

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

April 27, 2010

1. Call to Order

CHAIR PATRICK NOLAN (Sociology) called the meeting to order, and welcomed Faculty Senators, colleagues, guests, and the Officers of the University.

2. Corrections and Approval of Minutes

CHAIR NOLAN asked for corrections to the minutes of the meeting of March 3, 2010. 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), on behalf of the Steering Committee, presented three nominees for committee vacancies:

Faculty Advisory: Professor James Carper (EDUC)
 Professor Danielle Holly-Walker (Law)

Grievance: Professor Caroline Strobel (BADM)

Professor Maxwell asked for further nominations from the floor. There were none and the Faculty Senate accepted the nominees presented. Professor Maxwell left the floor open for further nominations.

Before resuming committee reports, CHAIR NOLAN congratulated Professor Laura Walls (English) on her award of a Guggenheim Fellowship, which created one of the vacancies on the Faculty Advisory Committee.

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 College of Engineering and Computing, the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management, the School of Music, the Arnold School of Public Health, and System Affairs and Extended University (please see Attachment, pages 13 - 23).

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

c. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Professor Craig Keeney, Chair:

PROFESSOR KEENEY (Libraries) presented first a proposed revision to the policy on Course Grade Forgiveness (please see Attachment 2, page 24). Professor Keeney confirmed that the date of Fall 2007 is correct – which is to say that classes taken before Fall of 2007 are not eligible for course grade forgiveness. The revision was adopted as written.

Professor Keeney presented a second proposal (please see Attachment 2, page 25) to revise the policy on the in-residence requirement. The revision would update the policy to stay in step with SACS accreditation rules. The rationale is that SACS requires that the last 25% of a student's classes be taken on campus, and the University has stated this as a 30-hour requirement. The total number of hours required for graduation is 120, but some of our program hour requirements exceed 120, hence the need to edit the bulletin language. The revision was adopted as written.

d. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Harold Friedman, Chair

CHAIR NOLAN delivered the report on behalf of Professor Friedman (MEDC), and noted that at the General Faculty meeting held immediately prior to this Faculty Senate meeting, the faculty adopted the changes in the Faculty Manual that were proposed by Faculty Advisory regarding language relating to tenure and promotion. The process started approximately three years ago, went through several committees, and went through a forum. Chair Nolan observed that the changes improve the Faculty Manual in both its consistency and its explicitness and adds some sections that filled in noticeable gaps in the process. Chair Nolan congratulated the Committee and thanked everyone who participated in the revisions.

e. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Charles Adams, Chair:

PROFESSOR CHARLES ADAMS (Public Health) addressed the Senators on behalf of the Classroom Space and Scheduling Committee. He noted that USC is facing a number of challenges in the area of academic scheduling and general purpose classroom space management. This is predicated by several factors. Examples include the movement of the Moore School into the Vista - which could lead to possible need for more faculty and student transit time across campus, as well as possible changes in general purpose classroom assignment – as well as the increasing number of students coming to USC. A third factor would be the long-standing deferred maintenance of many of our classrooms and buildings such that repair, cleanliness and available technology are at times of concern to faculty and students. The Provost has convened a representative group of faculty, staff and students to review classroom space and scheduling issues.

The members of this committee include:

- Dean Kinzley – History, who is the Faculty Co-Chair
- Helen Doerpinghaus - Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, who is the Administrative Co-Chair
- Charles Adams - School of Public Health
- Bob Askins - Registrar's Office
- Suzanne Axland – Moore School of Business
- Barbara Blaney – Registrar
- Jim Burns – Honors College
- Tina Crews – Center of Teaching Excellence & Hospitality, Retail, & Sport Management
- Laura Knapp – Arts and Sciences
- John McDermott – Moore School of Business
- Stephen McNeill - Engineering

This committee has been meeting since late fall and is discussing several important issues. It is considering scheduling questions, including the length of time between classes and the length of the class day. It is considering space issues such as the types of classroom needed, for example, large versus small classrooms and smart classrooms and their availability. The committee is also discussing governance and representation issues so that provision is made for faculty and students to participate in dialogue on these issues regularly and consistently with decision makers over time.

The committee hopes to launch a website by late summer that provides some background on scheduling and space concerns, copies of minutes of its meetings, resource documents, and options. The site will also include space for faculty to record comments online. The committee plans to report back to the Faculty Senate in the fall with recommendations about space and scheduling.

PROFESSOR WANDA HENDRICKS (History) presented a concern regarding the level of technology in some of the classrooms in the Humanities Building. Sometimes the overheads don't work. For half a semester, Professor Hendricks did not have any technology in a classroom that was supposed to be a smart classroom. She noted that this issue was not the fault of the personnel who maintain the technology in the building and wondered, in light of the recession and the budget cuts that we are enduring, how this sort of issue would be addressed.

PROFESSOR ADAMS explained that while the charge of the committee was to examine issues relating to classroom space and scheduling, he understands Professor Hendricks' concerns. The committee is still in the process of defining its mission, and has not ruled out technology issues.

f. Faculty Budget Committee, Professor Andy Gowan (Music), Chair:

PROFESSOR GOWAN recalled the survey that the Budget Committee created and administered in the fall. One of the common themes of the survey was the desire of faculty members to receive more information about budget issues at all levels. Professor Gowan was happy to report that he is receiving confirmation from throughout the campus that there is more budgetary information now flowing to the faculty level. Professor Gowan thanked the various administrators who have made this sharing of information possible, and hopes the trend will continue.

Professor Gowan reported on the Blueprint and Budget meetings that he and Chair Nolan have been invited to attend. He notes that he leaves those meetings with some confidence and even some optimism. He has been able to observe that, although the economic situation is challenging, the unit administrators understand their units, and their decisions are made in a strategic way. The Provost, the President and the University budget personnel likewise have a good understanding of the units. While the financial realities are bad, the people who are handling the situation are good, and Professor Gowan sees every reason to believe that the University can emerge from these challenging times in relatively good shape.

Professor Gowan observed that in the distant past, in the days of a centralized budget, the Faculty Budget Committee would meet with the President and provide some input to the budgetary process. With the advent of value-centered management or the decentralized budget model that we currently use, in some respects the committee was moved to the fringe. Our current administrators clearly value faculty input and so the budget committee has moved to regular briefings, with discussions of strategies that are being considered before they are put into place. Professor Gowan and the entire committee appreciate the openness and cooperative spirit of our current University administrators.

In closing, Professor Gowan encouraged faculty to consider committee membership. Committee service is one of the ways that we can guarantee that faculty will continue to have a voice in governance on their campuses, so our interest and participation are quite necessary.

4. Reports of Officers

PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS reiterated the points that President Pastides made in the General Faculty Meeting. The University's administrative team has been meeting with the various colleges and units to discuss their academic blueprints as well as their budgetary situations. All of the blueprints have been submitted and the administrative team expects to be finished with all the reviews and budget meetings in the next couple of weeks. The team hopes to be able to come back to the units between May 15 and May 31 to give them the exact size of the budget cuts that they can expect. The units can then begin implementation of their various budget plans.

Provost Amiridis reported on the first round of the Arts and Humanities and the Social Sciences grants. The Provost's Office has funded 28 of 85 proposals in the Arts and the Humanities, and 11 of 62 in Social Sciences. The Provost is thrilled by the level of response to the call for proposals and congratulated the winners. He thanked all faculty members who submitted proposals and encouraged them to submit again next year. The Provost's Office plans to issue a similar call next year and hopes to have the grants as a recurring event.

The Provost addressed Professor Wanda Hendricks' question about the functionality of technology in the classrooms. He noted that while the current economic climate makes it unlikely that non-technology classrooms can be upgraded into technology classrooms, he will make a commitment to be certain that the technology that we currently have works properly. Provost Amiridis and the Dean of Arts and Sciences will oversee an inspection of the technology equipment in the classrooms in the Humanities Building and the repair or replacement of equipment that doesn't work. The Provost asked faculty for help in identifying non-functioning equipment, in Humanities and in all buildings throughout the campus. He observed that our students are our customers and that, especially given that our present funding model is very tuition-driven, it is our responsibility to see that the classroom equipment is working and available to them.

Provost Amiridis reported on the Dean Search ongoing in the College of Engineering and Computing. He will meet with the search committee this afternoon to winnow a list of 5 semi-finalists down to 3 finalists. The search committee is very optimistic about the outcome of the search.

Six dean reviews have also been conducted during the last year. Review committees for Arts and Sciences, the College of Pharmacy, and System Affairs have submitted their reports to the Provost. The committees for Music, Nursing and the Honors College will finalize reports in the near future and the Provost expects to be able to report to the various colleges on those findings within the next month.

Provost Amiridis presented some updates on the University's initiatives in response to SACS requirements. We are making good progress on the Quality Enhancement Plan. Professor Irma VanScoy (EDUC) is leading the committee that is planning the implementation of the QEP, which will be working through the summer to produce a draft of the plan. The draft will be posted on the Provost's Website and faculty will be able to submit comments.

The General Education Carolina Core Committee has also been making very good progress. Another forum on the Carolina Core took place in March, with more than 100 people attending. The committee now is in the arduous phase of taking the principles defined by the faculty and reducing them to specific course requirements and content. The committee expects to have recommendations for the Faculty Senate sometime in the early fall.

The University is putting together a distance education plan for SACS accreditation, and Professor Paul Solomon (SLIS) is leading this effort.

In conclusion, Provost Amiridis recognized and congratulated the faculty and student recipients of the University's internal awards. Award winners were recognized and presented with their prizes on April 28. The list of winners will soon be posted on the Provost's website, but an article by Media Relations lists faculty honors at <http://www.sc.edu/news/newsarticle.php?nid=931> (majority of winners listed on page four of the article).

VICE PRESIDENT TED greeted the Senators and faculty and responded to a thoughtful message that had come to the President from Professors Beverly Baliko and Joan Culley from the College of Nursing. The professors were responding to news coverage about staff salary increases. The article was focused largely on Clemson but included information about USC and MUSC as well. The professors asked the President whether the statements made were accurate and whether he would give the rationale for the administrative staff and salary increases. Vice President Moore noted that the process of responding won't be complete today, but that he would arrive at a complete answer in time.

Vice President Moore explained that there are three ways that we see salary increases. One is a promotion, another is a PFP (pay for performance) increase, and a third comes about when additional duties are assigned and the individual is given additional salary support. These are the three main methods used to produce salary increases. They are implemented by three different levels of action. The first is written justification, which is required for all increases in administrator and staff salaries.

The Vice President noted that the concept of "administrators and staff" include several categories of positions: senior administrators such as vice presidents, the president, chancellors of the 4-year campuses, vice chancellors, the Provost, deans and so on. Then we have, in addition, unclassified and classified staff. For example, most of our administrative assistants on campus are in the classified category. Again, for all four of these categories, no matter what type, there are those three principle processes by which to see salary increases. All require written justification, and all go through at least two levels of review. In addition, is the factor of calibration. Salaries at USC are continually reviewed in terms of the rest of the market and the market is a very good calibrator. There is also a market for presidents, vice-presidents, chancellors and deans, and we use these markets as well as a host of regional and national statistics. Our frame of reference is always other public doctoral degree granting institutions.

Vice President Moore's overview of the salary process serves as background for a report that his office will be working on with Professors Baliko and Culley to produce a refined report in greater detail to be presented to the Faculty and the Senate at a meeting in the near future.

Vice President Moore then reported the latest budget news involving reports of a \$60 million accounting error made by the state. The explanation for the error is similar to the baseball analogy in which two players each thought the other had the ball and, colliding, dropped it and enabled the runner to make it around all the bases. Our department thought it had the money and another department thought it had the money and neither one did. The money wasn't lost; it was strictly an accounting mistake. University administration was concerned that our budget cut would be even greater in an attempt by the Senate to accommodate the \$60 million, but that seems more unlikely to be the case, and we expect our cut to maintain at 21%.

These cumulative cuts bring us now to approximately a 46% reduction in our state appropriations over the last year and a half. We assume that these cuts are perpetual. To respond to this drop in state funding, we look at three main parameters: the level of tuition, the student population, and reductions in recurring expenditures. We will find an adjustment of these three points that will accommodate the budget cut. We have a computer simulation model that helps us to do this. We also factor in just plain horse sense: Does the proposed solution make good common sense? We also use a healthy dose of compassion to address issues of access and affordability, and a liberal amount of understanding of the difficulties that our families face in South Carolina and elsewhere in affording a college education. The results are not complete yet, but will be wrapping up in about 4 weeks, after which the faculty will be hearing from the Board of Trustees regarding a manageable budget cut. There will be a few more students at Columbia and elsewhere and there will be a modest tuition increase. Our model is a 10 year horizon focusing on the immediate fiscal year.

Vice President Moore acknowledged the tremendous amount of support and help that his office has gotten and continues to get as the University goes through this very, very difficult but important budget planning cycle. He recalled the words of his friend and mentor, the late Dr. John Olsgaard, who said, "The job of university leaders is to assemble the resources that bring faculty and students together so that magic happens." The Vice President notes that we are blessed to have a team of dedicated, talented and energetic staff at the University as well.

Vice President Moore observed that the University is also well served by the Faculty Budget Committee and acknowledged the members of the Committee:

Andy Gowan (Music), Chair
Duncan Alford (Law Library)
Camelia Knapp (Earth and Ocean Sciences/Arts and Sciences)
Patrick Nolan (Sociology), Faculty Senate Chair
Bob Best (Medicine), Past Chair of Faculty Senate
Harold Friedman (Medicine)
Mathieu Deflem (Sociology)
Charley Adams (Public Health)

Beth Bilderback (Libraries)

This committee helps in the budget process as much as it can, and Vice President Moore notes that its members have provided very useful guidance and advice.

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 did not present a formal report, but asked that the Committee Chairs and the Faculty Senate Secretary stand and be recognized for their contributions to faculty governance during the past year. He then asked the Faculty Senators to stand and be recognized, and thanked them for their service to faculty governance at USC.

8. Unfinished Business

PROFESSOR REBEKAH MAXWELL issued a last call for nominations for the committee vacancies before the Senate. There were none and the Senators elected the nominees. Professor Maxwell congratulated and thanked the newly-elected committee members, and echoed Professor Gowan's urging to the Faculty and Senators to consider committee membership.

9. New Business

There was no new business.

10. Announcements

PROFESSOR MARCO VALTORTA (Engineering and Computing) announced, for the benefit of those who did not know, that the Italian Major at the University had been terminated. He observed that, as Senators might guess from his name and his accent, that this issue was an emotional one for him, but assured the Senators that it had been discussed thoroughly and that the program was indeed languishing. The one student left in the program has been taken care of and the minor lives on. Professor Valtorta expressed optimism for the Italian Minor and hopes to see many students in it in the future.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, June 23, in the Law School Auditorium.

11. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed.