

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

February 3, 2010

1. Call to Order

CHAIR PATRICK NOLAN (Sociology) called the meeting to order.

2. Corrections and Approval of Minutes

CHAIR NOLAN asked for corrections to the minutes of the meeting of December 2, 2009. There were no corrections and the minutes were approved as written.

3. Reports of Committees

a. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Rebekah Maxwell, Secretary

PROFESSOR MAXWELL (Law Library) reported briefly on the work of the Steering Committee in assembling the slate of committee volunteers for the coming academic year. The slate will be ready for presentation at the March meeting. Professor Maxwell invited any Senators and faculty who are interested in committee service but who have not yet volunteered to do so.

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 Moore School of Business, the Department of Education, and the College Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management (please see attachment, pages 18-31).

The Committee recommended that the Faculty Senate accept the changes. The changes were approved as written.

c. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Harold Friedman, Chair

PROFESSOR CHRIS ROBINSON (Art) presented the report on behalf of Professor Friedman. He noted that the Faculty Advisory Committee has been working for almost two years on revisions to the Faculty Manual regarding language relating to promotion and tenure. The changes will be discussed in an open forum on Thursday, February 25th, from 4:00 – 5:30 p.m. in the Law School auditorium. Professor Friedman has summarized the revisions on the Faculty Senate website at http://www.sc.edu/faculty/manualchange_pro.shtml.

CHAIR NOLAN noted that, while the normal procedures relating to document revisions are to indicate additions with underlines and removals with strikeouts, the revisions to the Faculty Manual involve moving material from one part of the document to another, and adding and removing parts as well. Professor Friedman urges Senators and faculty to read the entire document as well as his summary in order to be informed of the proposed changes.

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

PROFESSOR ANDY GOWAN (Music) reported on the survey administered by the committee in the fall semester. Professor Gowan thanked Susanne Hicklin of Institutional Assessment and Compliance for her help with formatting the survey information and preparing it for display. The full reports from the survey will go to the President, Provost, and Vice President for Finance and Planning. The Faculty Budget Committee plans to display the University summary report, as well as reports sorted by college and school, on the Faculty Senate website. The committee will email to the faculty the link to the site so that faculty members can view these reports.

Professor Gowan provided some highlights from the survey, which garnered 439 respondents.

More than half the respondents did not know that the Faculty Budget Committee existed. Professor Gowan noted that this is not surprising in light of the fact that the current budget model, in effect for approximately six years, did make the Faculty Budget Committee less visible. Professor Gowan observed that our present administration is making an effort to include faculty input into the budget model again and that the faculty and the committee appreciate this inclusion. Slightly more than 50% of respondents don't really know much about the current budget model but would like to know more. About 80% would like more financial information than they get. Regarding budgetary priorities, respondents favor libraries, graduate schools, and university technical services.

Several respondents asked about faculty and staff salaries, and Professor Gowan notes that these items were established as priorities in 2006 by a Faculty Welfare survey conducted at that time. The Faculty Welfare Committee is currently engaged in a significant study of faculty and staff salaries, so that issue will be properly addressed.

In terms of satisfaction with budget decisions made at various levels, about 76% of respondents were at least neutral or positive toward the decisions made by the President, Provost, and Chief Financial Officer. About 63% of respondents were at least neutral or positive about decisions made by their deans, and about 77% were positive or neutral with decisions made at the unit level (department or program chairs). Respondents also expressed a very high rate of interest in financial reporting, so the committee hopes that all levels of administration hear that plea.

On February 19th there will be a meeting of the Focus Carolina Operating Resource Committee, which is essentially the University Finance Committee that is mentioned in the Faculty Manual.

This committee is made up of the Chair of the Faculty Budget Committee, the Past Chair of the Faculty Budget Committee, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, two deans, the Vice President for Finance, the University Budget Director, and two or three other representatives from the budget office. The major agenda item will be a discussion of the current budget model and its strengths and weaknesses.

5. Reports of Officers

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES greeted the Senators throughout the University system and began with a report on his recent visit to the House Ways and Means Committee. The President notes that this is not the time to be seeking new money, as the revenue situation for the state continues to be bleak. The outlook is murky into the next fiscal year as well, so President Pastides focused on the medium-term future instead, asking for a compact between the people of South Carolina and the University of South Carolina. The compact would work like this: the Legislature would provide the University with hope and a promise that when the economy rebounds the University can look forward to a reasonable discussion about funding at an appropriate level. The University, in the meantime, would continue to remain a high quality, accessible, and relatively affordable university for our families – the families in South Carolina and beyond.

The President is talking about a compact because it is not possible to talk about new funding for next year. The Legislature is reluctant to offer assurances when the state's financial future is so uncertain. In fact, it is likely there may be two further budget cuts this year and South Carolina's Universities are holding onto the hope that the cut will be across the board for all agencies and that the universities don't get a larger cut relative to other state agencies. President Pastides explained that this phenomenon happens because the Legislature sees a bit of growth in the universities' budgets in the form of grants and philanthropic/foundation giving, where other state agencies have no budgetary growth at all. This leads to the mistaken impression that universities can take care of themselves.

The President observed that this is not a dialog that had a conclusion; it is a dialog that we and the Legislature are still in, and one in which the Carolina Family can participate. March 24th is Carolina Day at the Statehouse and is an opportunity to do outreach in support of the University, not in a confrontational or protesting way, but an opportunity to talk as students, as alumni, as faculty, about the reach and the service that the University provides to the State of South Carolina.

President Pastides reported some good news: student applications continue to be up and the University of South Carolina continues to be a preferred destination. Applications are up in-state as well as out-of-state, and are up at most of our campuses. The President credits this rise to good buzz about the University generated by current students who go home on their holiday

breaks and tell their friends and neighbors that the University of South Carolina is a fine place to be a student. The President notes that the applications are up at the undergraduate level as well as in the professional schools.

President Pastides closed his remarks with a report on a wonderful speaker who had recently visited USC. Jim Leach, Director for the National Endowment for the Humanities, brought his Civil Discourse Tour to Columbia because he'd heard of the University's initiative. Mr. Leach was a member of the Iowa Congress for 30 years and credits his longevity in the job to his ability to listen and to compromise. Mr. Leach feels that partisanship in politics and in other aspects of life has led to a breakdown in compromise and in civil discourse. President Pastides remarked that, although the USC initiative in support of civil discourse will not alone change the face of our society, we can create a more educated and civil citizenry, starting with our students. The President welcomed any advice or recommendations from the faculty and Senators in ways to promote and implement elements of civil discourse into the routine life of the University.

PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS greeted the Senators, then reported on the call for proposals for the University's Quality Enhancement Plan. The Quality Enhancement Plan is a requirement of SACS, our accreditation agency, but is also an opportunity to improve the institution on a system-wide basis. The Provost's office issued a call for proposals, and Provost Amiridis expected something in the neighborhood of 10 proposals, based on the size and type of our university. However, the University's faculty and staff submitted 22 proposals, and the Provost thanked them for their outpouring of support and ideas. He also thanked the selection committee, chaired by Professor Bob Best (Medicine) which reviewed the proposals and selected the winners, not an easy task. Provost Amiridis pointed out that, although he would present the four winning proposals today, the final institutional QEP would be a merger of these ideas.

The Provost introduced the QEP winners in the order in which the proposals were received, and presented cash awards to the winners.

FOSTERING GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT. PROFESSOR DOYLE STEVICK (Education) accepted for the group. Professor Stevick explained that, as South Carolina history is profoundly international and our future is profoundly international, students need to have an understanding of the world. To be engaged in the world requires transcending the education that students come in with because the education that our students arrive with is relentlessly focused at the national level. We do not educate people to leave South Carolina, but to become travelers and to be able to engage in the world, while functioning effectively in their everyday worlds here.

THE TENTH DIMENSION: AN INTEGRATIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT.

PROFESSOR DAVID MILLER (English) served as spokesperson for the group. The Tenth Dimension is a proposal to integrate the campus as a learning environment. It involves a database that will grow over time as we build it together. It involves a couple of different user

interfaces and applications to hand-held portable devices. The Tenth Dimension will enable students to “put the campus in your pocket.”

USING STUDENT AND COURSE PROFILES TO IMPROVE STUDENT SUCCESS.

PROFESSOR JOHN GERDES (Hotel, Retail, and Sport Management) explained that the proposal grew from the frustration he experienced in trying to advise his students while not knowing the details of the different courses. His proposal seeks to profile the different courses based on student input. Professor Gerdes went to a number of courses outside his department and profiled them. His team developed a way of looking at the course profiles and then, based on a student’s grades in those courses, create a profile of the student that enables him to predict which type of courses a student will do well in.

KNOWLEDGE FOR SOCIAL CHANGE: A FACULTY, STUDENT, COMMUNITY COLLABORATIVE. PROFESSOR GREG FORTER (English) described his proposal as a type of service learning initiative which also tries to expand what we mean by service learning. Dr. Forter proposes organizing our service learning around the four themes of racial equality, gender empowerment, sustainability, and global citizenship. Additionally, the proposal seeks to increase the number of service learning courses and link the service learning enterprise to a national speaker series. A separate aim of the proposal is to initiate interactive fora with the community in which those engaged in service learning would figure out the needs and wants of the communities in which they are trying to intervene.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS noted that some of the faculty members associated with the winning proposals had expressed a wish to direct their winnings back to their departments and programs, and he thanked them for their support.

Full-text PDF files for all the winning QEP proposals are available on the Provost’s website at <http://www.sc.edu/provost/qep/>.

Provost Amiridis reported on the recent call for proposals from faculty in the Arts and Humanities. His office has received 88 proposals in response. To review the proposals, the Provost’s Office has created a committee comprised of four panels of senior faculty in these areas, and it has already begun its work. The Provost thanked Steve Kresovich, Vice President for Research and Graduate Education, for contributions to this initiative that raised the funding level by 50%, for a total of \$300,000.00. Even with the increased funding, Provost Amiridis expects to be able to support only 20 or 25 of the 88 proposals at the level requested. He encouraged faculty whose proposals are not selected this year to resubmit next year when the call is issued again.

The Provost expressed appreciation to all faculty in Arts and Humanities who submitted ideas. When the proposals review is over, Vice President Kresovich will be in contact with all faculty

who submitted proposals, whether funded or not, to try to direct them to national outlets that may be able to provide additional funding.

A similar call for proposals went out to the Social Sciences, and the deadline is drawing near. The Provost expects to be able to announce the recipients in March for Arts and Humanities and in April for the Social Sciences.

Provost Amiridis echoed Professor Chris Robinson's announcement of the forum to discuss changes in the Faculty Manual, and encouraged faculty and Senators to attend and contribute to the dialog.

VICE PRESIDENT TED MOORE greeted the Senators and followed up on President Pastides's evaluation that the state's financial fortunes are not showing robust signs of recovery. Regarding the sales figures for the state, the November and December figures were lower than they were in 2008 or 2007. This is troubling because of the state's heavy reliance on sales tax revenue.

Vice President Moore noted that we are anticipating a budget cut going into the next fiscal year, and this cut could be in the double-digits. Additionally, there is a possibility that we will get a smaller mid-year cut before the end of fiscal year 2010. This information is based on reports that the Finance and Planning Office is receiving from various state government bodies. The Vice President sought to offer perspective on these possibilities and to talk about the planning that is going forward now with the administration, the deans, and the chancellors at the University's other four-year campuses.

Vice President Moore described the fiscal environment that we are facing. According to the state's Board of Economic Advisors, as well as the State Budget Office, the budget cap for fiscal 2011 is presently estimated at \$575 million. That figure is not firm. It has a number of factors that will influence it, such as the inclusion of a \$58 million item inside the budget for improved health care benefits for state employees. In addition, between now and the end of the fiscal year, there will be a revision in the revenue forecast. However, barring a miraculous recovery, there will be a substantial gap, which will translate into a budget cut for all state agencies.

The state's annual budget is presently about \$4.5 billion per year and that is down about \$1.8 billion since the economic catastrophe began about 18 months ago. If a \$575 million budget gap remains constant, comparing it to a \$4.5 billion deficit, the anticipated budget cut would be around 13% across the board. Vice President Moore echoed President Pastides's suggestion that an across-the-board cut would be better for the University because, historically, universities often face higher cuts than other state agencies. Vice President Moore emphasized that we are not certain that we'll be facing a 13% cut; he was simply presenting some honest perspective.

The Vice President noted that we've been here before in dealing with a budget crisis, and thanked the deans, chancellors, the President, and everyone with budgetary authority in

managing the crisis that we've already been through. The question remains: What do to about it? Vice President Moore outlined several types of things that we can do to deal with a budget cut:

- Enhance revenue to the extent that we can and, certainly we are seeing substantial improvements in philanthropy and research support.
- Increase tuition some.
- Increase the number of students. There is capacity in the system, some at Columbia but more elsewhere in the system.
- Reduce our operating expenses, which is what we've been doing in response to the previous cuts.
- Buy time using one-time money.

Vice President Moore notes that what the President's job is and what a Dean's job is essentially is to find the single point that represents a combination of all those possibilities that leaves us with the best university we can be subject to the new financial constraints we face.

Several of our system campuses, due to very good management, have some carryforwards and some operating fund balances that may help us in bridging for a year or two. We must be careful and disciplined in using any type of one-time source to bridge and we know that one-time sources do not solve underlying problems – they just buy us time so that we can solve the underlying problems.

We realize that carryforward and fund balances are not all in cash. In many cases, they are receivables, and in other cases the funds are already committed contractually or otherwise for other purposes. Most carryforward is generally not "surplus." Moreover, the credit agencies, such as Moody's, Standard & Poor's, and Fitch, are looking increasingly at how much liquidity higher education institutions have. Moody's has added 4 more ratios in determining our credit rating. Consequently, we must be very careful in using carryforward, even if it is for temporary bridging purposes. If we get below a certain level, it could affect our credit rating.

As most Senators know, the Columbia campus has a modest amount of funding sequestered for an additional cut this mid-year. We don't know whether it will be enough, and are watching that carefully, but hope to avoid asking the units mid-year to cut their budgets again before the end of the fiscal year.

The Finance and Planning Office is working with our campuses throughout the system to determine how much they can withstand in immediate reductions in recurring funds. We are monitoring student population and tuition revenue very closely throughout the system. Most of

the current stimulus funds have not been spent yet but they have been committed. With a little good luck next year, we will have the federal stimulus funding again and that is about \$29 million for the system and \$20 million for Columbia only. Of course, some of that funding could be used to help us bridge to buy time before we have to recalibrate our budgets.

Vice President Moore reported on talk we have heard of a state bond bill coming up in fiscal year 2011. The bond bill is still a possibility, but with the expected budget gap and with the fact that the state just undertook \$23 million in recurring funds to service debt for Boeing, it isn't likely. It would take about \$65 million a year more to undertake debt service on a billion dollar bond bill, so the University is not optimistic. However, we will always continue trying, and will make a bond bill our main priority with the state.

We know that if we increase the student population there are capacity restraints that are very real. We know that there are numerous implications of increasing the student population for example the in-state out-of-state mix is important. Academic quality – SATs – extremely important and won't be comprised. Diversity is important. We have to watch all those variables because each one of those is in turn affected by the amount of students that we bring into the University every year.

As far as tuition increases are concerned, we have the moral obligation to operate the University as efficiently as we can and to make college education accessible and affordable. That has been a key part of the President's platform ever since he took office. We are not considering tuition increases as the sole mechanism to solve our budget problems. That is simply unthinkable but we may ask the students to help. So we may ask for an additional increase in tuition but it can only be so much. The President and his staff are working very hard to try to come up with an optimal mix of the kinds of things that we have to do over the next couple of years to deal with this particular crisis. The sun will shine again but it does not look like it is going to be in fiscal 2011.

Vice President Moore noted that the University has been through a lot, and that it has taken a lot of cooperation by the faculty, staff, students, and alumni. The Vice President thanked everyone for their patience and understanding.

6. Report of the Secretary

There was no report of the secretary beyond that given in the Steering Committee report.

7. Report of the Chair

CHAIR NOLAN had no formal report but announced that a doctoral student at our University is doing a study and that, within the next day or two, serving Faculty Senators will receive by email a link to a survey. The survey will take only a few minutes to complete, and Bob Best has

worked on the vetting of it. Chair Nolan encouraged the Senators to fill out the survey and help the student.

8. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

9. New Business

There was no new business.

10. Announcements

CHAIR NOLAN repeated the announcement on the forum to discuss the Faculty Manual revisions, to be held in the Law School auditorium from 4:00 – 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 25, 2010. He reminded the faculty and Senators that this document is our working contract with the University, so that everyone who is subject to it should understand it and have input to how it is written.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on March 3, 2010, at 3:00 p.m. in the Law School auditorium.

11. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed.