

# **FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**December 2, 2009**

## **1. Call to Order**

CHAIR PATRICK NOLAN (Sociology) called the meeting to order, and welcomed the Senators and recognized and welcomed President Pastides, Vice President Amiridis, Vice President Moore, and Vice Provost Helen Doeringhaus.

## **2. Corrections and Approval of Minutes**

CHAIR NOLAN asked for corrections to the minutes of the meeting of November 4, 2009. There were no corrections and the minutes were approved as written.

## **3. Invited Guests**

VICE PROVOST HELEN DOERPINGHAUS provided an update on the Quality Enhancement Plan and the preparations for the upcoming visit from a SACS accreditation team.

The Quality Enhancement Plan is part of the SACS reaffirmation process. There are two parts to the reaffirmation process:

- (1) Ascertaining that we are compliant with SACS rules
- (2) Ascertaining that an initiative is developed to address the QEP

The QEP is a five-year project to improve student learning. The idea for the QEP initiative comes from a broad institutional process that has been operating during the fall semester. In August, the Provost's Office issued a call for proposals to suggest a plan for the QEP and there was a strong response. More than 20 proposals were submitted and a committee – three faculty members chosen by the Faculty Senates (including a representative from the Regional Campuses), two students, and two administrators – has been reviewing the proposals. The committee's work is to identify the top four proposals and a final QEP topic will emerge from those four. The final initiative may be one of the four or it may blend more than one proposal.

The Provost's Office had hoped today to announce the top proposals but, as the response was greater than expected, the committee's work is still in process. When the QEP topic has been identified, the University will send a detailed proposal, about 100 pages, to SACS. If they approve, we will implement the plan. After five years of work on the plan, SACS will consider the University's review and assessment of it. The Provost's Office will report on the committee's

findings when its work is complete, both to the Faculty Senate and to the Student Government Association. A SACS team will visit USC in April of 2011, and will ask folks they meet – students, faculty, and administrators – about the QEP. The University community will be receiving much information about the QEP and the reaffirmation process so that everyone will be conversant with the issues.

Vice Provost Doerpinghaus emphasized several other issues relating to the SACS reaffirmation process:

1. All documentation regarding a unit's/department's majors or programs needs to agree. Examples of this type of information include: contents of the unit's bulletins, guidebooks, handbooks, and Websites. All sources should be consistent and accurate. Students have complained about inconsistencies in this type of departmental information and this is an area of interest for SACS. The online bulletin can be ideal for providing a standard, but it should be in agreement with other departmental documentation. The Provost's Office is asking that all units and departments complete a cleanup of these documents by April of 2010, in preparation for the offsite review next fall.
2. Please take a look at the online bulletin. The Provost's Office launched the bulletin very quietly, but it is an important resource for prospective students, current students, families and faculty. Its accuracy is key, so departments should check the bulletin for information about their program areas. Information that needs changing can be reported to a department's Academic Program Liaison (APL). The APL is a new concept. Every college, school, or campus has an Academic Program Liaison who acts as a resource person for academic program changes. The list of APLs is located on the Provost's website at <http://www.sc.edu/provost/acadprog/contacts/index.shtml>.
3. Departments should check the syllabi for all their courses to make sure that they contain student learning outcomes. Outcomes should focus on what students will learn rather than on what faculty will teach. Syllabi need to be kept updated. For the Columbia campus, these learning outcomes for programs appear in the assessment plan composer. Learning outcomes contained in a unit's syllabi should be mapped into what is happening in the program areas. Assessment for a program needs to be done both semesters every year.
4. Regarding faculty hiring, units should not only check the credentials of faculty who are being hired (including adjuncts), but also collect those credentials and keep them on file so that they will be easy to locate and retrieve during the SACS review process.

The SACS review process highlights certain dates in the coming years: Our off-site review will take place in August of 2010. The University will submit the requisite paperwork to SACS and an

off-site committee takes a look at what we are doing. In April of 2011, the on-site visit occurs. The SACS review process moves us toward best practices and as we work together, talk through issues, and talk about student learning, we are making wonderful improvements and the entire University will benefit from the process.

Vice Provost Doerpinghaus delivered an update on the General Education Revision process. The Carolina Core is the new general education curriculum that the Faculty Senate approved in April of this year, and includes 9 new learning outcomes. This summer, the Carolina Core Committee worked on context statements to flesh out the meaning of the learning outcomes. The committee reviewed task force reports from three and four years ago in order to benefit from the work of the faculty who served on the task forces. Committee members talked among themselves, talked with students, and developed context statements that are now available for review by the Faculty Senate. The committee has also prepared a comparison table of distribution requirements for the current General Education Curriculum compared to the new Carolina Core. The committee will be holding a forum on Wednesday, December 9, from 12:30 to 2:00 p.m. in the Russell House theatre here in Columbia and all USC Columbia and Regional Campus faculty, students and administrators are invited to attend. The purpose of the forum is to gather comments on the context statements and the comparison table, which can be found on the Provost's website at [http://www.sc.edu/provost/forms/CarolinaCoreAppendix\\_Oct2009.pdf](http://www.sc.edu/provost/forms/CarolinaCoreAppendix_Oct2009.pdf) and <http://www.sc.edu/provost/forms/CarolinaCoreComparisonChart.pdf>, respectively. Those unable to attend the forum are invited to submit comments online. The response to the spring forum was very strong, with over 200 faculty in attendance and over 100 online comments. This input has really shaped the work of the committee, so the Vice Provost encouraged faculty to get involved with the second forum as well.

The Carolina Core Committee is dealing with many different questions, and Vice Provost Doerpinghaus offered the following examples:

- How will the foundational general education requirements thread through the entire curriculum?
- How will the integrative Carolina Core course in the major shape student learning?
- How would departments brand their integrative courses in the major?
- What role is there for interdisciplinary courses in the new core?
- How will core requirements affect particular programs and particular colleges?

The Vice Provost encouraged faculty members to discuss these and similar issues with one another. Going forward we will have a forum every semester. This coming April, the committee hopes to bring the distribution requirements to the Faculty Senate for a vote. In the summer the committee will begin preparing policies and procedures for specific Carolina Core course approval

and next fall will host a forum about that, as well. The committee welcomes comments from the faculty and it welcomes discussion from faculty at any time.

You can find out who your Carolina Core committee representative is by consulting the committee's membership list at <http://www.sc.edu/generaleducation/committee.shtml>. All colleges, schools, and regional campuses have folks on the committee, and they will be glad to hear your thoughts.

Vice Provost Doerpinghaus concluded her report with an update on the Higher Education Opportunity Act. This act requires us to provide our students with textbook information, including pricing, before they register for the course. To accomplish this goal, faculty will need to adopt textbooks early. The University Bookstore is working with the Registrar on this issue and information will soon be posted on the Provost's Office website detailing how faculty will order textbooks. The procedure will be very like the current procedure, but the deadline for textbook adoptions is expected to be in early March. The Vice Provost then invited questions.

CHAIR NOLAN introduced Professor Jim Knapp, Chair of the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

PROFESSOR JAMES KNAPP (Earth & Ocean Sciences) reported on changes that are ongoing or forthcoming relating to the tenure and promotion process at the University. These changes involve three specific but interrelated areas:

- The conversion of the tenure and promotion process to an entirely electronic process
- A proposed revision to the tenure and promotion provisions in the Faculty Manual
- A proposal to significantly revise the annual tenure and promotion calendar

The initiative toward an electronic promotions and tenure process was begun several years ago. The process seeks to implement electronic execution of everything from submission of the file to balloting and evaluation to anonymity of voting and the confidentiality of the process. A pilot process has been developed over the past year and during the 2009-2010 cycle the College of Engineering and Computing has been testing the digital process. While the process has not concluded, all indications so far are that it is working fairly efficiently. The process features a new set of forms that faculty will use to submit their information through Blackboard. Reviewers access the files and submit their votes online, and the files are passed along electronically all the way up through the promotion and tenure process.

The test run has worked well this cycle on a total of seven files from the College of Engineering and Computing. The UCTP expects to expand the process to the rest of the USC system, probably over a period of two to three years where groups of colleges would be rotated into the new system

with each cycle of the tenure and promotion process. While by no means final, the provisional schedule would add in the coming cycle the College of Mass Communications and Information Studies, the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management, the College of Education, the School of Law, and the Moore School of Business. The remainder of the colleges would follow in either the following year or two years thereafter, depending on the success of the process. The automated process will apply to a candidate's primary tenure and promotion file. The committee anticipates that most of a file's secondary material will continue to be submitted in the traditional paper format.

Professor Knapp also discussed a UCTP issue that relates to the current revision of the Faculty Manual. The Faculty Manual revision project is being conducted by the Faculty Advisory Committee, but included in the revision is a fairly significant change to the provisions for tenure and promotion as recorded in the Faculty Manual. If some semblance of the proposed changes is approved by the Faculty Senate, it could result in a requirement to revise essentially all of the unit tenure and promotion criteria throughout the system. Professor Knapp encouraged faculty and Senators to take a close look at the proposed changes, which the Faculty Advisory Committee hopes to have posted on the Faculty Senate website by sometime in January. A forum on the changes is anticipated later on in the spring semester and, ultimately, the issue will be put to a General Faculty vote at the spring meeting.

PROFESSOR DON EDWARDS (Statistics) asked whether the new tenure and promotion procedures would apply to new hires for next year.

PROFESSOR KNAPP answered that they would, depending on when the procedures were approved.

PROFESSOR EDWARDS inquired whether this would be true even in the event that the unit criteria did not match the requirements of the new procedures.

PROFESSOR KNAPP noted that the UCTP has had discussions about this with the Provost's Office. As the Faculty is the ultimate authority on these types of issues, if the changes are approved by the Senate, some mechanism would have to be used to bring the unit criteria into compliance with the Faculty Manual. No one has a final answer yet on how that mechanism would work.

PROFESSOR KNAPP's final point related to the prodigious number of files that are coming through the T&P system at this point. The committee has reviewed 13 files in the traditional mid-year cycle this year and is anticipating another 80+ files in the spring semester. Based on the hiring patterns and the tenure clock for recent hires, UCTP anticipates that those numbers will increase at least for the next couple of years. This is a significant increase over the numbers of

files that have been handled historically and it is placing a significant burden on various parts of the tenure and promotion process. To cope with this increase in files, the Provost's Office has proposed a potential revision to the tenure and promotion calendar. Vice Provost Christine Curtis has shared the proposal with the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions. The committee has discussed it and believes that the proposal has significant merits. The core idea is that the proposal would separate the tenure and promotion process into two main phases during the course of an academic year. One phase would take place during the spring and include the mid-year files, as well as the promotion-only files. The remainder of the regular-cycle files would come through in the fall as they traditionally do. This proposal would spread the workload evenly over the course of the entire year. It also provides the University with more discretion in potentially responding to retention issues of faculty who may be hired away. Professor Knapp invited Senators and faculty to share input on this proposal with the committee, through him directly, through faculty colleagues on UCTP, or through the Provost's Office. If the calendar were to change, there would be at least a year's notice before those changes would go into effect. Professor Knapp then invited questions.

PROFESSOR JORGE CAMACHO (Languages, Literatures, & Cultures) asked about the traditional print submission of secondary T&P files. He noted the difficulty of maintaining the secondary file box from one year to the next. Professor Camacho wondered if there could be a process for uploading materials for the secondary file.

PROFESSOR KNAPP noted that the committee was supportive of this option in principle, but that the mechanics of production would have to be refined to make it viable. The information would need to be made easily accessible to the entities that are going to review the file. For instance, if a candidate submitted a CD of his/her secondary file materials, the data would need to be indexed in an appropriate way to enable the rapid access of the desired information, instead of the reviewer having to search through all the documents to locate the one sought. The committee is currently accepting electronic versions of both primary and secondary file material, but the digital process has been tailored specifically for the submission of the primary file.

CHAIR NOLAN then introduced Ms. Lynne Mack, Director of the Carolina Card Office, to address issues related to the Carolina Card, especially refunding.

DIRECTOR LYNNE MACK (Carolina Card Office) presented an overview of the Carolina Card, noting that the issuance of new Carolina Cards was completed by December of last year and that faculty still using the old cards are encouraged to come to the Carolina Card Office and get a new one. There are three ways to put money on the cards:

- Use VIP to add money to the card in \$10 multiples via a credit or debit card. There is no fee involved and the money is available in five minutes following transfer.

- Come to the Carolina Card office to add money. It is located in the bottom of the Russell House across from the Post Office.
- Go to an Automatic Deposit Machine to add value to the card (there is one outside the Russell House, one in the Thomas Cooper Library, and one in the BA Library).

The money on one's card represents one's Carolina Cash Account and works the same way as does a declining balance on an ATM or debit card. The card can be used all over campus at establishments set up with card readers: all Carolina Dining locations, the University computer labs, the Thomas Cooper Library, the Apple Store, the Student Health Center, the Russell House University Bookstore, Parking Services, Williams Brice Stadium, and the Baseball Stadium. In the near future, the card will be usable to access and leave the University's parking garages.

Detailed information can be found on the website of the Carolina Card (<http://carolinacard.sc.edu>). The Carolina Card Office invites input from students, faculty and staff regarding potential expansion of services ([carolinacard@sc.edu](mailto:carolinacard@sc.edu)).

Director Mack then invited questions.

PROFESSOR WANDA HENDRICKS (History) – asked about refunding, specifically to facilitate students' purchasing of textbooks that are not available from the Russell House Bookstore. She related the huge problem experienced by her undergraduate history class this semester and asked whether it were possible to post a notice in the Russell House Bookstore describing the refunding process for undergraduates, especially first-semester freshmen.

DIRECTOR MACK described the process. A student gets a manager from the Russell House bookstore to complete a special refund request form. The student brings the form to the Carolina Card Office and the office produces a paper refund form and gives it to the student. The student takes it to the Bursar's Office, which issues the student a check can either deposit in a bank account or cash immediately and purchase textbooks. Information on the refunding process is posted on the website of the Carolina Card Office, although Director Mack cautioned that the information applies only to the Columbia campus. Director Mack noted that the Carolina Card Office and the Russell House Bookstore plan to communicate the process to students during orientation.

CHAIR NOLAN asked whether money on a Carolina Card ever expired, and Director Mack answered that it does not.

#### **4. Reports of Committees**

##### **a. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Rebekah Maxwell, Secretary**

PROFESSOR REBEKAH MAXWELL (Law Library) reported on the results of the recent election to fill a vacancy on the Faculty Grievance Committee. She thanked the Senators for an excellent turnout at the polls and announced Professor Christopher Berg (School of Music) as the winner of the election. She thanked Professor Berg and Professor David Reisman (Biological Sciences) for being willing to run.

Professor Maxwell announced a vacancy on the Faculty Committee on Libraries. This vacancy was created when a sitting member left the University; the term runs until the middle of August of 2011. The Steering Committee nominated Professor Ellen Douglas Schlaefer (School of Music). Coming from a committee, the nomination did not need a second. The Senators voted to accept the nomination. Professor Maxwell called for further nominations and, hearing none, left the floor open.

Professor Maxwell reported on the vacancy on the Faculty Committee on Instructional Development, which remains unfilled. Professor Maxwell invited nominations for that vacancy, as well.

**b. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Jennifer Vendemia, Chair**

PROFESSOR VENDEMIA (Psychology) reported changes in courses and curricula from the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Education, the College of Engineering and Computing, College of Nursing, the School of Music, the Arnold School of Public Health, and the System Affairs and Extended University (please see attachment, pages 12-35).

The Committee recommended that the Faculty Senate accept the changes.

Two professors raised questions regarding the proposed changes on pages 22-24, dealing with the curriculum for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Early Childhood Education. PROFESSOR DANNY JENKINS (Music) asked why the number of Fine Arts courses has been reduced on pages 22 and 24. PROFESSOR WANDA HENDRICKS (History) noted that on page 22, the HIST 111 and HIST 112 courses were written as if they cover the same material when, in fact, they are two distinct courses with different timelines.

PROFESSOR LUCY SPENCE (Education) offered background regarding Professor Jenkins' question, explaining that the changes were proposed to give students more exposure to courses oriented toward math and science teaching methods.

Given that these questions will require further discussion by the committee, all of the proposed changes to the College of Education were tabled pending such discussion.

The rest of the changes were approved as written.



**c. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Harold Friedman, Chair:**

CHAIR NOLAN offered a brief update on behalf of the committee. The tenure and promotion changes are going through the Faculty Advisory Committee. The committee is meeting once more in December to finalize a couple of minor language changes and hopes to have the documents online and available for review by the Senate sometime in January. Most of these changes are designed to clarify procedures or to try to promote consistency in the language of departmental criteria. They are not meant to impose criteria, but to facilitate consistency in language. The potential changes to units' P&T criteria are expected to be linguistic rather than fundamental.

**d. Faculty Budget Committee, Professor Andrew Gowan, Chair**

PROFESSOR ANDREW GOWAN (School of Music) had recruitment commitments and was unable to attend the meeting, so CHAIR NOLAN delivered a brief report on his behalf. He reminded the Senators and faculty to complete the brief online survey on the budget that was recently distributed by the committee. The information will be used by the committee in their work during the coming year.

**e. University Athletics Advisory Committee, Professor Pamela Melton, Chair**

PROFESSOR PAMELA MELTON (Law Library) reported on the UAAC's activities during the fall semester, beginning with an overview of the committee's work. The University Athletics Advisory Committee reviews and monitors admissions decisions and the academic performance of all student athletes.

The committee has met three times during the semester. At the first meeting, Scott Verzyl, Director of Undergraduate Admissions, briefed committee members on the admissions process. The vast majority of USC's student athletes are admitted to the University through the regular admissions process. At the second meeting, Jennifer Stiles, Assistant Athletic Director for Compliance, briefed the committee on the University's process for dealing with major and secondary violations of the NCAA rules governing collegiate athletics, including those governing the academic eligibility of student athletes. Eric Hyman USC's Athletics Director, updated committee members on the progress of the Athletics Department's capital improvements program which includes the soon-to-be-completed Dodie Anderson Academic Enrichment Center.

Over the past five semesters, the University of South Carolina, of all the schools in the Southeastern Conference, has had the largest number of student athletes on the SEC Commissioners' Academic Honors Roll. At the committee's most recent meeting, Raymond Harrison, Director of the Academic and Life Skills Program, gave an overview of the ways in which his department assists and empowers student athletes to become better students and to prepare for success after graduation, on and off the field of competition. In the course of that briefing, the committee discussed ways that athletes and the general student population currently

share University academic support resources and ways that this collaboration could be increased to the benefit of all.

This semester, the committee has also dealt with issues focused on travel for athletic competitions, including notice and attendance issues and academic advising for student athletes. It will meet four more times in the spring and anticipates having one or more coaches come in to talk about how their student athletes are doing in their particular programs. On behalf of the committee, Professor Melton expressed members' regard for the work of the committee and their pride at being involved.

## **5. Reports of Officers**

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES greeted his faculty colleagues across the system and conveyed his wishes for a wonderful Thanksgiving had by all. He noted that the Carolina Family has much to be thankful for. While he took some time over the holiday to reflect on the semester so far and the many, many accomplishments of our faculty and students, Dr. Pastides is now turning his attention to the New Year and the work ahead of us. The University's administration is expecting another difficult budget year and is beginning to lay the foundations for an approach to the state legislature for better funding systemwide.

The President was recently quoted in the newspaper as saying that our current level of funding is no way to run a railroad. He notes that it's no way to run a University, either, yet we continue to do our jobs, educating nearly one of every two South Carolinians who attends a public college or university. We are becoming increasingly popular as an application destination for excellent students from the 49 other states and from many nations around the world. Our research numbers are up again this year, as are our philanthropic numbers, but we have to make the case to the legislature for increased support. President Pastides will be asking the faculty for their assistance as we approach the Carolina Action Network Day in mid-March of 2010.

Recently, the President was speaking with a delegation of government officials in Spartanburg, who told him that he made a very good case, but that they had no money at the present. President Pastides emphasized the importance of making a strong case now for recurring and increased state funding, even if funds are not immediately available. He notes that the reception that he has been getting is one of interest in the University's activities.

The President observed that the University of South Carolina is ever more accessible despite our lower budget. We have more students in the USC system today than we have ever had in our history, with over 41,000 students being served. We kept our tuition increase as low as humanly possible in the face of declining state revenue. Other states are raising tuition and capping enrollment. As part of making our case to the South Carolina legislature, our message will be to transmit the realities: If our government does not want the University of South Carolina to become smaller, more out-of-state focused, less diverse, less accessible, and more expensive, we will need increased state support to be able to travel the alternate path.

President Pastides the addressed the issue of the University’s “branding” and what we should be known for: for high quality, for our general education curriculum, for the way the faculty serve our student communities, for the way we serve our greater communities, for faculty excellence, for keeping tuition reasonable. We need to be cognizant of how the rest of America and the world views the University of South Carolina. The President believes that USC needs to find a message that is reasonably concise and that serves us well, not only in the southeastern United States but in many nations around the world. To develop our message, President Pastides has appointed Dean Charles Bierbauer of the College of Mass Communications and Information Studies as Interim Vice President for Communications. Dr. Bierbauer is looking at how we communicate internally with each other, how we communicate as a system, and how we communicate to the press and to the people what our image, our brand, would be. The Faculty Senate, through committees and through broader discussion in the Senate, will be engaged in this development of our image and our brand. How are we recognized and what do we say about ourselves to the world? President Pastides is excited to be working with the Senators and the faculty on these issues.

The President concluded his report with an update on Advance Carolina. Our University system has a major Carnegie One research university in Columbia, three outstanding 4-year baccalaureate universities that also offer masters degrees, and four outstanding regional campuses that confer associates degrees. All of us together are profoundly more powerful than the simple accumulation of the good works of the eight universities in the system, and if we can capture the collective synergy of the entire system, we can be more effective and efficient overall. President Pastides noted that the committee’s recommendations are not aimed at creating new positions and new bureaucracy. The Advance Carolina committee is looking at ways to capitalize on our systemwide synergy to work more effectively together – how our students can transfer more effectively within the system, how our faculty can digitally communicate more effectively, how we can best make the case that we are South Carolina’s flagship university.

The President invited all faculty and staff to a reception at the President’s House, and to the tree-lighting ceremony that evening. President sent special well-wishes to USC Beaufort, which was under a severe weather warning, and wished his faculty colleagues a safe and happy holiday season and a prosperous New Year.

**VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS** greeted the Senators and faculty and sent special greetings to USC Union and USC Salkahatchie, the latest stops on his visiting tour.

The Provost underscored the earlier comments of Professor Jim Knapp regarding the proposed changes in the tenure and promotion calendar. Provost Amiridis noted two main reasons for the proposed changes: (1) to distribute more evenly the workload of the review of files, primarily for the UCTP, but also for all of the administrative levels involved, and (2) to give the University more flexibility to address possible retention questions in a shorter and more effective timeframe. An added benefit would be the leveling of the playing field by according all candidates the same

timetable, as opposed to the disparate one in operation now, depending on whether the candidate is a January or August hire.

The Provost reported on the call for proposals for faculty development grants in the Arts and Humanities. He has received 85 proposals from faculty in these areas. This number is greatly in excess of the 20-30 proposals expected, but Provost Amiridis urged faculty and units not to be discouraged if their proposal is not selected. He hopes to make this initiative an annual event, so another chance will be available next year. The Provost's Office will appoint a committee to review the proposals and will report on its work when completed.

Provost Amiridis announced the recent accomplishments of two USC students. Joey Montoya is a dual degree candidate in Chemical Engineering and Mathematics with a minor in piano performance. Jeet Guram is a baccalaureate degree candidate in the Honors College with a concentration in Biology, Economics, and Political Science. They both did a fine job representing the University in the Rhodes Scholars competition this fall, making it all the way to the final round in Kansas City. They epitomize what our students can achieve and their success reflects very well on the faculty members who supported encouraged, and challenged them.

Provost Amiridis congratulated all the students who will be graduating this fall, and recognized their successes and accomplishments. He wished the USC family well for the holiday season and the new year, and is looking forward to working with them in the Spring of 2010.

VICE PRESIDENT TED MOORE greeted the Senators and faculty delivered an update on the University's budget status.

During the past 18 months, and assuming an extra 3% cut later this month, the University will have lost about \$67 million in recurring funding from the state budget. For the Columbia campus alone, that will equal \$55 million that has disappeared. These losses will translate approximately into about a 30% reduction in our state appropriations during this time period. The Vice President congratulated the Carolina family for managing well under these conditions.

The expected 3% cut would translate into \$4.9 million for the system – with a little over \$4 million of the loss borne by the Columbia campus. University administration had already built a 10% budget cut into this year's budget. A 3% cut, coupled with the previous cut of a little over 4%, will still keep us within this budget. We have a little more room in the budget and the Finance & Planning staff expects additional cuts in the spring. We don't expect them to exceed the cumulative 10%, at least not extremely, but we must be prepared for the event.

The good news is the stimulus funding. The University received \$29 million onetime funding in stimulus money this year. This is onetime money but is for two years, assuming that legislation is enacted again next year for us to receive it. The stimulus money that we have received has been strategically applied based on guidance from the President, the Provost, and the Vice President for Research. The Focus Carolina initiative identified several strategic systemwide goals, and 18% of

the stimulus money is dedicated to the research and creative achievement goal. A significant part of this goal is a substantial review and revamping of the research computing system. In addition, about 37% of the \$29 million systemwide is devoted to the teaching and learning goal. The stimulus funds are non-recurring, and so are not appropriate for faculty salaries, but are very useful for fixing and improving things such as classrooms. A major part of the 37% will be dedicated to improving classrooms, improving distance education capability. Thirty-nine percent of the stimulus funding is being devoted to a quality of campus life goal. This goal includes such initiatives as fire safety (increasing the number of sprinkler systems in dormitories, improving fire alarm systems) and asbestos abatement in major buildings. About 6% of the stimulus funding is devoted to the goal of improving the University's recognition and visibility.

Vice President Moore concluded his report with a wish on behalf of the Finance and Planning family to all his faculty colleagues for a very safe and happy holiday.

## **6. Report of the Chair**

CHAIR NOLAN observed that Professor Robert Best, Immediate Past Chair of the Faculty Senate, would occasionally comment on issues that were in the news and that affected academia. Chair Nolan intended to follow this example by reporting on two issues that, although not very pleasant, are important and worth the consideration of the Senate.

Chair Nolan remarked that currently we face two threats, one physical and the other intellectual. An example of the first sort of threat is the recent shootings at Fort Hood, which reminds us that everyone in public-access environments is vulnerable to the possibility of an event of this nature. Chair Nolan has attended workshops on emergency preparedness and active shooters, sponsored by USC under the leadership of Law Enforcement and Safety Director Ernie Ellis and T.J. Geary, Training Coordinator and Active Shooter Specialist. Chair Nolan has attended these workshops on two different occasions and was quite impressed with them.

Chair Nolan has been interested in these issues for some time and organized a session at the 2008 meeting of the Southern Sociological Society where participants discussed the possibilities for responding to an active shooter situation. To that session he invited Jack Rumbaugh, a firearms instructor for Suarez International who had done some force-on-force experiments where he had simulated classroom situations and had "attackers" come in with paintball guns. The conclusion of the experiments was that any kind of resistance lowered the number of potential casualties and interrupted the shooters' intention of taking as many victims as possible.

Chair Nolan reported that when he went to active shooter seminars last year, no kind of resistance was advocated. Chair Nolan found this disturbing, especially in light of reports on the Virginia Tech shootings, where the gunman methodically picked off cowering victims who had been so conditioned to non-confrontation that they made passive and easy targets. However, Chair Nolan found this year's active shooter seminar to include a system abbreviated as ADD: Avoid (stay clear of a known incident), Deny (if possible, prevent access to your immediate environment by

violent intruders – lock doors) and, ultimately, Defense (if unable to manage the first two options, resist according to your capabilities, interrupt the intention of the shooter to take as many victims as possible).

The Faculty Seminar on Active Shooter is described on a page of the Center for Teaching Excellence (<http://www.sc.edu/cte/ellis/index.shtml>). A download of the seminar is available on the site, as well as an online viewing option. Chair Nolan notes that the active shooter team will also come to a unit or department to give a presentation on minimizing the threat or responding to a violent incident.

Chair Nolan addressed a second issue, that of the general credibility of academic researchers, as demonstrated through the recent events surrounding what has become known as ClimateGate. The University of East Anglia in the United Kingdom has been the primary entity responsible for reconstructing historical climate data. The University's email was recently hacked or leaked, leading to the discovery of somewhere between 3,000 and 5,000 emails between some of the most prominent scholars in climate research. The emails discuss, among other things, how to deny access to the University's climate data and how to keep skeptical climate research out of peer-reviewed journals and out of the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Chair Nolan noted that true objectivity comes from the community of scientists. A researcher puts forward his or her hypothesis, theory, data, and results and allows it to be subject to the informed criticism of the entire scientific community. If a researcher withholds or "spins" objective information, it undermines the credibility not only of the researcher involved, but of the entire intellectual enterprise. Objectivity in our research and credibility in our work can only be maintained if our data are shared openly, if our data are transparent and believable, if peer review is honest.

Chair Nolan urged the Senators and faculty to remember that sunlight is the greatest disinfectant, and to be as objective as possible in conducting research and as open and honest as possible in offering the results to the scientific community.

PROFESSOR STEPHEN SHEEHI (Languages, Literatures, and Cultures) supported the principle of open and honest scholarly procedure but wanted to emphasize the reality of climate change and to note the moral and ethical imperative of responding responsibly to the environmental issues that climate change presents. Professor Sheehi observed the importance of branding the University of South Carolina as being in the vanguard of sustainability.

CHAIR NOLAN agreed with the moral and ethical imperatives involved in sustainability, but considered sustainability a separate issue. He agreed that climate does change, but suggested that the issue is whether anthropogenic global warming as currently understood is correctly modeled. He underscored his point that when a researcher's ideology and belief trumps the empirical research, the theory suffers. The theory may actually be improved if the researcher is open to

skepticism. Chair Nolan thanked Professor Sheehi for his comments and invited him to discuss the issues further after the meeting.

### **7. Unfinished Business**

SECRETARY MAXWELL returned to ask for additional nominations for the vacancy on the Faculty Committee on Libraries. There were none and the Senate elected Professor Ellen Douglas Schlaefer (School of Music) to the committee.

The Secretary then revisited her standing request for nominations for a vacancy on the Instructional Development Committee.

### **8. New Business**

There was no new business.

### **9. Announcements**

CHAIR NOLAN reminded Senators and faculty of the Faculty Forum on the Carolina Core, to be held on Wednesday, December 9, from 12:30 to 2:00 p.m. in the Russell House Theatre.

Chair Nolan then congratulated Dean Mary Ann Fitzpatrick on her recent election to the Board of Directors of the Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences.

### **10. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Wednesday, February 3, at 3:00pm in the Law School auditorium.