

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

March 2, 2011

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 called for corrections to the minutes of the meeting of February 2, 2011. There were none and the minutes were approved as corrected.

3. Invited Guests

PROFESSOR MICHAEL MATTHEWS (Chemical Engineering) gave a brief status update on the activities of the Carolina Core Committee during the current semester.

Previously, the Faculty Senate has approved seven core components and nine learning outcomes for the Carolina Core. At the December, 2010 meeting, the Senate approved the distribution requirements (credit hours) for the core components. We now have the academic framework of the Carolina Core in place.

Moving forward, our target implementation date for the Carolina Core is the fall of 2012. We will need a full and comprehensive set of courses for the Core reviewed and approved to assure that the goals and outcomes of the General Education Program are met, and to demonstrate that we have system-wide support and awareness of these goals. To that end, the Carolina Core Committee this spring has been engaged in four activities:

1. The Committee is working with the Office of the Provost and the Committee on Curricula and Courses on developing a call for Carolina Core Course proposals. The Committee will put online a form that will guide faculty and departments in developing course proposals. The Committee is gathering supplemental materials (such as background information on the Carolina Core and its learning outcomes, guides and best practices for articulating learning outcomes) to place online, as well. It hopes to include some sample syllabi to help faculty and units as they develop courses.

2. The Committee is recruiting additional tenured and tenure-track faculty to the Committee. Nine specialty teams of academic content experts, one for each of the Core's nine learning outcomes, will review course proposals to ensure that the stated learning outcomes are consistent and appropriate.
3. Professor Matthews has been in discussions with Professor Jennifer Vendemia (Psychology), who chairs the Committee on Curricula and Courses, to confirm the necessary chain of reviews and approvals so that the courses are approved properly and that the information is communicated properly system-wide. These discussions will also involve the Parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate, Mark Tompkins, as a consultant.
4. The Carolina Core Committee will host another Faculty Forum after spring break, in late March or early April. The Committee will present the Carolina Core review and approval process. The Committee wants to gather feedback from faculty and administrators that will allow it to fine-tune and finalize the course approval process, which they hope to have finished by the summer. The Committee hopes to have the process, including access to its online forms and supporting material, operational by the fall of 2011 and to have the specialty teams at work on approving courses. Once the process is in motion, the Committee will monitor the process to make sure that we get courses from all the learning areas, that we are on schedule, and that there are no course shortages in some areas. As the system produces approved courses, the Committee will disseminate the information to all of the stakeholders in the system. Further information on the scheduling of the faculty forum is forthcoming.

PROFESSOR JENNIFER VENDEMIA (Psychology & Chair of Curricula and Courses) asked if, while the Committee was developing an appropriate course approval process, the Committee was considering ways to keep the process simple and to minimize the burden on the faculty to the extent possible.

PROFESSOR MATTHEWS responded in the affirmative, noting that while an approval process is necessary for courses to be included in the Core, it is not the intention of the Committee to force units to change everything they are doing with existing courses. He suggested that, regarding existing courses, a department might simply provide an explanation of those courses relative to the new Carolina Core learning outcomes and, perhaps, to take a look at the articulation of the learning outcomes for the courses. New courses could be expected to take a little longer in the approval process, but the Committee is mindful of the need to minimize the approval burden on the units.

4. Reports of Committees

a. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Rebekah Maxwell, Secretary:

PROFESSOR MAXWELL (Law Library) presented to the Faculty Senate the slate of nominees for faculty committee vacancies. She thanked those who had volunteered for committee service in the new cycle, as well as those who are rotating off, for contributing their time and talents in the interest of faculty governance at USC. The slate of nominees is:

Academic Responsibility

Nominees: Divya Ahuja (MEDC)
Whitby, Kenny (POLI)
Rotating off: Janice Bacon (MEDC)
Edward Gieskes (ENGL)

Admissions

Nominees: Joan Donohue (BADM)
Hunter Gardner (LLC)
Lori Schwartz (UNIV LIBR)
Rotating off: Sarah Fuller (NURS)
Matthew Kostek (HEAL)

University Athletics Advisory

Nominees: Harold Friedman (MEDC)
Mark Nagel (HRSM)
Rotating off: Pamela Melton (LAW LIBR)
Ray Torres (GEOL)

Bookstore

Nominees: Douglas Meade (MATH)
Gloria Zinky (LAW LIB)
Rotating off: Marilee Birchfield (LIBR)
Susan Lessner (MEDC)

Curricula and Courses

Nominees: Pat Gehrke (ENGL)
Michael Hill (LLC)
Rotating off: Marco Valtorta (ENGR&COMP)
Jennifer Vendemia (PSYC)

Faculty Advisory

Nominees: Shawn Chillag (MEDC)
Melinda Forthofer (ASPH)
Rotating off: Harold Friedman (MEDC)
Chris Robinson (ART)

Faculty Budget

Nominee: Tom Regan (HRSM)
Rotating off: Duncan Alford (LAW)

Faculty Grievance

Nominees: Pamela Melton (LAW LIBR)
Rotating off: Christopher Berg (MUSC)
Martin Donougho (PHIL)
Francisco Sanchez (LLC)

Faculty Welfare

Nominees: Karen Brown (UNV LIBR)
Elizabeth Sudduth (UNV LIBR)
Rotating off: Kevin Bennett (MEDC)
Stephen Sheehi (LLC)

Honorary Degrees

Nominees: Venkat Lakshmi (EOS/GEOL)
Toni Torres-McGehee (PEDU)
Mark Tompkins (POLI)
Rotating off: Bo Cai (HEAL)
Mark Tompkins (POLI)

Instructional Development

Nominees: Jeffrey Patton (MEDC)
Susan Rathbun-Grubb (SLIS)
Rotating off: Tena Crews (HRSM)
Paul Solomon (SLIS)
Jeffrey Makala (UNIV LIBR)

Intellectual Property

Nominees: Esmail Jabbari (ENGR)
Richard Long (BIOL)
Rotating off: Scott Crittenden (PHYS&ASTR)

Karen Lear (HRSM)

Libraries

Nominees: Katherine Barbieri (POLI)

Ashok Chauhan (MEDC)

Karen Gavigan (SLIS)

Rotating off: Junko Baba (LLC)

Scott Phinney (MUSC LIBR)

Ellen Douglas Schlaefter (MUSC)

Scholastic Standards and Petitions

Nominees: Joan Culley (NURS)

Lori Schwartz (UNIV LIBR)

Rotating off: Jayanth Jayaram (BADM)

Craig Keeney (UNIV LIBR)

Tenure Review Board

Nominees: Craig Keeney (UNIV LIBR)

Rotating off: Milind Purohit (PHYS&ASTR)

Ran Wei (JOUR)

University Disability Affairs:

Nominee: Andrew Gowan (MUSC)

Rotating off: Marna Hostetler (LIBR)

Russell House Advisory

Nominee: Victor Jenkinson (MED LIBR)

Rotating off: Bruce Konkle (JOUR)

Faculty Senate Secretary

Nominee: Rebekah Maxwell (LAW LIBR)

Professor Maxwell opened the floor for further nominations.

b. Committee on Faculty Welfare, Professor Kevin Bennett, Chair:

PROFESSOR BENNETT (Medicine) provided an update on the Committee's activities during the past year. He noted that, as the Committee's name implies, it is concerned with issues that affect the welfare of the faculty, and that the Committee reads it charge broadly. Its concerns range from safety to fitness and even to environmental issues such as paper and recycling.

This year, the Committee funded 230 flu shots in the fall.

To address issues of salary equity, the Committee has been working with the Provost's Office on a salary study that will compare salaries at USC with those of peer and peer-aspirant institutions across the SEC and nationally.

Professor Bennett reported on the hour reduction at the Blatt PE Center, noting that he received input almost daily from faculty members who had been affected by recent changes at the Blatt. Since August 1, 2010, the Center is closed until 7:45 a.m. and is closed on the weekends. He notes that the change seemed abrupt to faculty members because the decision regarding the change came about approximately three weeks before it was implemented. The notification went out in July, at a time when many faculty members are not on campus. Professor Bennett reported that the hours reduction was caused by the shortfall in state appropriations.

The Provost's Office has assisted the Committee in putting together an offer of reduced fees for faculty, staff, and spouses at the Strom Thurmond Fitness Center beginning March 1. Under the offer, an early-bird membership would cost \$10/month. An early-bird member must arrive at the Strom before 1:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, but has continuous access on weekends and holidays. A regular membership would be \$20/month, and includes unrestricted access any day. This offer is time-sensitive and is good until the end of June, at which time Campus Recreation will revisit the issue. Professor Bennett directed the Senators' attention to flyers about the offer, located at the back of the auditorium. He noted that, during its investigation of this matter, the Welfare Committee has learned that the Strom is not funded through any state appropriations but through user fees. The Committee worked hard trying to get free morning and weekend access to the Strom for Blatt users affected by the hours reduction. That initiative was not viable because of the way the Strom is funded, but Professor Bennett notes that the fee reduction program at the Strom is not a bad compromise. He encouraged interested faculty, staff and spouses to enroll. The more folks who sign up for the program increases the likelihood that the reduced membership will be extended, which would make the facility more accessible for everyone.

Professor Bennett encouraged the Senators and faculty to communicate with the Welfare Committee about issues that they see as affecting faculty welfare. The Committee is always looking for ways to improve the quality of life for faculty members and invites contact about any area of concern.

PROFESSOR JOHN BESLEY (Journalism & Mass Communications) asked whether it is a policy that parking services tickets at the Blatt lot before 9 a.m.

PROFESSOR BENNETT responded that it appears that there never was a policy *not to* ticket at the Blatt before 9:00 a.m. Ticketing before 9:00 simply was not strictly enforced. He is willing to pursue the issue further.

PROFESSOR BESLEY endorsed the idea of further negotiations, noting that while it was nice to have the Blatt open before 9:00, it would be especially nice if users could actually park there without getting ticketed.

Professor Besley wondered if the Welfare Committee could perhaps negotiate with the Strom to push the early-bird cut-off from 1:00 p.m. back to 2:00 or 3:00. He noted that during the times he has been at the Strom at 2:00 and 3:00 p.m., few people were there.

PROFESSOR BENNETT clarified that early-bird members didn't have to leave by 1:00 p.m., they just had to arrive by 1:00 p.m. If they are still there by 1:00, they may remain as long as they wish. He agreed to pursue a push-back of the early-bird cut-off time.

CHAIR NOLAN thanked Professor Bennett, Provost Amiridis, Jerry Brewer, and Herb Camp for working on the reduced membership plan at the Strom.

c. Bookstore Committee, Professor Marilee Birchfield, Chair:

PROFESSOR BIRCHFIELD (University Libraries) reported on solutions to problems with the University Bookstore that came to the Senate floor last fall.

The University Bookstore at Russell House has initiated the Faculty Textbook Hotline which is 777-4270. Around 30 calls came in at the beginning of the semester and most of those were verifying information or checking on availability. Reorder rates fell from over 10% last semester to just 2.7% of all text units this semester. Students currently have a lot more options for getting textbooks. Rental sales increased over 36% over the same period from the previous January. Our students have saved over \$122,000.00 by renting textbooks in January of this year. Year to date rentals sales have increased nearly a 200%. Digital textbooks are also a growing segment of sales. On our campus, e-textbooks account for about 3% of the sales. Faculty who are interested in using digital textbooks in their classes are invited to call Andy Shafer, the manager at the University Bookstore at Russell House, at 777-5016.

At the last Faculty Senate meeting, the Provost Office distributed a survey about the Bookstore and textbooks. Only one of the responses reported a problem. The Bookstore Committee is following up on that survey by asking some of the same questions as well as additional ones and will be distributing that to all faculty.

The University Bookstore at Russell House, in consultation with the Registrar's Office, has determined the optimal date for the textbook adoption. Typically that would have fallen around March 15, but this year they will be able to have the deadline moved to March 25 and still be able to comply with the law and give the students the most accurate data possible.

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

PROFESSOR VENDEMIA (Psychology) began her report with minor corrections to the Committee's report:

On page 29, in the Proposed column under Progression Requirements the last sentence should be changed as follows:

“In order to satisfy the requirements for a degree in ~~technology support and training management~~ **integrated information technology** and regardless of other satisfactory work, a student may not repeat a **an** ITEC course a third time.”

On page 33 in the Proposed column – 7th course from the bottom – ITEC 343 note the following change to the title:

Introduction to Computer Hardware and Software **Support**.

Also on page 33, in the Proposed column – 4th course from the bottom – ITEC 352 note the following change to the title:

Software ~~Systems Development~~ **Design**

Then on page 41 near the bottom, change the title of ITEC 352 to:

Software Design ~~Development~~.

She invited interested faculty to pick up a copy of these corrections from the table at the back of the auditorium.

CHAIR NOLAN noted that if there was no objection, these corrections would be included when the Senate votes on the sections of the report. There were no objections and the changes were included as reported.

PROFESSOR VENDEMIA reported changes in courses and curricula from the College of Arts and Sciences, the Moore School of Business, the College of Education, the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management, the College of Mass Communications and Information Studies, and the Arnold School of Public Health, (please see attachment, pages 21-43).

The changes were adopted.

4. Reports of Officers

PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS noted that he would be delivering the only report, as President Pastides was on a fundraising trip to New York. He began his report with the observation that the forum offered by the Faculty Senate meetings is his and the President's main channel of communication with the Faculty. As he visits the various units of the University this spring, he has come to realize that there is much variation in how a unit's Senators communicate information from the meetings back to the faculty in their units. He asked that Senators help in getting the officers' communications to their faculties by reporting on what is discussed in Senate meetings. He and the President take very seriously the function of the Faculty Senate as a communication forum for the interests of the entire faculty.

Provost Amiridis reported on the current political climate in South Carolina, noting that the current legislative session is an active one. Some proposed legislation is of great interest to the University. One recently-proposed bill would have required all faculty members to teach at least 9 credit hours, but this bill was withdrawn. For some time, the University has been concerned about provisos that would cap tuition and limit out-of-state enrollment. The Provost reported that a bill has been presented in the Senate that limits the enrollment of out-of-state students to 25%. The Provost thinks that the Governor's posture toward this issue might be helpful to the University. The Governor has previously stated that she is interested in the ratio of in-state/out-of-state students only from a funding perspective. She has also stated that she is in favor of the state funding only in-state students, and does not consider out-of-state enrollment a focus issue.

Provost Amiridis reported that while we have not yet seen a proposed bill regarding a tuition cap, this does not indicate that none will be introduced. The University has tried to communicate to the Legislature that if it allows us to run our own business, we will be very reasonable.

The Provost reported on two meetings that the Governor has had with the presidents of South Carolina's institutions of higher education. President Pastides was out of the country for the first meeting, and Provost Amiridis represented him. President Pastides attended the second meeting. The Provost expects a third meeting at the end of March. The Governor will be focusing on the following five factors:

1. The percentage of in-state versus out-of-state students: Her objective will be for the state to provide funding only for in-state students.
2. The measure of an institution's quality: The six-year graduation rate has been proposed and discussed as a measuring device, as has an institution's retention rate from the freshman to the sophomore year.
3. The measure of an institution's economic development impact: There has been much discussion of how to quantify the economic development stimulated by the presence of an institution of higher education. We don't know exactly what is meant by the term

“economic development.” Is it jobs created? Is it additional funding brought in with grants? What other variables will be considered? The Provost expects that this component will generate much debate.

4. Placement of students post-graduation: At the meeting that the Provost attended with the Governor, she asked such questions as: Where are your students placed? What do you do to help them get jobs? How much do they earn in these jobs?
5. Diversity: The presidents proposed this factor, and the Governor accepted it as a subject for consideration. The discussion will involve the diversity of the institutions’ populations, not only racially or ethnically, but also in terms of socio-economic background of the students and their families, regions of the state, etc.

Provost Amiridis notes that the University is in agreement with the Governor on several fronts, the first of which is the idea that the current funding model for higher education is broken. If the amount appropriated to each institution for example, is divided by the South Carolina FTEs, substantial discrepancies appear from institution to institution. There are different sectors involved - research institutions (such as the Medical University and Clemson), 4-year campuses, and regional campuses. Within each sector, there are discrepancies in funding, and the variances can be as great as 5 to 1. For example, some institutions in South Carolina receive five times as much as USC Beaufort receives for a South Carolina student. A fair division of funding would be welcome news.

The Provost suggested that the devil, indeed, is in the details, and that arriving at a fair funding formula would not be easy. Any formula that the Governor may pursue will not be associated with next year’s funding, but she has declared a strong desire to have legislation in place for academic year 2012-13. President Pastides will be leading some of the efforts to work with the Governor to arrive at a fair formula.

Provost Amiridis then reported on the financial climate for 2012. The House Ways and Means Committee approved the budget proposal that will go to the full House within the next week. Under the proposed budget, state appropriations for the University of South Carolina system go down by approximately 15%. This reduction includes the stimulus funds, as well as a reduction in the base budgets for each of the institutions in our system. These reductions vary between 5% and 8%. The cuts are not uniform across the board – approximately 5% for Upstate, 8% for Beaufort, 6% for Columbia, and the majority of the system is at approximately 6%.

It is too early to assume that these figures will be final. There are further steps in the legislative process. The full House will take up the budget, and then the bill goes to the Senate. If the houses disagree, there will be conference proceedings, and the bill goes to the Governor after that. The Provost notes that in the last couple of years, the House Ways and Means budget did not change much from the time it was proposed, so this informs our expectation that we will get

a significant cut in the next year. However, Provost Amiridis notes that we were prepared for such a contingency. Some of the measures that the University took over the last year, such as increasing the number of students admitted last fall, will propagate through the system as the larger class moves forward. We cannot increase the number of freshmen again, but we will see an increase in the number of sophomores if we retain the majority of last year's freshmen.

The Provost noted that our University administration takes tuition increases very seriously. Last year's increase was 6.9%, and a similar figure is not tolerable this year. Neither the public, the legislators, the Board of Trustees, nor the students' families have the desire for that kind of an increase. The Provost expects a very moderate tuition increase, and the University's Administration Team will be examining all the variables in our budgetary projection model to determine what it will be.

Provost Amiridis then announced that Ed Walton will be the next Chief Financial Officer of the University. A search is underway for a Vice President for Administration, who will oversee Human Resources, University Police and Facilities. The Provost noted that the University's current reorganization at the vice-presidential level was recommended by the Huron Consulting Group, which visited last fall to evaluate the University's internal operations. The Huron Group suggested that the President had too many direct reports and that, to some extent, this structure hindered the President in his ability to work outside the University in such activities as engaging in political advocacy and fundraising for USC. A further phase of this reorganization will bring the Vice President for Research and the Vice President for Information Technology under the aegis of the Provost's Office.

In a matter unrelated to the restructuring, Provost Amiridis reported that Dr. Steve Kresovich, Vice President for Research, will step down from this vice-presidency to concentrate on his research activities.

Provost Amiridis delivered a status report on the recent round of Provost Grants in all areas, arts, humanities, social sciences and clinical grants. Faculty committees, led by the Vice Provosts, have completed the selection process. The Provost looks forward to the funding of many exciting projects, and to seeing the results of projects funded last year that are now coming to fruition. He hopes to be able to continue the annual grants process for many years to come.

The Provost announced that we are very close to finalizing decisions regarding the faculty replenishment initiative. In 7 to 10 days, he hopes to be able to notify the departments that submitted successful proposals so that they may begin their search processes. Provost Amiridis noted that his office had received many excellent proposals and that the selection process was very difficult. Regarding the initiative for senior faculty hires, the success rate was somewhere between one 1 of 3 or 1 out of 4 proposals. The clusters were 1 out of 10. The Provost is happy that the University has been able to support some exciting proposals for faculty replenishment.

Provost Amiridis then observed that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee meeting, which precedes the Faculty Senate meeting, had run a bit late, owing to a lively discussion about the faculty retention initiative. He paraphrased the question that he was asked, “The University is hiring, while its current faculty suffers from salary compression. Why aren’t you dealing with salary compression instead of spending money to hire more people?” He notes that it is a fair question. As background information, the Provost explained that the question of cost-of-living adjustments was a State issue, and the State has not approved such adjustments for quite some time now. Even if there were available funds from other sources, were the University to announce cost-of-living increases for all of its employees, it would create the impression with the State that we have more money than we need, which would likely lead to an additional loss of funding.

Some Faculty Retention Initiative funds were distributed to the deans in November and December. It was not a lot of money, because the University does not have a lot of money, but it was intended to help deans make preemptive retention efforts. The funds were used at the discretion of the recipient colleges to provide incentives for faculty considered at risk of going elsewhere to remain at USC.

Provost Amiridis is looking forward to having the results of a salary survey done by the Faculty Welfare Committee. The Provost’s Office has had the survey for a few weeks and will begin moving forward with its review. While the University cannot stop hiring, it can also examine the data from the survey. Administrators are sensitive to faculty concerns about salaries and salary compression, but are also aware of a need for more faculty, particularly at the senior leadership level. The Provost’s Office had funding for 30 positions and, from the Faculty Replenishment Initiative, got requests for approximately 170 or 180 positions across the institution.

The Provost delivered a status report on the SACS visit and the University’s Quality Enhancement Program (QEP). SACS is visiting this month and we are well prepared. The Provost believes that we are going to do well on the SACS team’s evaluation, and is grateful to all the people system-wide who have participated in the development of the QEP. Carolina Connects, our QEP program, seeks to integrate students’ in-the-classroom experiences with learning experiences beyond the classroom. The University is receiving national press about the plan, which gives us an opportunity to improve and enrich the educational experience of our students, and to define priorities of what we want our students to learn beyond the curriculum. Provost Amiridis likened our current opportunity to one we had 40 years ago, when we became one of the pioneers in the freshman-year experience, with initiatives such as University 101 and Reading Day. He believes that we are on the edge of another transformational step in terms of undergraduate education.

The Provost closed his report with an update on the status of several current dean searches. The fourth candidate (of five) for Dean of the Law School was on campus the day of the meeting. The last will be interviewing after Spring Break, and then the next phase will commence. The

first of four candidates for Dean of the Honors College was on campus that day, as well. The searches for the College of Education and the College of Social work are in progress, and both search committees have identified a number of candidates that will be invited to campus. The Provost thanked the faculty in the various colleges for their support in these important searches.

PROFESSOR AL PAKALNIS observed that formula funding was passed by the legislature more than 10 years ago and we have never received even close to 100% of the amount of the formula.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS noted that the legislation was passed, and then ignored and never applied.

PROFESSOR PAKALNIS opined that the nation, as well as South Carolina, did not make education, or the acquisition and retention of quality teachers, a priority. He then noted that there is a committee to look at the new medical school in Greenville, and asked if the University was represented on the committee.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS responded first to the issue of formula funding, noting that South Carolina already has a law regarding formula funding for higher education. Part of the problem is that the formula, developed 10 years ago, is so complicated that it was never actually used. One goal of any new formula development will be to make it simple to understand. The Provost explained that another problem with the former formula was that it was to be applied to new money only. Since new money is unlikely in the near future, a similar provision would be of little use to the University in the present. The President and the Provost are diligent in their efforts to educate the legislators about these issues and concerns. Provost Amiridis is supportive of the idea of a public campaign by citizens groups who want to support the University.

Regarding the expansion of the medical program at Greenville, that committee will be politically appointed. The initial plan is that the committee will be set up by two people, the Speaker of the House and the Chair Pro Tem of the Senate. The committee will include representatives from the House Education Committee, the Senate Education Committee, and the Commission on Higher Education. The University will present information to the committee but will not have representatives on the committee. The Provost acknowledged that agreement about the Greenville program has not been unanimous. He does not expect everyone to agree, but is committed to the transparency of the process. The University will be making all the information on the program available to the Committee, the legislators, and to our own internal constituents as well.

PROFESSOR GREG WILSBACHER (University Libraries) wondered whether, now that the Vice-President for Information Technology has been re-structured into the purview of the Provost's Office, there are any plans for a faculty forum regarding how the CIO's office has/has not met their expectations for academic and research needs.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS responded that he was currently gathering this sort of feedback from the deans, but is also interested in constructive suggestions from faculty. The Provost asked the Senators and faculty to consider what format they considered an appropriate vehicle for the feedback, and suggested as possibilities an open forum or a special committee.

RYAN QUINN (Student Reporter, Daily Gamecock) inquired what sort of percentage would constitute a “very modest increase in tuition.”

PROVOST AMIRIDIS responded that we are not able to quantify it at the present, but that the University’s administrators are sensitive to it. They will be trying to determine the point at which the quality of students’ educational experiences will suffer for lack of funding. He expects it to be a small number.

MR. QUINN noted that state legislator Bobby Harrell, the Speaker of the House, has been quoted as saying that for the first time, the University’s percentage of out-of-state students was used as a criteria for determining its state appropriations, the logic being that out-of-state students pay higher tuition. Students have heard reports that ten years ago, 78% of the University’s students were in-state, compared to 60% today.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS explained that, as the proposed cuts for higher education were not across the board cuts, he is not sure what criteria were used. Most of the cuts were between 5% for some institutions and 8% for others. At present on the Columbia campus, 71% of the students are from in-state. The system as a whole, including the Regional Campuses, is comprised of approximately 78% of in-state students. He noted that this is the percentage for the entire student body. The percentage of in-state students in last fall’s freshman class was approximately 60%.

6. Report of the Secretary

There was no report.

7. Report of the Chair

CHAIR NOLAN reported on his current initiative to make the Faculty Senate perhaps more integral to the decision-making of the University. He has discovered on page 9 in the Faculty Manual the following committee:

FACULTY - BOARD OF TRUSTEES LIAISON COMMITTEE

This committee shall serve as liaison between the faculty and the Board of Trustees. Members shall be the chair and chair-elect of the Columbia Faculty Senate, the chairs of the Faculty Advisory and Faculty Welfare committees, one person appointed by the president upon nomination by the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate, and the chair of the faculty government at one of the four-year campuses. The representation of the four-year campuses shall rotate annually among these campuses. The chair of the Columbia

Faculty Senate shall be chair of the committee and shall sit with the Board of Trustees as provided by the bylaws of the board.

The committee shall meet with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, which deliberates on matters of mutual concern to the faculty and the Board of Trustees.

Chair Nolan notes that the President has appointed members to the committee as set out in its charge. The committee's membership will also include Chair Nolan, Professor Chris Robinson as Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee, and Professor Kevin Bennett as chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee. Chair Nolan has been unable to confirm whether this committee has ever met, but he intends to convene it and hopes to use it as a forum for discussing issues of faculty concern. The committee will be a direct line to the Board of Trustees. Chair Nolan would not like to see it used as a forum for venting, but as a connection between the Board of Trustees and the Faculty. He notes that Wes Jones, Chair of the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the Board of Trustees, has previously addressed the Faculty Senate as an invited guest. Mr. Jones is very much interested in knowing about faculty activities and about the issues of concern to faculty. Chair Nolan hopes that the convening of this committee may awaken people to the idea that the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Welfare and Faculty Advisory Committees are important in the governing of this institution and may perhaps encourage them to become more involved, to become more active, and may encourage other people who have not participated so far to volunteer for the committees. He pledged to keep the Senators and faculty informed about the activities of the committee and the issues that it discusses.

8. Unfinished Business

PROFESSOR REBEKAH MAXWELL (Law Library) returned to ask for further nominations for the committee volunteer slate. There were none. The slate was accepted by the body as presented, and the nominees were elected. Professor Maxell thanked all incoming and outgoing committee members for their service and their commitment to faculty governance.

9. New Business

There was no new business.

10. Good of the Order

There were no items presented for the good of the order.

11. Announcements

CHAIR NOLAN announced that the Active Shooter Seminar promoted at last month's meeting had to be cancelled due to illness. It has been rescheduled for March 17 from 3:30 to 4:30 p.m. in the Thomas Cooper Library in Room L511.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on **Tuesday**, April 26, 2011, at approximately 3:10 p.m. in the Law School auditorium, following the General Faculty meeting.

12. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed.