

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

October 6, 2010

1. Call to Order

CHAIR PATRICK NOLAN (Sociology) called the meeting to order, and welcomed Senators, faculty and staff colleagues, and University Officers.

2. Corrections and Approval of Minutes

CHAIR NOLAN asked for corrections to the minutes of the meeting of September 1, 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) reported the following vacancies on faculty committees:

Committee on Honorary Degrees has four vacancies, three of which occurred when sitting members left the University. In addition to a new three-year term, the committee has two vacancies for terms running until mid-August, 2012, and one to finish a term ending in mid-August 2011. The Admissions Committee and the Tenure Review Board each has a vacancy for a new three-year term ending in 2013. Professor Maxwell encouraged Senators and faculty to contact her if interested in any of these committee opportunities.

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

PROFESSOR VENDEMIA (Psychology) opened her report by mentioning two course and curricula changes that were discussed but not specifically named at the last Faculty Senate meeting. The changes for the College of Social Work on the previous agenda were on pages 16 to 17 and changes for System Affairs and Extended University were on page 18 of the previous agenda. The changes were accepted.

Professor Vendemia reported new changes in courses and curricula from the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Education, the College of Engineering and Computing, and the School of Music (please see attachment, pages 11-14).

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

4. Reports of Officers

As PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES was returning from a trip to Korea and PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS was leaving for a trip to Europe, VICE PRESIDENT TED MOORE delivered the report of the Officers. He welcomed the Senators and guests and delivered greetings on behalf of the President and the Provost.

Vice President Moore began his report with an update on a discussion began last year in a Faculty Senate meeting by Professors Beverly Baliko and Joan Culley (Nursing). At that time, *The State* newspaper published an article on state employees making over \$50,000 at various universities who were being given raises during a time when state budgets were being cut. Professors Baliko and Culley raised this issue in response to the news reports and Vice President Moore provided summary statistics describing faculty and staff raises over this particular period of time.

Salaries are increased for a number of reasons including:

- Promotions
- Position reclassifications: Someone, for example, who goes from a band 4 to a band 5 has a salary increase that goes along with that.
- Pay for performance or PFP: In many cases these are given to faculty as retention offers, as well.
- Additional duties and responsibilities (ADR): This applies mainly to staff when staff is assigned additional duties. For example, when we have reductions in staff, which we have all had, those who remain typically have to pick up the workload and often that is accompanied by an ADR which gets them a little extra salary for that.
- Special pay increases: Large-scale initiatives such the Nursing faculty initiative that was enacted last year affecting a large number of faculty.

Vice President Moore provided some statistics for employees making \$50,000 or more in the USC system for the year October 2007 through September 2008. He chose this timeframe to match up with *The State* newspapers timeline. In that year there were:

- 95 promotional raises – 65 of whom were for faculty – there were 44 for staff, due to reclassifications (that is going from a band 4 to a band 5)
- 189 special increases – 185 of those were faculty
- 310 PFPs (pay for performance increases) – 108 of those were faculty
- 28 ADRs additional duties and responsibilities) and all but 3 of those were for staff and administrators.

For the next year October 2008 through September 2009 (fall of 2009 was when the story appeared in *The State* newspaper):

- 88 promotions – 74 of those were for faculty

- 21 raises due to reclassifications
- 5 special increases
- 220 PFPs – 137 of whom were faculty
- 33 ADRs all but 4 of those were for staff

For the six months beginning October 2009 through March 2010 (only six months because we don't have the data set complete for the next full year but we will, and Vice President Moore will report that probably at the next meeting). For that six month period:

- 29 promotion raises – 20 of those were for faculty
- 21 were due to reclassifications of staff personnel
- 0 special increases
- 71 PFPs – of those 37 were for faculty
- 18 ADRs and all but 7 of those were for staff

In summary, for 2007-08 there were 666 raises total and 361 of those were for faculty. In 2008-09, there were 367 raises; 218 were faculty. The Vice President noted that the second year in which he presents data was the first year of the so called "Great Recession." Our budget deteriorated rapidly and we went from 666 to 367 individuals who received salary increases. For the most recent six month period there were 139 raises and, while Vice President Moore would hesitate to simply multiply by two, there is a strong indication of where we are headed. The University's administration has cut back substantially on raises for faculty and staff during this period. Vice President Moore notes that the University's budgeting process is completely transparent, and his office will be happy to share any data that a Senator has need of.

