

## **FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**December 1, 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 November 3, 2010. There were no corrections and the minutes were approved as written.

### **3. Invited Guests**

PROFESSOR JIM AUGUSTINE (Medicine and University Ombudsman) delivered an overview of the Annual Report of the University Ombudsman (please see attachment, page 18). The Office of the University Ombudsman was created in 2006 by then-Provost Mark Becker. The Office provides an opportunity for faculty to share concerns and conflicts with a confidential, neutral, informal, and independent resource person. The Ombuds Office operates under the standards of practice and the code of ethics of the International Ombudsman Association, which protects the activities of the office and the confidentiality of the process. In his Ombudsman role, Professor Augustine serves the faculty of the entire University system. He invited faculty to visit the Ombudsman's website at <http://www.sc.edu/ombuds/>. The Office's activities for the year are included in the annual report under Section II. Professor Augustine highlighted some of the information contained in Section III regarding Visitors and Topics of Concern.

During the past year, Professor Augustine spoke with some 48 faculty members. In the four years that he has served as University Ombudsman, he has spoken with a total of approximately 212 faculty members. He has about 50 visits to the office per year. Professor Augustine has surveyed other Carnegie I institutions and that seems to be a normal amount of activity for an Ombudsman Office.

Professor Augustine noted that he does not keep document records, journals, or notes relating to the identities of visitors or substantive discussions that he has with visitors. He assured the Senators and faculty that the Ombuds Office is a safe and confidential place to come and encouraged them to visit if the Office can be of assistance.

The Ombuds Association has a well-documented series of categories for collecting statistics on the concerns of visitors to the office, and the annual report is structured around those reporting categories (please see attachment, pages 19-20). Professor Augustine noted the majority of his visitors have come because of concerns about evaluative relationships between themselves and people in positions of authority – senior faculty members, program heads, deans, chairs, and other University officials. The second largest group of his visitors come with issues related to career progression and development, including promotion and tenure reappointment, resignation, and other aspects of career progression.

Professor Augustine shared two concerns from the Final Comments section of the annual report. He notes that from the very beginning of his service as the Ombudsman, faculty have come to him with concerns about standards of conduct for members of the faculty in the workplace and in the tenure and promotion process. These concerns led last year to a group working diligently to put into the Faculty Manual the faculty commitment to the Carolinian Creed. Professor Augustine applauds this effort but feels that we still need to work creatively to promote civility and to strengthen faculty commitment to the Carolinian Creed, including holding one another accountable to it. The Ombuds Office has heard from faculty with concerns regarding bullying and abusive, threatening, or corrosive behavior. Professor Augustine notes that unless and until we work together on these types of matters, these behaviors will be hard to stamp out.

The second concern is that there are many people who are unwilling to come forward after experiencing unwelcome physical or sexual activity. Professor Augustine strongly encourages that we exert our rights and protect ourselves and others from this type of harassment, and encourage victims to report it.

Professor Augustine recognized that his activities as Ombudsman have benefited greatly from the support and encouragement that he has received from the Provost and, especially, from Dr. Christine Curtis. Professor Augustine noted that many of his visitors just want information, and the Provost's Office is always very helpful in providing him with accurate information regarding the way we should be going about things. He observed that this assistance is always offered in a way that does not violate the principles of independence, neutrality, informality, or confidentiality.

Professor Augustine encouraged faculty and Senators to take one of the cards that contain his contact information and a bit of information about the Office.

CHRISTINA GALARDI (Student Director of MLK Day of Service) provided an overview of the Day of Service, one of the largest annual campus-wide community service programs at USC. In 2010, more than 400 Gamecocks volunteered on this nationally-recognized day honoring the life

and legacy of Dr. King. The Day of Service is open to students of all ages, majors, and backgrounds, but it is also open to the faculty of the University.

The day's activities are scheduled from 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. The program will start with a ceremony in the morning commissioning the day of service. Service work will follow at local non-profit organizations such as Harvest Hope Food Bank, Homework for Columbia and the Carolina Children's Home, with transportation and lunch provided for all volunteers. A registration for the MLK Day of Service is located online at the Office of Community Service Programs website ([www.sa.sc.edu/communityservice/MLK.htm](http://www.sa.sc.edu/communityservice/MLK.htm)). The academic departments of faculty participants will be honored at the morning ceremony commissioning the day of service.

On behalf of the Office of Community Service Programs and the Carolina Service Council, Ms. Galardi encouraged faculty members to get involved in the 14<sup>th</sup> Annual Martin Luther King, Jr., Day of Service on January 17, 2011.

### **3. Reports of Committees**

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

PROFESSOR MAXWELL (Law) presented two nominees for faculty committee vacancies:

Professor Jerry Hackett (Philosophy) for a new term on the Committee on Honorary Degrees  
Professor Brant Hellwig (Law) for a new term on the Tenure Review Board

Professor Maxwell asked for further nominations from the floor. There were none and the nominees were elected.

Professor Maxwell reported on remaining vacancies on Faculty Senate committees:

Committee on Admissions: one new term (2013); one partial term (2011)

Committee on Honorary Degrees: 2 partial terms (2012)

She encouraged faculty and Senators to get involved with committee work and asked them to fill out and return the new volunteer forms that have been distributed to staff Faculty Senate committees in the coming year.

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

PROFESSOR VENDEMIA (Psychology) reported new changes in courses and curricula from the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Engineering and Computing, the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management, the College of Mass Communications and Information Studies, and the College of Nursing (please see attachment, pages 22-24).

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

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

PROFESSOR KEENEY (University Libraries) introduced two proposed changes to the Accelerated Bachelor's/Master's Program (please see attachment, page 25). The changes will:

1. allow undergraduate students to apply up to 12, as opposed to 9, graduate credits toward both undergraduate and graduate degree requirements
2. change the name of the program to the Accelerated Bachelor's/Graduate Degree Plan

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

PROFESSOR JOHN MCDERMOTT (Economics) moved to move up the Unfinished Business portion of the meeting to allow discussion of the Carolina Core Distribution Requirements. The motion was seconded and, with unanimous consent, the Senate took up the matter of the Carolina Core Distribution Requirements.

PROFESSOR DAVID MILLER (Economics), one of the Co-Chairs of the Carolina Core Committee, began his report with a short history of the activities of the Committee. The Carolina Core Committee was formed in the Spring of 2008 to build on the work of a very large faculty task force. One of the Committee's first activities was to look at the work that had been done at peer institutions with models of curriculum reform like the one that we envisioned. The Committee studied discussion of models that succeeded and of those that failed. A key lesson that committee members learned was that an institution cannot do a complicated curriculum revision in one fell swoop. The revision must be completed in stages, and it generally takes an institution several years to complete a set of complicated reforms. The Carolina Core Committee has come forward with one piece at a time: first the rationale, then a set of core elements and association learning outcomes. Next the Committee produced appendices to the plan that elaborate on the learning outcomes and give guidance as to how the outcomes might be put into practice. The practical question involved at this stage was, "How do we incorporate these learning outcomes into the number of hours that we can have in the University's core curriculum?" SACS requires that there be at least 30 hours. The core curriculum is a system-wide plan and, while every college and every school adds its own general education requirements, the Committee was tasked with creating the best possible version of a common core.

The Committee brings before the body today the current phase, the distribution requirements. In order to realize the objectives of our core learning outcomes within the number of hours that we can reasonably maintain as a universal core, the Committee proposes a strategy of creating

overlay courses (please see attachment, pages 26-27). Overlay courses meet one of the foundational learning outcomes, as well as the learning outcomes for one of the new competencies: Speech, Information Literacy, or Values, Ethics and Social Responsibility.

Professor Miller recognized that faculty members have questions about the overlay courses such as, “Who is going to approve these new courses,” and “How do we know that they are going to do what they’re designed to do?” He agreed that these are critical questions. The Committee will be working to get the answers to those questions, and will be back in the spring to present to the faculty a detailed implementation plan. Much of the groundwork for the plan has been done, but it is not yet ready to be presented in full detail. A feature of the plan that Professor Miller was able to share was more oversight of the process for approving new courses, and that this oversight will have been done before the courses come to the Faculty Senate for final approval. Faculty will be introduced to the plan in the spring and will have the opportunity to comment.

Professor Miller mentioned the recent feature story on our University’s curriculum revision that was done by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (available at [http://www.aacu.org/aacu\\_news/aacunews10/november10/feature.cfm](http://www.aacu.org/aacu_news/aacunews10/november10/feature.cfm)), and also noted that, according to its offsite review report, SACS is reacting favorably to our revision of the core curriculum. Professor Miller asked the Senate to approve the Carolina Core Distribution Requirements Proposal, and invited questions from the floor.

PROFESSOR DONNA CHEN (Chemistry and Biochemistry) stated that the current general education requirements appeared to her to be more detailed and specific and the new requirements to be much broader and much more open to interpretation.

PROFESSOR MILLER suggested that the current educational requirements were specific as far as providing a menu of courses, but that the new requirements were geared toward stating learning outcomes. He encouraged Professor Chen and other faculty with similar concerns to consult the Appendix: Contextual Information on the Carolina Core Learning Outcomes (available at <http://www.sc.edu/generaleducation/resources.shtml>) for a deeper level of detail that would address their concerns. He also noted that it may be necessary for the Committee to review the learning outcomes in two or three years, evaluate how they work in practice, and make necessary adjustments. Although it has been 20 years since the last major general education curriculum revision, the Committee going forward will monitor the process in an on-going and open-ended manner.

PROFESSOR GREG WILSCACHER (University Libraries) asked for clarification regarding credit hours for Carolina Core courses as noted in the document on page 21, Attachment 4. He notes that Information Literacy component could be met with his department’s LIBR 100, which is a one-credit information literacy class. He wondered if the credit hours noted read as “0 or 3” or “0 to 3.”

PROFESSOR MILLER confirmed that the credit hours should be interpreted as “0 to 3,” and noted that Information Literacy would not necessarily have to be met with an overlay course. It could be met with a free-standing course, as well, but an overlay option will provide scheduling flexibility for students.

PROFESSOR WILSBACHER inquired whether the Committee had considered certifying faculty as eligible to teach overlay courses, particularly in fields that are fast-paced and dynamic.

PROFESSOR MILLER described the approach of the Committee to this question. Specific subcommittees will be anchored by content specialists in the various disciplines. These specialists will be considering three variables:

1. The Appendix that details the Committee’s understanding of the learning outcomes.
2. The course syllabus, to evaluate whether the learning outcome is appropriately and plausibly incorporated into the syllabus.
3. Qualifications of the faculty member to teach the course.

PROFESSOR MILLER also noted that faculty input will be invited in the spring, when the Committee returns with more details on the implementation of the core.

CHAIR NOLAN invited further comments and questions from the floor. There were none, and the Senate voted to adopt the proposal regarding the Carolina Core distribution.

#### **4. Reports of Officers**

PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS opened his report with an overview of Dancing with the Deans, which he had attended prior to coming to the Senate meeting. He noted that it was extremely entertaining and advised faculty members to attend if the program was presented again in the future.

The Provost offered the regrets of PRESIDENT PASTIDES and VICE PRESIDENT TED MOORE, who were attending a press conference with the Speaker of the House and were unable to attend. Both the President and the Vice President sent their regards and their best wishes for the upcoming holiday season.

Provost Amiridis reported briefly on the SACS offsite report. He noted that, although we are satisfied with what we have learned from the offsite report, we still have work to do in generating our response to the report. We will also be preparing for the onsite visit from SACS.

The Provost then reported on the response to the different grants announced recently by the Provost’s Office. The deadlines have closed and the response has been tremendous. The Provost’s Office has received 128 proposals in the different categories: creative performances

and art, humanities, social sciences, and clinical grants. A small number of proposals have come from the regional campuses, and the Provost is glad that the regional campuses are participating. Provost Amiridis expressed his gratitude to the Senators and faculty members who have agreed to serve on the teams that will be reviewing the proposals. He expects to be able to announce the winners in the spring. The Provost notes that he is already hearing feedback from the first set of awards that were made last year, and of the positive impact that some of these awards has had.

Provost Amiridis is also hearing generally positive feedback regarding the recent faculty replenishment initiatives. He encouraged Senators and faculty members to work with their deans and their department chairs to put together proposals for faculty replenishment.

The Provost observed that last year, back in December of 2009, we were suspecting but not quite knowing the magnitude of the financial cuts that we'd be facing in the coming year. He recognized the sacrifices that we have made together and the difficulties we have faced in our day-to-day operations and noted that our University has done well in spite of the draconian budget cuts we've received. Provost Amiridis highlighted three examples of the University's successes during the past year.

The first is our continuous success in the area of scholarship and research. Under very difficult financial conditions, our faculty set a record in terms of research awards and research expenditures. The Provost noted that this is not the only way to measure scholarly productivity in a comprehensive university like this one, but it is one of the very good measures, as are publications, books, and creative performances.

A second very important event was this fall's freshman class. It is a very strong class and much larger class than usual. With a lot of work from our faculty, we accommodated the numbers without any significant problems.

A third and, for the Provost, most important, was the NRC rankings. Our success in the rankings is a confirmation of what we have been saying for a number of years now. Since 1995, we have had a five-fold increase in the number of our doctoral programs that are ranked in the top 50 nationally: from 3 in 1995 to 17 programs today. That speaks volumes for the work of our faculty and of our doctoral students, and the Provost is very proud of this.

Provost Amiridis closed his report by thanking all of the Carolina Family for their efforts on behalf of the University. He is looking forward in the new year to another round of departmental visits, and to talking with faculty across the University system. He wished faculty, students, and staff a safe and happy holiday season, and invited questions from the floor.

PROFESSOR AL PAKALNIS (Medicine) asked if there are any new developments with the Greenville medical school, and asked if the Provost thought that the proposed 10-year plan was reasonable.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS responded that he did, indeed, think that the plan was reasonable. He notes that the University has faced two main criticisms regarding the expanded medical program. One is: Is there a need for physicians? The second is: What are the resources that the University is going to put into the Greenville program and are there state resources needed for the program? The 10-year financial projection plan is a response to the second question.

The Provost noted that many Senators might not have heard of the 10-year plan, and offered a recap. The previous Monday evening, University Administration was at the Medical School to talk about the program for expansion and to present the 10-year plan. The plan shows that the revenue for the expansion will be coming from two sources: the tuition of the students in the program and contributions by the Greenville Hospital System. These two sources together provide a balanced budget.

Provost Amiridis noted that there had been suggestions that the Greenville Hospital system was not contributing enough money for the expansion and was trying to accomplish it “on the cheap”, but stated that the numbers show this is not the case, since the proposed budget is equivalent to the budget of the Medical School in Columbia. A second recurring question is: Is the University counting on state resources for the expansion? The answer is no, and the projections clearly show that the program will be funded by tuition and the contributions from the Greenville Hospital System. Over a 10-year period, the Greenville Hospital System contributions total \$81 million. Furthermore, the Greenville Hospital System is assuming a contractual responsibility to cover any additional deficit that may be created in the process of the operation of the school. The University will not go back to the state to ask for more money for the program. This agreement also eliminates the risk for the University because the Greenville Hospital System is assuming the risk.

PROFESSOR PAKALNIS asked if the Medical School in Greenville would operate under the aegis of the University of South Carolina.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS stated that it would, absolutely. This principle is secured in the foundational agreement that we adopted last August, and preserves the academic integrity of the process and the clear reporting lines. This is the University of South Carolina School of Medicine Greenville; it is not the Greenville Hospital System School of Medicine. The Dean of the School will be appointed by the Provost and will report to the Provost, the same reporting relationship as currently exists with the Dean of the Medical School in Columbia.

PROFESSOR PAKALNIS observed that projections in medicine now are very nebulous because no one knows what is going to occur in the next 10 years.

PROVOST AMRIDIS agreed that this is a concern that University Administration investigated when negotiating the agreement. It checked the credit ratings of the Greenville Hospital System to ascertain that it is capable of paying what it agreed to pay. The credit ratings appear to be



excellent according to the financial analysis but, to avoid potential problems, the agreement includes a sun-setting provision. If at some point the Greenville Hospital System or the University wish to dissolve the partnership, or if Greenville declares itself unable to continue to pay for the program, the program will be closed pending a 3-4 year period to allow the existing students to graduate. Funds from the Medical School in Columbia will never be transferred in order to salvage the program in Greenville. That is one of the reasons that we will have a dual accreditation process, to put a clear wall between the two programs financially.

## **6. Report of the Secretary**

There was no report.

## **7. Report of the Chair**

CHAIR NOLAN opened his report with an update on faculty concerns regarding the services of the University Bookstore. In response to those concerns, a meeting was held between representatives of the Bookstore, The Provost's Office, and interested faculty. Chair Nolan noted that the meeting was very open and very interesting, and has yielded an action plan. The gist of the action plan appears to be that the Bookstore will order more books. Another meeting was scheduled for December 6 at 3:00 p.m. in the McCutchen House to discuss the action plan and other issues. Chair Nolan recognized the Provost's Office and Dr. Helen Doerpinghaus for moving this initiative forward.

Chair Nolan observed that the meeting was well-attended and thanked the Senators for their response to his plea to be present to discuss the Carolina Core. He noted that the Steering Committee is discussing ways of making the Senate a more deliberative body that is involved in the process of making decisions, and invited suggestions from Senators. He plans to report in February or March on the progress of this discussion. Chair Nolan has been working to facilitate communication between the faculty and the University's Board of Trustees. The University has a Faculty Board of Trustees Liaison Committee but it hasn't been very active in the past. Chair Nolan is working with William W. Jones, Jr., who chairs the Board's Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee, to get the committee up and running.

Chair Nolan noted that, for the purposes of conducting Senate business, only Faculty Senators can vote and only Faculty Senators should sign the attendance log. He then explained the procedure for Senators who are unable to attend a meeting due to illness or conflicting obligation. He emphasized that the informal process of a Senator asking a colleague to go in her/his place was not the correct procedure. The process requires that the unit head send a communication to the Faculty Senate Office certifying a designee to be the Faculty Senator for a particular meeting or a particular time frame.

## **8. Unfinished Business**

PROFESSOR RITA CHOU (Social Work) brought forward a request from a colleague regarding the procedure for appealing parking tickets. She asked why, when so many other administrative functions may now be done online, a person wishing to appeal a parking ticket is required to go in person to the Parking Office.

Chair Nolan will investigate and refer the question to the appropriate committee.

## **9. New Business**

There was no new business.

## **10. Announcements**

Chair Nolan thanked the Senators for their service this year and wished everyone a productive, joyous, and safe holiday season and winter break.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on Wednesday, February 2, 2011, at 3:00 p.m. in the Law School auditorium.

## **11. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed.