaucratic monitoring, if not policing.

The Trustees feel the same way about it. might tell you that this is a feeling among most of the trustees of institutions in the state. And for that reason and other reasons for the first time, a week or so ago, the Boards of Trustees of the University of South Carolina, Clemson, and MUSC met together for the first time. And that was one of the topics. The main topic was economic development and how the research universities impact that and why we need support. But also was how we can function more effectively and how higher education is structured in this state to do that and the kind of resources that go into dealing with the Commission.

You know, human resources and financial resources.

Ellen Chamberlain (Beaufort): In regard to what you were just saying about the Commission, yesterday we did indeed have the Two-Year Committee come down and spend the day with us, and we felt very good about our presentation in the morning. I think it was very strong, particularly from the community representatives who spoke on our behalf and representatives from the legislative delegation spoke very strongly on our behalf and have committed themselves publicly to supporting USC B and USC B's eventual hope to become a four-year institution in Beaufort. Also, though, we had the feeling and I think the downside of that is that even though we put on a very good presentation, that its almost like base closure presentations.

Palms: "A for presentation and go, thank you very much."

Chamberlain: Exactly! That it might be done and yet in the end when the decisions are made, it may not be a decisive force. I guest my question to you is, do you have any feeling from what you are hearing in Columbia as to how this is going to play out and where it eventually is going to be decided?

Palms: It would be a lot of speculation. I do not see any legislative support for integrating the so-called two-year campuses. I see a strong commitment to try to avoid duplication. Remember who was there first. And I see us trying to address the needs of the state. As I told the Commission the other day, if the percentage of students graduated from high school were to go to college that needed to go to college, we wouldn't have enough institutions. It is not that we have too many institutions, you know. It is that we don't have enough money to run the ones we have. We need to provide this opportunity for our citizens. I am going to keep the pressure on them to be good stewards for the citizens and provide higher education opportunities. So I don't really see--I see some encouragement for us to cooperate more, especially as we build more facilities, and that we need to agree on a strategic philosophy within which we can work.

I have been to one meeting now of the Executive Committee of the Council of Presidents this year, and there were three members from the technical colleges there, three presidents there. This is a very diversified group, I tell you that. They are locally hired, they claim. Have their own autonomy, you know. There is a limit to what their board can really do to them and all of this, and it is just a different culture than ours, too. I maintain that. So, I am willing to work toward cooperation in any way we can, but I don't see any drastic integration. It shouldn't happen.

Gordon Haist (Beaufort): Following on that, one thing that has always bothered me in this state is how easily the University and I think other academic institutions in the state have allowed the

debate between technical education and academic education to arise and remain in a political sphere and allow it essentially to be brokered by the Commission on Higher Education. And I realize that USC doesn't have a school and it is too late to really develop such a thing as a school of technology but it will serve as a standard or serve to create the standards of what technical education ought to be. But it does seem to me that we have been remiss in not developing a technological feasibility study, agency, or some sort of research group that is ongoing that doesn't do the sort of things that this state seems to want to do mainly and that is to try to prepare the case for saying this company ought to move here or this company ought to move there because we have this capacity or that capacity. But rather, try to identify what it is that is needed technologically and what it is that is needed educationally in order for that technology to be available, I mean not available but to fit in the total plan of education of this that as a state we would want our citizens to have. That seems to be a subtle distinction but it does seem to be something that other states do manage to do. The debate between technical and academic education is usually sustained by academic institutions who are concerned about the relationship and concerned equally about the difference. We don't do that in this state and I wonder whether there is a mechanism by which we could, or in this university.

Palms: Well, we have not had those kinds of discussions. It has mainly been the responsibility of the technical higher education board that oversees all the technical schools and it has been left sort of to the Commission. Hence, we've had our hands full developing our institution and developing our philosophy of liberal arts versus professionalism and the needs of various communities. I think that debate is taking place indirectly, right now, through this process of assessment.

Haist: Well, at our level we find it very difficult precisely because standards we claim our freshman English courses should have are directly countered by the sense of English that are reductively?? necessary for a technical program. So we need....

Palms: I understand.

Nancy Washington (Lifelong Learning): I was very gratified as a librarian that the Future Committee was supportive of the libraries in Columbia and I was wondering if there are any plans for additional support for the System libraries--collection building, cooperative collecting, automation, this sort of thing? Has anybody thought about....?

Palms: Well, there is certainly a need there and I think that the library support goes directly to the campuses, does it not? But we are certainly realizing how we are linked together increasingly because of the technology that is provided. So... John?

John Duffy: The campuses get an allocation. In turn, the campuses allocate through the direct charge back to Columbia, money which we use to support the central library services. We, of course, benefitted the past few years by being part of that planning for and in fact the implementation of USCAN and in fact we've done quite well on it.

Washington: There is a committee for cooperative collecting and when each campus has its own mission to support with this funding, it is hard to pull money from that for cooperative collecting. Nevertheless, there probably are some efficiencies that can be affected if there were, I guess, additional funds is what I am talking about, to address the problem of cooperative collecting and automation in the same way. The automated access, the networks, and so forth.

Duffy: But the money has gone to the campuses.

Palms: But a great deal of the central investment in the library is, according to George Terry, in fact in technology. And, of course, technology is not site-specific. So I think it will benefit everybody.

Washington: Yes, I agree.

Palms: Any other comments?

Haist: Tenure and promotion is going to start--the process is going to start up almost as soon as this meeting is over and I can tell from questions that I am getting that one of the major concerns that we are going to face on our campus is the need to establish in quantitative terms, a case for our applicants to establish a quantitative case, a kind of clear statement I've done this and I've done that, which would be much more handily done if, indeed, we had our professors doing research and publication and number of other things. Instead we understand, and you have lead us in this, that we can take a broader sense of what scholarship is and try to use that as criterion by which we can make application for promotion. But there is a lot of concern now about scholarship means and how it is that we are to present our cases for scholarship, and I was wondering whether on the level that you are going to be looking at this and the Provost is going to be looking at this, whether you have a set of criteria that you are using--such as revitalization of courses and so on? A number of ....

Palms: Yes, I have a sort of a rough draft document I've sent on to the Provost for the Columbia Campus. When I talk to the Regional Campuses and the Four-Year Campuses, I really want the faculty there to set these criteria. I mean, you know the culture within which you work. You know the demands on your time. You know the kind of students that you have. I am confident you know what kind of evidence that you can seek in order to assure yourself

that the faculty are keeping up in their discipline, are teaching up-to-date materials, how that is done. I think you have the best judgement of that. I would hope that you wouldn't overly quantify it, you know, with some statistical analysis thing, but be as subjective as possible but still be able to make a very strong case for what you want. There are many definitions of professionalism or scholarship now. And we have our own challenges on this campus. The Provost is going to address this in a major way for our faculty because there is tremendous variation on this campus in departments as to what are the higher standards for a flagship campus. Some departments that are ranked fourth in the nation, our Chemistry Department is 20th in the nation, and they have standards as though they are 20th in the nation, and if they want to be tenth, they've got a sliding scale. You know it is going to slide. It is not the criteria you were hired in. You've got to understand...you've got to show evidence of growth. We're growing in quality. And I would hope all of you would build in a sense of growth in quality--that you are going to get better. Here is the state of this department or this campus, but here are our aspirations, and you've got to show us evidence you are capable of growing. And even when tenure is given to you or promotion is provided on these campuses, it is based on the understanding of continuing growth.

We've never had more requests on this campus, not just from faculty but from staff who say, "look, I'm doing so much more than I ever used to do. I want you to reclassify my job. I want to paid more." We are all going to have more to do. We are all supposed to be getting better. It goes with the understanding of the job. And I think that is the real challenge. What are your eventual aspirations and can faculty really go into them. Do they supply evidence. We have never had any trouble with strong cases. It is your weak cases that you have difficulty with. Then you manufacture numerical analyses. It is a 6.2 for this and a 5.2 and the overall average is 6.1 and the person gets tenure. We hopefully are not going to get into that.

I am still going to rely on your faculty to be the principle guidance on this with your deans on your campus. And we would be glad to sit down as you work through this. We do need to have some consistency on the Regional Campuses--some generic guidelines for you. But then you have to address your own. All the campuses have different needs and the Provost's Office is going to work with the campuses, you and John, also.

We have asked for a presentation of data in a little more systematic way because we have to be able to handle that on the campus with the other departments and the four-year campuses. If we can do that. There are some things that can be numerically presented, but I hope you would minimize it. But I am still getting, say, teaching evaluations. When I get these dossiers, and we have teaching evaluations, and the question offers only a yes or no answer. There is not a scale of one to five, and there is no

opportunity for a subjective analysis whether the faculty member was capable, was effective, had an influence on my learning. There are no questions that are discussable. I have a real hard time if there are only yes or no answers, and we can do better than that. I am sure there are instruments that are better than those. Let the Chief Academic Officer speak to this.

Moeser: When I get up I will speak to that...

Palms: I will be here for a little while and then let James...

Stephen Bishoff (Sumter): I was curious as to what the future holds for four-year programs in operation on the Regional Campuses.

Palms: Well I would look at our four-year involvement. Wwe are moving in a situation of drastically changing economics. Who knows where the future of economics of this state are going to be or the future demographics of the state? We are going to continue offering undergraduate baccalaureate degrees through association with Coastal, Aiken, Spartanburg. We are going to try to expand our offerings through distance education and television. There is a real opportunity there to do that. Even with local involvement--the B.A.I.S. program--I believe we are trying to continue to encourage that. I don't believe that politically or economically it is a good time to create independent four-year institutions right now. But hopefully that time will change. Right now we are trying to survive with the budgets that we have. One of the presidents was joking the other day that we used to be state-chartered, state-supported, state-assisted. Now we are just state-authorized. (laughter)

We have a real battle here to survive with the resources that we have. And it is a sensitive political issue, too, to try get to get everyone more informed.

Thank you. By the way, I am going to try to visit all the campuses again as soon as I can. So my office will be working on that. I am going to Spartanburg, and Jack Whitener is doing a super job. They already have a problem there, but I am not going there just for that. I would like to visit the campuses. I am going to Union at then month to spend a day in Laurens. And I hope to see you all again soon.

Attachment B

Dr. James Moeser's Comments to the
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate
September 10, 1993

James Moeser: I'll be very brief because I think Dr. Palms has touched on--and with your questions--you have touched on several issues that I was going to speak about. I will come back to the promotion and tenure question which I know is a concern. I think Dr. Duffy's going to talk with you about the issues currently pending at the CHE. Obviously, we are very concerned about the meeting that is going to take place on the 16th in which the Jones Proposal will once again be aired. And I think there is something bad in that for almost everyone which produces a tremendous sense of solidarity among all of the institutions and all of the components of this System. But we are concerned about what appears to be a consensus developing on the Commission that could be very harmful to us.

Carolyn West (Sumter): There are many people in this room that don't know what the Jones Proposal is. Would you briefly summarize that?

Moeser: The Jones Proposal is predicated on a statement of goals and priorities that the Commission adopted last year. It goes like this: the first priority of higher education in South Carolina will be funding two-year education, recognizing that the most economical two-year education is offered in the technical schools. That is priority number one. Priority number two is undergraduate, baccalaureate training/education at the four-year campuses, and beyond that is graduate and research. And there is a provision for excellence where possible so it is a sort of marginal tipping of the hat toward excellence. But it is a sort of pyramid based on a populist philosophy. Now that might sound like it would be good for the Regional Campuses because the Regional Campuses are included in Marvin Jones' definition of two-year education but it also makes it impossible for any offering of upper-division course work to be offered at any two-year location and locks in everyone in terms of what they can do. It limits missions very specifically.

West: It also includes open admissions for two-year campuses.

Moeser: That is correct. It does.

West: No 300 and 400 level courses and open admissions for....

Moeser: Correct. In other words, it is not unrelated to the two-

year study. My answer to your question about the two-year study is that I think the recommendations of the Two-Year Study Committee will be utterly benign and even favorable. I think they will recommend some positive interaction between the technical campuses and our colleges at Beaufort and Sumter with regard to sharing of facilities, maintenance of those facilities. I think those are all things that we should be doing. And I think that they will probably recommend that the technical colleges remove themselves from baccalaureate preparation at those two locations and that we remove ourselves from remedial work--that we separate the missions of those two places much more discretely, which I believe would be a positive suggestion. And I think the Commission already knows--the Commission staff (we are really talking about and the Commissioner)--I think they already know that in essence they have lost that battle but they have not lost the war. And the Jones Proposal is another way of winning the war. It accomplishes in one fell swoop everything that they have been trying to do for the last 20 years in terms of reordering and controlling the missions ..... It is very harmful. So obviously we are concerned about it. I think, for those of you who have the ability to influence individual members of the Commission on Higher Education, this is a very critical time.

In terms of issues that I see on the horizon that I think are of a mutual concern, as I said to the Columbia faculty last week, I think the whole question of the relationship of the Regional Campuses faculty to the Columbia faculty is something that we must pursue and continue to be concerned about. As you know, the Regional Campuses are now included in the accreditation of the University of South Carolina Columbia. You are part of the mission of the University of South Carolina Columbia. I think that what we really need to pursue are relationships primarily at the departmental levels. I was very impressed this summer at the demonstration over in the Swearingen Building of the several FIPSE grant projects which involved faculty from several of our campuses working together--faculties in English, biology, mathematics, many of the core disciplines. Yet, I am struck by the lack of interchange between the English Department in Columbia and the English faculties on the other campuses, or the biology faculties, or the physics faculties, or the chemistry faculties, or the mathematics faculties. As a University, I think we need to begin to start that discourse. I think that we can all learn from each other. That was what was very clear in the FIPSE work, that learning was going on on both sides of the equation. The Columbia faculty have things to learn from faculty on the Regional Campuses where basic courses are taught by faculty and not by graduate teaching assistants, and the Regional Campuses faculty obviously can benefit from the interaction with Columbia faculty. There is a very positive interchange, and we need to find ways to do that. I want to know, for example, and I think we have a right to know, whether the English 101 that's taught at Union or Lancaster is really in fact the same English 101 that's taught at Columbia. And

it should be if we are going to accept credit back and forth within the System, and University credit be accepted as University credit and not as transfer credit from another institution. And for us to be able to speak to that issue with assurance there needs to be that kind of communication primarily at the departmental level. I hope that my office, through the undergraduate vice provost can help to facilitate that kind of dialogue. I don't want some kind of heavy talk-down apparatus but I would rather see a grassroots springing up of this kind of interchange, and we will be talking with our deans and department chairs, and I will be talking also with the campus deans. We are going to arrange for a meeting of the campus deans with the academic Columbia deans as well to talk about some of these issues and to see if we can't start some of these discussions. Maybe we will do it on a test basis with a few chosen disciplines initially.

The relationship of the Regional Campuses' faculty to Columbia, also, I think, can be discussed in an even larger context of what do we as a university want to do about System governance and how will we approach this issue? Now I bring into the equation Aiken and Spartanburg as well. And that relates to the question asked earlier about the System Academic Advisory Committee which we will convene.

The Board of Trustees has asked us to begin to develop common policies first of all in the area of grievance. The Board, as you know, is the final court of appeals internally on grievance matters, and it concerns them that they have to deal with four different grievance tracks--one from Columbia, one from Spartanburg, one from Aiken, and one from the Regional Campuses. The procedures are not identical, and they lead to confusion. It seems to me that in this area and in a number of common policy areas, common system policies would be appropriate. The President is going to refer to this Faculty Senate and to the senates of Aiken and Spartanburg that legislation recently passed by the Columbia faculty on sexual harassment. Our strategy there will be to ask you to look at that document as well as the comments from the System Legal Office as soon as they are available and from the Office of Human Relations--to ask you to enact your own legislation, and then we will put together a conference committee of the several senates to see if we can, through that manner, hammer out a common policy that can be used Systemwide. There are a number of other areas where I think that we can apply the same technique. That would raise the question as to whether we need to have a more systematized, regularized form of system faculty governance. I raise that simply as a question more than as a suggestion, but I think it is a question we should examine.

Now I want to turn to promotion and tenure and just make a brief statement about that, and then I will answer questions. I've proposed or am in the process of proposing a fairly comprehensive reform of promotion and tenure procedure and criteria for the

Columbia Campus. At the same time, I want to raise the question about whether or not we should address in a very generic way, any kind of System statement about that. Again, that raises the question of System governance, of a faculty manual in which a portion might be common to all of the major components of the System. As I hear your concerns about promotion and tenure, let me tell what motivates some the things that we have tried to instill, and I would say exactly the same thing to you that I will say to a department or a college on this campus. I believe strongly in not only the right but of the responsibility of the local faculty unit to determine what scholarship is. I think only a math department in a large college can tell us what scholarship in mathematics is. I can't tell mathematicians what their scholarship ought to look like, or physicists, or chemists, or pharmacists, but I know what scholarship in music is. At the same time, I think that generically for the whole University we can say some things very simply. Just about all faculty engage in teaching. All faculty are scholars and engage in scholarship. All faculty provide service. As you look at American higher education, these are the three standard criteria by which we measure merit and achievement in the academic community. The Faculty Manual at Columbia has nine different criteria for promotion and tenure including something that says "experience at the University of South Carolina." It has another one that indicates that there is a sort of congeniality test. There are several...we have a lot of people that would fail on that score (laughter) and I am not sure it is in the faculty's interest to keep that in the Manual. There are a number that say the same things but in different language. It is very cumbersome, and what it really comes down to is a very fuzzy and messy statement of criteria. So I want to suggest that we look at that.

I want to look at a number of other things. My concern with the dossiers that came in last year from the Regional Campuses was primarily in the lack of documentation for claims that were made in the dossier and that is the principle issue, I think, at stake. I want to say absolutely and categorically that I am not interested, and I don't think the President is interested as you have already heard him say this, in quantification. I think quantification is the worst thing that we could do, either measuring the numbers of articles or the height of stacks. I went to the Firing Line debate yesterday and met a professor who had written 501 books, a man that we didn't hire and I think we made the right decision. In fact, I shudder to think what the scholarly output of 501 books might be. His field is biblical scholarship and one of the people in Religious Studies said that he had written books in religious history faster than God could make it. (laughter) Quantification is not the issue. Obviously quality and a qualitative measure is. And that goes for teaching as well as scholarship. On your campuses, I think teaching is obviously of paramount importance. And the things that I want to know are not only how much does a person teach but how well do they teach as measured both by students and peers, and I think that every promotion and tenure

dossier ought to have not only student evaluations of teaching but peer evaluations. That means that promotion and tenure committees need to visit classes and write reports on what they see. I want to see those in those dossiers. I want to see a faculty measurement of peer quality, peer evaluation, and that is really the only discussion that we had last year because there were dossiers that came to us that simply didn't have any documentation. There were claims made that were not supported by the evidence in the dossiers, and those were the ones that we sent back. And I think that's a discussion that I really don't think, when we all fully understand why we are asking those questions, there will be any real concern. We are not, I assure you, attempting to tamper or to interfere with your rightful setting of those definitions of what constitutes scholarship or anything else that belongs clearly within the prerogatives of the faculty. I believe strongly in tenure and promotion being a peer review process, and I think that everything that we do will be aimed at strengthening the peer review, internal and external process. I will now answer any questions that you might have on any of these subjects. Yes, sir.

Gordon Haist (Beaufort): I thank you for those comments. I think it does help to clear the air quite a bit. We do have problems, probably at Beaufort and Union and the smaller campuses that are more obvious than elsewhere. For example, the analogy tends to break down concerning scholarship. It is quite right that mathematicians in the Department of Mathematics are the best people to tell what math scholarship for that department is. But when you've got the problem such as a single musician on a campus, the question is what does music scholarship count as in relationship to the other things that are being taught outside music? Similarly, we have that sort of problem when it comes to a faculty measure, because we very frequently discover that our local promotion or tenure process would inevitably have to involve the scientists evaluating the teaching of the humanist and the literature teacher or the literature teacher evaluating a social scientist or something of the sort. So we're not dealing with the department level homogeneity by which we can establish incontrovertibly that this process is going to have the same ....

Moeser: I fully understand the problem and I have dealt with it. As you know, when I was a dean at Penn State, at that system I had responsibility for faculty in my college at outlying campuses and so I have dealt with this at an existential level. And I think where you've got one physicist or one mathematician, or one musician, that is a problem and part of the answer to that is in the selection of external peers. Obviously you can measure the scholarship. Let me just use my own field. If you've got one musician who you know is not only an organist but teaching history of music, music theory one, two, and three or whatever but a whole range of courses which, because one has to be a generalist as well as a specialist where you are the only person representing that discipline in a small college, it is very important that you select

peers externally who understand the mission of that campus. So to send...if you had a musician at Beaufort, if you sent his or her credentials off to the University of Michigan for example, a person who read that file and looked at that C.V. very likely would not understand the culture of USC Beaufort and what it is like to teach at a small campus where you have to be not only the organist but conductor or the orchestra and symphonic choir and teaching theory and history--all those things wrapped into one. So what you do, it is very important that you send that to a professor of music at a college that has mission like yours and a faculty composition that is similar--of like scope, and you try to choose good people within that setting, and that is where external peers can be extremely important. And I also agree with you that it is more difficult to get local peer analysis of the quality of teaching, but I still insist that it can be done. Because, if you think about it, if I go into your classroom, I may not understand all of your discipline but I can immediately identify with a number of things. I can tell whether you've got enthusiasm for your work. And let's face it, after basic content knowledge in the field, when you are measuring quality of teaching, commitment and enthusiasm to the process of teaching are some of the most important criteria in success. I can tell after sitting in your class for an hour whether you really enjoy teaching, how you relate to your students, whether or not you entertain questions and field questions effectively. I think, in other words, I can get a pretty good sense of the dynamics of teaching in your classroom even though I am outside your discipline, and I am sure you have all experienced that as well. Because when you think about it, all the times, even at a place like Columbia, where you have a departmental or a college promotion and tenure committee, you're going to have English professors and historians visiting people who are teaching psychology. So it's...I think it's not asking too much to ask faculty to measure the quality. And also faculty know, especially in a small setting, you know darn well from your conversations with your own students, where effective teaching is going on. You can tell it from...not just that Professor Jones is a very entertaining teacher, but "I really learned a lot from that course. It was hard but I learned a lot. He was fair. He was tough and I only made a C, but boy was that a good course." You hear that all the time, or you hear the opposite.

Haist: I think that's true, but I think what immediately pops to mind is one usually hears that ten years later. So and so was a great teacher but during the time he was an awful teacher and so it is just impossible. That's what a person remembers. That sort of response is surprisingly common, and my only concern at this point is that we are able, through our own hindsight, through our own practice, to make judgements on people in other fields and we do it all the time, when we interact. Probably everyone has their opinion, and they express it. What I am concerned about is that I'm not sure, academically, it makes too much sense to try to think of teaching as external to what is being taught, and there is a

tendency to do that as a kind of formula. You know--here are the things that are making this classroom an exciting classroom. There is a tendency to evaluate that independently of what is taught

Moeser: Sure.

Haist: And if that becomes very strong...

Moeser: And that is also where external peers can help, because if you have only got one biologist on campus and you don't really feel comfortable...you don't know whether this guy is teaching creationism or not. That's where sending out syllabi from the classes to biologists as well as sending out research materials, send your syllabi. Send the final exam. Say, is this currently scholarship being taught in this intro biology class? And I think that is not an unreasonable question. Especially in your settings given your mission where teaching and scholarship are so interwoven that I think you could be asking your external peers, not just for an evaluation of the articles that have been written, but an evaluation of the course syllabi. And you will find out...they will say, "Oh, this is great scholarship. The only trouble is it's 1962 and since that time here's what's happened in the field. You guys are hopelessly out-of-date." And you might not know that, but that would be devastating to find out.

Castleberry: I think some of the problems continue to trace their way back, however, to the concept of what really is documentation. I would dare say that when most of the folders went forward, people who are players in the game felt that documentation had occurred. So obviously, now, I think we are trying to validate a different sense of what constitutes documentation. I think that that can only be worked out if people can sit down and talk about it to the extent that your office will take more of an active role than I think has occurred. Do you have plans for you and others in your office to visit the campuses, talk to the faculty, independent of any visitations from the President?

Moeser: I'm going to be at Salkehatchie next month, and I will be glad to go to any campus to talk about this subject--if you would just invite me.

West: We would like to invite you to Sumter and we want to make sure that when you do come that you have an hour or two to talk to faculty because of the fact that we have spent many, many years talking about what quality teaching is, and I think that you have some important points of view to offer us, and you may be surprised at what you hear from us. I think that one of the things that you will be impressed with is the fact that we do represent a different culture, but in some ways we may be better at what we do than some graduate student in Columbia who has had 18 hours of graduate courses to teach freshmen. I think there is the automatic assumption that because Columbia has certain credentials that they

are better at teaching, and I think that if there were a true assessment of that, I think there has even been a fear of a true assessment of what goes on on our campuses because we are highly educated, talented, and we spend all of our time talking about how we can do better in the classroom what we have been hired to do. And Sumter would like very much for you to come to Sumter and spend two or three hours talking to faculty about what we have been discussing for 10 years.

Moeser: I'd be happy to do that.

Haist: Beaufort would like....

Moeser: Certainly I will come. I've got one scheduled and four to go. I would be glad to do them. Let's do it this fall. One final word on this subject and then I am going to quit. I said I was going to be brief and it's not turning out to be so brief. Early tenure. Let me just say a word about that. Tenure--we make two decisions. We make really three decisions. These personnel decisions are the only really important decisions that we make in the University that affect the real life of the University. The initial appointment, the decision to tenure, and promotion. I would say that of those, I am frankly less concerned about promotion issues than I am about the first two, because those are...and of those three the most critical is the decision to tenure because it is a lifetime commitment. It is literally a multi-million dollar commitment in some cases considering the lifetime of the faculty person. I have always...when I was dean I used to tell the department chairs and the promotion and tenure committees that when we make tenure decisions, we must be very, very careful and if we err, we must err on the side of caution--that we cannot afford to make easy decisions for tenure. One of the things that concerned me last year was the apparent, sort of normal practice of sending people up for the award of tenure prior to the conclusion of their probationary period. I personally believe that the award of early tenure at any time prior to the penultimate year in the probationary period ought to be done in truly exceptional cases. There are cases that are exceptional, where a person--there are cases known where faculty were tenured after two years or three years. But I think those are...they ought to be truly exceptional. I do not believe that it is in the institution's interest to award tenure prematurely. And one of the things that I have suggested to Columbia, which I will also suggest to you, because I would like to do this Systemwide, is institute a mid-probationary year written review, in the third year. This is in place a lot of universities and I know that it is a very constructive process. It is helpful for young faculty, newly appointed, to have this review midway through their probationary period so that they can see how they are doing, so they can get a real reading. And it is a formal process, written, that becomes a part of their permanent record when it goes forward in the sixth year. My point is that I think that we need to be much more conservative in the application of the calendar and be much more careful about when we send people up. And normally, they ought to go up for promotion and for tenure in the sixth year. I'm also very leery of recommendations for tenure without promotion. That is not to say that every recommendation has to be linked, but to me it is a red flag that suggests that we really have some reservations about this person and we don't quite have the courage to deny them tenure but we don't think they are ready for promotion. And what that says to me is if we really ask the hard question we would probably say no on both. So be wary of those split recommendations that say yes on tenure and no promotion. And I will say that to tenure committees. I will look hard at that so I want you to look hard at it.

Castleberry(?): That is interesting because I have just the opposite impression in our system that it looks like it is not a good idea to come up for both at the same time. So that is why when I structured mine, I came up for promotion and then I came up for tenure.

Moeser: That's a different matter. If you want to go up for promotion first, I don't have any problem with that. In fact I think the norm ought to be tenure and promotion in year six. If a person is really accelerating and we want to send them a reward and this is a way of retaining people, obviously, who may be lured away by another institution, so maybe we promote them in the fourth year. Especially in a state that doesn't give merit salary increases, it is one way that we can help retain somebody. So I am not so allergic to early promotion as a matter of fact. I am allergic to early tenure.

Catalano: I hear you say that it is your opinion that someone should go up in the penultimate year. But that has not been the practice of the Regional Campuses. Nor was it incorporated into our Faculty Manual. Nor was it incorporated into our guidelines for applying for promotion and tenure. In fact, traditionally someone went up in their fifth year of employment so that it was a two-year process, essentially. If you were denied in your fifth year there were some chances to make some improvements and in your sixth year to have another shot at it. If you wait until your penultimate year, you turn it into, basically, a one-year procedure where you tell a faculty member, this is it. Take it or leave it. That wasn't part of our system, and I understand that these are your thoughts on it, but that isn't in our Manual.

Moeser: Well, I will tell you what's in the Columbia .....

Catalano: ..... nor was it Board-approved.

Moeser: That's right, but I am only telling you what I am going to do as Provost. In most cases I am going to say this looks good, but we can wait another year. You see, what I would suggest is a better alternative. It is a real review in the third year. If what you're asking for is some reasonable guidance and constructive feedback from your faculty peers and your campus dean (and I would suggest that the third-year review only go as far as the campus dean, by the way). This would be an internal process so that if a person is not on track, they can be counseled early. And if they are, they can be encouraged.

Catalano: I think that is a great idea, but let's not attack people who have been here at the University five years and say, "I've changed my mind about this. You should have had an approval in the third year and so now I am denying you tenure and promotion."....

Moeser: I am not suggesting we deny tenure. I am suggesting that we don't award it. We can still award it in the sixth year. We have the full probationary period in which to act. All I am saying is that let's wait until we have the maximum amount of evidence in before we make a lifelong commitment. That's the only way you build quality in a university. A university has to think we are making a lifetime investment in an individual. Are we ready to make that?

Catalano: I understand building quality for the future by changing what your policies are based upon your hiring of people this year and next year. But I don't see it by changing what happens to someone who has been at the University for five years under the impression that in the fifth year they are going to apply and if they are turned down, they had better start getting a resumé together. To me, you need to work on the people who are now being hired, not those who have been here for five years.

Moeser: I think the misunderstanding here is that were denying tenure. We didn't deny tenure to any of those people in the fifth year.

Catalano: When you tell someone their application for tenure and promotion is denied, they're not going to take this as a positive experience. (laughter)

Moeser: I think it depends entirely on how that is communicated. The deans communicate this and I will speak to the deans. I think at this moment, especially if this person is performing at something more than the adequate level so that obviously that recommendation is there, we want to say, the University is just not ready to make this commitment but we don't really see a problem, unless we really do see a problem. If we do see a problem, we ought to start the non-reappointment process, right then. We're the only institution in the world that give people a 365-day notice when we terminate them. Well we're really a humane institution. We give people a full year. What you're asking for is two full years.

Catalano: No, I'm not. I'm not asking for two years for termination. But that we go by the guidelines that are published in the Faculty Manual. And the guidelines...

Moeser: Do your guidelines say that the probationary period is five years?

John Gardner: No, they do not. They say the probationary period is seven years.

Moeser: See, that is my point. The probationary period is seven years. For associate professors it's four years. We make the critical decision in the penultimate year by necessity. You

understand why we do that, that if we made it in the seventh year, they have earned de facto tenure because we were unable to give a year's notice at that point.

Haist: I think part of John's point is that we do have a number of faculty who have been operating under another set of impressions or expectations, and that is that there are people going up for tenure or planning to go up for tenure based on the knowledge that they proceeded faithfully through these three or four or five years, and they have done everything they need to do, and this is the next stage for development. Now, I hear you saying that you're not harming them if you defer them, and I think that most of these people do expect that if it's early, then so much the better, but because it is early it may not happen for another year. But, isn't there an argument to be made from the faculty level particularly departmental or local politics are volatile which very often seems to be the case on smaller campuses? Isn't there a case that a faculty member can make for seeking tenure early as an assurance of what he is trying to do in the course of his career as building this department or building this course of study, is....?

Moeser: Surely. I think we cannot prevent a faculty person...I think it is a right. If one insists on putting forth one's case, I think that is understood. All I am saying is that I don't believe that we as an institution have an obligation to make that decision until the penultimate year. I think we should also at the same time be very careful not to send the wrong message, and that is what I am trying to say that I am not trying to send a negative message. I am simply trying to say that we need to be circumspect about the decision and be careful about it. I don't really think we are as far apart as you're suggesting or that might be inferred from this discussion. Obviously, the last thing I want to do is drive away or terrify bright, young, promising faculty who are advancing and who are performing well, and I think we ought to give them every encouragement. And one possibility, for example, is promotion without awarding tenure. As I have said, I have no problem with that if there is a strong recommendation to do it, and that is a positive sign. It just maintains the institution's flexibility until the last moment. Now, on the other hand, what if...let me turn this around. I also believe that we must build in a mechanism to be able to respond quickly to the loss of good faculty or people who are about to leave because they are being lured away by other institutions, and if they are really attractive people, then I think we need to find a way to speed up the clock for early tenure--I think we need to respond rapidly. Because, again, it's in the institution's interest to retain people that are being sought by other places.

??: I am just curious of what the foundation of this fifth versus sixth year. Have you found in your experience that people have broken down after the fifth year...

Moeser: Yes, I actually have. I had a case of denial of tenure at Penn State where actually problems arose that I was unaware of that the department chair was unaware, that most of the faculty were unaware of, that in fact in this case came from graduate students in the department, and they were quite--I mean they were serious problems. I've dealt with plagiarism in last year, twice, on this campus, both cases, in fact, involving tenured faculty. The decision had already been made. These situations do arise occasionally...hopefully very, very rarely. But, if you have made a decision in the fifth year that could have been postponed to the sixth year and something like that occurs in the sixth year, you now have a 35-year commitment. Otherwise, you have to go through a cause process that's very difficult. That's my point.

Castleberry: I would like to shift over to a separate question. At the Senate meeting you encouraged the Admissions Committee in Columbia to strongly consider bumping up the standards again. What role do you see the Regional Campuses playing in that process? Obviously, the decisions made here do affect us and how do you think we fit in?

Moeser: This is really one of the more difficult issues that we will face this year. The Columbia Campus...let me speak about the Columbia Campus for moment. I really want to continue to ratchet up the standards. I am also very conscious of our bottom line, and the news I just received yesterday from Pete Denton, with regard to enrollment in Columbia, is not encouraging in terms of the impact on the budget. And so we may face more of a budget problem than I had thought originally we were going to face. And our problem, incidentally, is not so much at the freshman level, our problem is at the transfer level. Where we are seeing the losses is at the junior/senior level. And I am not sure quite yet what the real cause of that is. I do know that we are in a demographic slump in this state until the late 90s. My impression is that enrollments on the Regional Campuses, John, are basically stable. Is that correct?

Duffy: Down slightly.

Moeser: Down slightly?

Duffy: They had been moving rapidly higher ....

Moeser: And they dropped a bit? What do you think is driving that?

Duffy: We don't know yet. In fact, that is one of the things on the agenda with the deans.

Moeser: Our discussions on this campus about admissions will be in the context of budgetary implications. Obviously, we can't afford to drive this campus into a deep recession, fiscally, by raising

standards. I mean, that would be a disaster. In fact, one of the ways that we hope that we can deal with faculty salaries here is to create some internal surpluses so that we can redirect some recurring funds into faculty salaries. The same premise will work, by the way, on the Regional Campuses. We are, unfortunately, operating within a formulated system that rewards growth and that also translates, in a sense, into...it could be translated into rewarding mediocrity. You could argue that by lowering standards or by having open admissions, you can inflate numbers and grab a larger piece of the cake and that is exactly, of course, what the technical system is doing. And they have managed to keep their tuition deflated and now they want larger state subsidies to compensate for their artificially low tuition. That is the fundamental problem we have. If I can make it work, what I would like to do is to continue to bring our standards up. I think at the same time I would argue that we should do this as a university. I don't want to be an open admissions university. I think we need to maintain access for disadvantaged students and we have to keep our eye on that, but I will tell you our SAT scores jumped 35 points on the Columbia campus this fall over last one--an enormous increase. The percentage of African-American students stayed steady at 21%. We are 55% female. So we haven't done anything to disturb the internal structure, either ethnically or by gender when we raise standards, and the numbers we lost are not at the entrance level. We lost 140 freshmen. That is a pretty small number for us, but we are down 600 to 700 students totally, and that is mostly at the upper-division level, which tells us it is probably the economy and other things and basic demography. I am not aware of any other institution having siphoned those students off at the upper-level. We just don't know where they are. They are probably all out working at McDonald's half-time. So, I think we have to work together as a system when we look at these issues, but I believe that we can maintain strong enrollments at the Regional Campuses but also begin to look at your standards and begin to ratchet up the admissions floors. The Regional Campuses system...the real value of this system is that it is an access point into the University both in terms of geographical location and in terms of having an admissions floor that is slightly below Columbia so that it allows students to come in, have small classes, and prove themselves, and succeed; and the success rate speaks for itself. That's our strongest argument <u>vis a vis</u> the TECs. We can show the data are very clear that students that come through this system have a very high persistence rate and graduation rate. So I think we can argue and successfully do that this System is an aspect of the quality of this University and needs to be protected.

Thank you all very much. I look forward to being on your individual campuses.