Vice President Moore reported on the University's participation in the Higher Education Summit on Tuesday, September 28, and the subsequent moratorium on capital spending. Essentially, every campus in the USC system was represented in person at the Summit, making the point that the University welcomes debate on high tuition rates.

The University was able to get the following statement read into the record at the Summit: "The United States has a history of making opportunity available to all citizens not just those with means." University representatives used as an example the GI Bill of Rights of 1945, which made a college education affordable for the 12 million young Americans who had fought in and won World War II. The same attitude permeated to those in virtually all walks of life. As a public good, higher education was financed largely with public funding. Higher education has been available in the country at reasonable costs to all citizens for many years.

As a consequence of the Great Recession, higher education has been pushed farther away from the same level of public funding. Tuition has increased and we are at risk of a reversal to those days when college was within the reach of only those who had means. South Carolina is hardly alone in this trend which, if it prevails, will have massive social impact. It is at that level that the

University of South Carolina is deeply concerned about high tuition. Regarding state support of higher education in South Carolina, the University and the Commerce Department agreed to exchange data, and to meet to discuss the data and try to get common data sets and a common frame of reference.

The USC system has lost about 46% of its state funding in two years. That translates to \$105 million recurring dollars. State support is now under 11% of our total budget. Next year, it will probably drop down below 10%.

According to a group called the State Higher Education Executive Officers in its Annual Report for 2009, the state appropriation is now about \$5,700 in South Carolina per resident student. For Georgia it is \$8,765 per resident student; in Florida it is \$6,564 per resident student, and in North Carolina it is \$8,844 per resident student. The national average, using the same denominator and as close as we can get in defining the numerator across states, the national average is \$6,928 and in South Carolina is \$5,700.

We offered these figures at the Summit, not in criticism, but on behalf of the University of South Carolina. We acknowledged that our legislature has enormous challenges and must also fund K through 12, health care, and a couple of other major critical service needs in this very small state. It is true that public universities nationwide are increasing tuition levels largely due to declining state support and those increases are out stripping the consumer price index, not in every case but generally.

It costs a certain amount to educate a student. USC has partnered with Clemson to generate a common data set that says about \$16,000 to \$17,000 per year per full-time equivalent is the cost of educating a student. These costs do not differ much when from state to state - \$16,000 to \$17,000. Vice President Moore observed that if you go back a decade and deflate those costs, they are just about constant, almost down to the dollar.

The claim has been made that when lottery funding is taken into account South Carolina public institutions are supported well compared with other states. Yet we still have the highest tuition in the southeast. However, the figures from the State Higher Education Executive Officers' report have adjusted for state financial aid. Additionally, lottery scholarships in particular are awarded to the students and they are portable. A scholarship can be taken to any institution in this state, private or public. No university in the state receives lottery funding directly from the state, as it goes to the student. Based on data from the Commission on Higher Education, students brought \$46.8 million in state scholarships to USC Columbia alone in fiscal 2010. That did not show up in our budget as scholarship; that showed up as tuition. The money went into the accounts of the students who won and earned those scholarships. These dollars then reduce the out-of-pocket cost or debt for each student. If you count the lottery funding in our state revenue then you should also deduct that amount from the tuition bill that the students are

paying. Not to do so basically double counts the lottery funding and University administrators made that argument at the Summit. Vice President Moore feels that the message was clearly received.

USC administrators also explained the process by which the University sets tuition, and the philosophy behind the process. We know that setting tuition is probably the most heavily scrutinized decision we make at the University of South Carolina and that is true for every campus. The trustees of the University South Carolina vote on every tuition and fee change in the entire system. The vote is publically recorded after much debate and discussion.

We apply two over-arching values to the process of setting tuition at every single step. First, we have to preserve our core mission – we teach, we discover, we serve. Second, we must preserve access and affordability for our students.

A key question raised at the Summit (and before and since) is – “Is the high tuition that we see at South Carolina universities due to capital spending?” It is a fair question, and Vice President Moore responded with the following figures: At USC Columbia capital items represent about 6% to 7% of our tuition revenue every year going back a decade. This year’s 6.9% tuition increase generates a projected \$15.8 million or thereabouts in recurring funds from tuition. \$650,000 of that was for capital spending and that is for the student health center, which the students have asked for and have indicated a willingness to pay a fee for. That is included in their tuition bill and, since it is a mandatory fee, it counts as a part of the tuition increase. There are no other capital items in our budget, and the public record supports that fact.

Another example we gave at the Summit regarded the Darla Moore School of Business. The new Moore School is about a \$90 million project which will generate, according to industry metrics, about 1,800 jobs for about a 3-year period. The project is financed largely from lease payments from the United States Department of Justice, not from state tax dollars and not from tuition.

How does the moratorium affect us? The Budget and Control Board passed a capital spending moratorium (with some exceptions) for all 4-year institutions that had raised their tuition this year by 7% or more. The Columbia campus saw a tuition increase of 6.9%, so the moratorium does not affect it.

For all 2-year institutions, the regional campuses, the limit was 6.3%. Our 2-year campuses keep their tuition the same across campuses and they had increased theirs 6.5%. They are a little over the moratorium limit and that puts one of our campuses in difficulty now with the moratorium – USC Lancaster is attempting to build an academic building. They are attempting to build the academic building using tax revenue that the county of Lancaster has just voted for. We are

asking the Budget and Control Board if there is perhaps an exception for this. If not, we will consider rolling back the tuition increase. These issues are ongoing. In fact, the Vice President was leaving this meeting to go to another meeting on this very issue.

USC Beaufort is engaged in a project to up-fit the second floor of its new library building. This is not a renovation; this is simply the first time this floor will actually be completed and this particular project has been approved already through all the necessary phases of state government. However, the funding for it has not yet been approved. The question is: “Does that mean that this project is stranded because the funding has not yet been approved even though the project itself has?” We don’t know the answer yet but hope to know today. Vice President Moore invited questions regarding the Summit, the capital spending moratorium, or the budget.

The Vice President closed his report with some celebratory news. In 1993, the University of South Carolina Columbia had 16 doctoral programs that were ranked nationally by the National Research Council, with 3 in the top 50. Today, the University of South Carolina Columbia has 25 doctoral programs ranked nationally by the NRC, with 14 in the top 50. Several of our programs that are highly ranked nationally rank at the top in the South. Our Electrical Engineering program is ranked first in the South. Geography is second in the South. History Ph.D. is seventh in the South. Biological Sciences are eighth in the South. English ranked # 5 in the South and # 26 nationally. (It may be added that the ranking of # 5 in the South for the overall quality of the program puts USC ahead of UVA, UNC-Chapel Hill, Johns Hopkins, Duke, Emory, and other departments that have traditionally been very strong nationally.) There are other superlatives in the NRC rankings, as well. On behalf of our President and Provost, Vice President Moore congratulated all those who have helped achieve these wonderful distinctions.

6. Report of the Secretary

There was no report.

7. Report of the Chair

CHAIR NOLAN did not present a formal report, but invited Vice Provost Helen Doerpinghaus to speak about the Carolina Core, which will be coming forward at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

VICE PROVOST HELEN DOERPINGHAUS (Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies) delivered an update on recent activity in Undergraduate Studies. The faculty forum on the Carolina Core distribution requirements was held on September 14. The Carolina Core Committee took under advisement the feedback generated at the forum and will be presenting a

recommendation for the adoption of new distribution requirements for the General Education curriculum at USC.

The Committee has the final version of the recommendations posted on the General Education Website (<http://www.sc.edu/generaleducation/committee.shtml>), and the recommendations will be distributed to the Senators for the November meeting. Vice Provost Doerpinghaus encouraged Senators to visit the Website and review the recommendations.

Much of the Carolina Core remains unchanged, including emphasis on communication skills, numerical reasoning and problem solving, social science, scientific literacy, and history, but the Committee has included three new competencies:

1. Speech
2. Information Literacy
3. Values, Ethics and Social Responsibility

The Committee is also introducing overlay courses, where one of the Carolina Core components can be covered in a class with another Carolina Core component. An example of an overlay course might be a philosophy course that has a values, ethics and social responsibility component that meets a reasoning and values requirement. Or a philosophy course might have a speech component, so that a student could take a 3 hour course and meet 2 core requirements. The University does not yet have any designated overlay courses, so the Vice Provost encouraged faculty to think about whether overlay courses would be a good fit for their departments. The Committee would like to have many overlay courses, and feels certain that they will be popular.

Another difference in the new core is that there is an integrated course in the major program. Majors should review their curriculums and identify a course or, if they'd like to develop a course or have a capstone course that threads through the curriculum, some of the Carolina Core requirements at an intermediate level (not at the foundational level but at a higher level). That will be up to the programs to design as they see fit. The Committee does not see it as an additional course in program areas, but as simply an awareness and an attention to some of these foundational skills or knowledge being threaded up through the curriculum.

Vice Provost Doerpinghaus noted that these recommendations will be brought forward for a vote at the next meeting and encouraged questions or comments from the Senators by email or telephone.

Vice Provost Doerpinghaus's second topic regarding undergrad studies was USC Connect. We have been going through SACS reaccreditation and the process has been at the forefront of University activity. The main part of SACS is compliance which, over the years, has produced a silver lining. Some good things have happened in the last 3 or 4 years as a result of SACS and

one is bulletins are online now. Our students can get that information, access it more easily, and faculty, advisors, and students can literally be on the same page.

Another good thing that has come from compliance requirements is that we are talking about a University distance education vision as a part of SACS compliance. SACS recommends that we think together how distance ed fits for us. New Vice Provost Lacy Ford is the University's Director of Distance Education.

Another good thing that came of compliance is that we have an academic programs website. If a department wants to develop a new major, change the name of program, or terminate a program that is not enrolling students, the relevant information is available on a website, as well as schedules of the procedures and processes. Those are all good things that have come from SACS compliance.

SACS requires the University of South Carolina to invest in learning. The University has to come up with one big new idea and spend at least half a million dollars on it. Last year the Provost called for proposals and identified four winning ideas. The Quality Enhancement Plan Committee has been working on these and the unified project is called USC Connect. The Committee will come to the Faculty Senate in January, when more information will be forthcoming, but Vice Provost Doeringhaus described USC Connect as integrating learning within and beyond the classroom. The initiative has students intentionally selecting what they do, reflecting on what they do and integrating from academics to experiential learning. Students are empowered because it deepens learning, it cultivates lifelong learning habits and it enables development of leadership as they learn to integrate learning in communities, in academics, in business, and families throughout their lives.

In order to connect what is going on in classes and beyond, the University is developing some technological platforms that will provide information about what is being offered. Faculty will be able to connect with colleagues with similar interest. They will find out about lectures or performances that are going on around campus that their students would benefit from attending. The initiative will facilitate collegial relationships among the faculty.

The University also will provide development opportunities for faculty through the Center for Teaching Excellence through educational programming about using experiential learning with your students. By providing this integration and providing some technology to students and faculty, the University can facilitate self-advisement by students. Students can find out more about what they are studying, how it might play out in experiences at Carolina and in the community. They can get an idea of what other people in their major have done, for example, with internships or with international learning. They can share information and get stronger skills in terms of self advising, which will assist University personnel who are working with students.

Vice Provost Doerpinghaus invited questions and comments about the Carolina Core or USC Connect.

8. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

9. New Business

PROFESSOR DAN SABIA (Political Science) asked whether the Athletics Advisory Committee could provide information on the situation in the media recently regarding NCAA violations involving USC student athletes.

CHAIR NOLAN reported that the Steering Committee had discussed this question. Professor Pamela Melton (Law Library), who chairs Athletics Advisory, noted that since the issues did not involved academic performance, they were not brought before that Committee.

VICE PRESIDENT TED MOORE will contact the University's general counsel to find out when the administration is able to discuss those issues, and will make sure that the information gets to the faculty at that time.

PROFESSOR DAN SABIA (Political Science) and PROFESSOR JOSHUA COOPER (Mathematics) brought to the floor issues that their departments have had with the University Bookstore. Professor Sabia noted that his faculty had asked him to complain on their behalf at this meeting of the Faculty Senate. Last year, Professor Sabia met for over an hour with representatives from the University Bookstore, but problems persist.

Professor Cooper noted the Mathematics Undergraduate Advisory Committee's "complete dissatisfaction with the Russell House Bookstore's practices," including its customer service, ethics, professional communications, ordering, textbook availability, refunding (or lack thereof), percentage of inventory devoted to items other than textbooks, and business practices in general.

Professor Cooper then asked for a show of hands regarding how many of those present had experienced "serious issues" with the Russell House Bookstore. Many faculty raised their hands.

CHAIR NOLAN volunteered to arrange a meeting between interested faculty and the Bookstore management.

VICE PRESENT MOORE asked that faculty send him their comments (wtmoores@sc.edu) on the University Bookstore – good, bad, or indifferent. He pledged to investigate and to make sure that the problems are solved.

10. Announcements

CHAIR NOLAN delivered sorrowful news regarding the recent loss of a longtime member of the Carolina Family. Professor Peter Neil Barry of the Lancaster Campus died on September 3, 2010. He was a long-serving member of the USC faculty and a representative to the Faculty Senate. The assembly observed a moment of silence in honor of Professor Barry and in appreciation of his contributions to the University.

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

11. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed.