

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

February 1, 2012

1. Call to Order.

CHAIR SANDRA KELLY (Psychology) called the meeting to order, and welcomed Faculty Senators, University officers, and guests.

2. Corrections and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR KELLY asked for corrections to the minutes of the meeting of December 7, 2011. There were no corrections and the minutes were approved as written.

3. Invited Guest.

PROFESSOR JOE RACKERS (Music), faculty co-chair of the Carolina Core Committee, addressed the Senate to deliver an update on the implementation of the new Carolina Core Curriculum, set to launch in the fall of 2012. He thanked the members of the Carolina Core Committee, Associate Provost Helen Doerpinghaus, and Professor Peter Binev (Math), Chair of Curricula and Courses, who has worked closely with the Committee on the implementation.

The revision of the General Education Curriculum here at USC began in 2005, when then-Provost Mark Becker appointed a task force of 100 faculty members to make recommendations about what a new general education curriculum would look like. Based on those recommendations, then-President Andrew Sorensen in 2008 created the General Education Committee, which contains representatives from all of the colleges on the Columbia campus, as well as the regional campuses. In 2009, the Committee came to the Faculty Senate with recommendations for a set of learning outcomes and core components for the Carolina Core Curriculum. The Senate approved the recommendations and, in 2010, the Committee came back to the Senate with recommendations for distribution requirements, which were also approved.

The focus of Professor Rackers' presentation was the course approval process for the Carolina Core.

The Core Components are:

- Aesthetic & Interpretive Understanding
- Effective, Engaged & Persuasive Communication
- Global Awareness & Multicultural Understanding

- Analytical Reasoning & Problem Solving
- Scientific Literacy
- Information Literacy
- Values, Ethics, & Social Responsibility

Each component has associated learning outcomes. The review and approval process for the Carolina Core courses is very similar to the process that has always been used at USC for approval of courses. A course proposal starts with an individual college or program, then goes to the head of the college, then to the Committee on Curricular and Courses, and then to the full Faculty Senate. The only difference is that the Carolina Core Committee also plays a role in the process, after the head of a college but before Curricula and Courses and the Faculty Senate issue the final approval. The Carolina Core Committee will designate a particular core component with which to classify the new course. The question the Committee asks is: Does the course being proposed meet the learning outcome and fit into the core component for which it is proposed?

In the coming several months, the Carolina Core Committee will be reviewing approximately 300 courses. Small subcommittees of 3 or 4 faculty members have been assembled for each core component. Courses associated with that core component will go to that subcommittee. The subcommittee will make recommendations concerning that specific course, at which point the course would go forward to the Faculty Senate.

Each course will have to indicate whether it is a brand new course or whether it is an existing course and is being submitted with small or no changes. Each course will have to indicate if it is a foundational course, meeting one learning outcome or one core component, or if it is an overlay course, needing up to two different learning outcomes. In order to handle the flow of approximately 300 courses over the next several months, existing courses will be grandfathered in. Existing courses will continue to be offered as general education courses up to December, 2010, in order to allow the Faculty Senate and the individual colleges to act on all of these courses.

In an effort to streamline the course review process, new electronic proposal forms have been developed by the Office of the Provost. The forms are easy to use. Faculty who are proposing courses will fill out everything electronically and members of Curricula and Courses and members of the Faculty Senate will be able to access all of those forms, and view the proposals and the syllabi for those courses by logging in to a website. The summary of a course at the point that the Faculty Senate would act on it will still be provided in the usual format that it always has. Many courses are expected to go to the Senate in March and April. About 90 courses have been proposed at the unit level, there are about 25 that have reached the Carolina Core Committee.

The secure site for Faculty Senators, members of committees, and the Carolina Core Committee to view these proposals is: www.sc.edu/programproposal/committeereview. The site requires logon codes: User ID: propuser and Password: sc2propc. The site tracks courses through the approval process, although it doesn't show courses that have recently been proposed. There are a number of ways to filter the courses, and to search them in several different ways. More information about the Carolina Core can be found on at: www.sc.edu/generaleducation.

4. Reports of Committees

a. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Peter Binev, Chair

PROFESSOR BINEV (Mathematics) reported new changes in courses and curricula from the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Education, the Moore School of Business, the College of Engineering and Computing, and System Affairs and Extended University (please see attachment, pages 11 - 14).

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

b. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Jim Knapp, Chair

PROFESSOR JIM KNAPP (Earth and Ocean Sciences) presented a proposal from the Faculty Advisory Committee to amend the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate. He directed the attention of the Senators to Attachment 2 of the meeting's agenda packet. The proposal has been under discussion by the Faculty Advisory Committee, as well as the focus of discussions with University administration. The proposal was precipitated by what Professor Knapp described as a constitutional crisis this past fall when the Faculty Senate was operating without a formerly approved Chair of the Faculty Senate. Professor Knapp thanked Past Chair Patrick Nolan for being gracious enough to continue to preside over the meetings in the absence of a Chair.

The proposal is an attempt to formalize both the nomination and voting process for both the Faculty Senate Chair, as well as Faculty Senate Secretary. It does not change the terms of the voting, but focuses the process for securing the nominations through the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and the Faculty Senate Office. It accelerates the nomination and election process to the end of the preceding spring semester instead of at the beginning of the fall semester, so as to insure that any given time the Faculty Senate has both a past chair and sitting chair or a sitting chair and chair elect.

The proposal also includes a couple of other minor language changes; these are from Appendix IV of the Bylaw of the Faculty Senate and Article III, which deal with the election of officers.

Most of the changes are contained in Section 2 of Article III, as well as reference to “Guidelines for Faculty Senate Chair Nomination.”

If approved, this process would provide that this nomination process would begin in an election year at the beginning of February and run through the remainder of the spring semester, with a vote at the last Faculty Senate meeting of the spring semester, thereby assuring that we have a chair elect in place from that point going forward.

There is some additional documentation in the “Guidelines for Faculty Senate Chair Nomination.” A feature of the proposal, derived from deliberations on the Faculty Advisory Committee, is that there is now a provision for some financial support for the chair of the Faculty Senate while he or she is serving in that position. The proposal provides for money that is made available to the Faculty Senate Office for discretionary use by the chair during his or her term to alleviate the strain that is put on a given faculty member for serving in that capacity. The attachment includes documentation of this funding.

Consistent with Article VIII of the Bylaws, the Faculty Advisory Committee is presenting this proposal for the Faculty Senate’s consideration, with anticipation that a vote will occur at the at the next Faculty Senate meeting on the 14th of March. A comment period is now open. The documents are hyperlinked on the Faculty Senate website through the announcement of the meeting and Professor Knapp and the Committee invite any questions or comments.

PROFESSOR DAN SABIA (Poli Sci) suggested that perhaps the language of the proposal could be clarified to indicate that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee would review, rather than vet, the nominations to insure that the nominees meet the stated criteria, “vetting” being a much broader term. Professor Knapp agreed that such a change would be helpful.

c. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Varsha Kulkarni, Chair

PROFESSOR KULKARNI (Physics & Astronomy) opened her report by thanking several people for their work on and with the Committee: Provost Michael Amiridis, Vice-Provost Christine Curtis, the members of the Committee, Phil Moore and Nancy Floyd from the Office of Institutional Assessment and Compliance, and Tina Marie Devlin in Campus Wellness.

The Faculty Welfare Committee’s goals are to promote the welfare of faculty in all aspects, including the address of specific issues brought to it by individual faculty members. The Committee’s activities cover a very broad spectrum, ranging from faculty salaries and compensation to health- and wellness-related issues to benefits and family-friendly policies. Professor Kulkarni provided an overview of the Committee’s initiatives this year.

Faculty Salaries and Compensation:

Salary is a top welfare issue for most faculty. The Committee's goal has been to compare faculty salaries at USC with those at our peer and peer-aspirant institutions and to help plan for future adjustments. The study was initiated over a year ago and is nearly complete.

The comparison sample consisted of the following peer institutions and peer-aspirant institutions:

Peer: University of Alabama, University of Kentucky, University of Alabama in Birmingham, University of Georgia, University of Tennessee at Knoxville

Peer-Aspirant: University of Virginia, Univ. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Louisiana State University, University of Delaware, University of Maryland at College Park

Additionally, in a separate category, the Committee also compared our data to that of Clemson University.

The initial pilot study focused on 6 departments at USC. For 4 out of 6 departments, mean salaries at USC are lower than at peer/peer-aspirant institutions. For the other 2, salaries were equal or higher. The deficit ranged from about 4K to 24K, depending on rank and department.

An expanded, broader study was inspired by the pilot study. The data is being compiled by the Provost's office and the Office of Institutional Assessment & Compliance, using Oklahoma State University's database. It compares all departments (68 total) at USC vs. those at the same peer/peer-aspirants utilized in the pilot study.

Findings

Assistant Professors:

For 20 out of 68 departments, USC higher
For 18 departments, USC lower by 0-5%
For 18 departments, USC lower by 5-10%
For 10 departments, USC lower by 10-15%
For 2 departments, USC lower by 15-18%

Associate Professors:

For 15 out of 66 departments, USC higher
For 16 out of 66 departments, USC lower by 0-5%
For 8 departments, USC lower by 5-10%
For 19 departments, USC lower by 10-15%
For 8 departments, USC lower by 15-29%

Full Professors:

- For 17 out of 67 departments, USC higher
- For 1 department, USC lower by 0-5%
- For 16 departments, USC lower by 5-10%
- For 12 departments, USC lower by 10-15%
- For 21 departments, USC lower by 15-32%

The study reveals mixed results—some departments are doing fine, some not. Numbers best for Assistant Professors, worst for full Professors, likely due to salary compression. The Faculty Welfare Committee will further study the data compiled and work with the Faculty Salary Committee, Faculty Budget Committee, and the Provost’s Office on trying to identify how future salary adjustments can be implemented to reduce the deficits compared to peer/peer-aspirants.

Health and Wellness

Flu Shots: Annually given in Fall semester. Administered by the Thomson Health Center at various locations on campus. FWC pays for about 200 shots from the USC Family Fund (Faculty Enrichment Fund).

Cardio screenings: if possible. Working with Campus Wellness to promote various wellness initiatives.

Campus Wellness Services:

Free	Fee-Based
Blood pressure check (drop-in)	Massage Therapy - \$22 for 25 minutes
Body Fat Analysis (drop-in)	
Fitness Assessment (appt. based)	State Health Plan
Exercise Consultation (appt. based)	Worksite Screening
	– \$15.00 for faculty and staff
	– Includes hemogram, lipid profile, blood pressure, height and weight and body composition measurements
	 * consultation with a Campus Wellness Health Educator

Benefits/ Other Issues:

- Parking—Succeeded in getting a new reserved section for N1 decal holders in the student lot.
- Partner benefits—working with the Provost's office on identifying these and reviewing any additions to existing family-friendly policies.
- Improving Faculty Civility—working with the Ombudsman's Office on developing an academic code of conduct.

Professor Kulkarni closed her report by encouraging Senators and faculty to bring to the Committee any concerns regarding faculty welfare at USC, and to consider volunteering to serve on the Committee in the future. She thanked the University Community for supporting the Faculty Enrichment Fund through the Family Fund giving initiative. She opened the floor for questions.

PROFESSOR SARA SCHWEBEL (English) asked how the peer and peer-aspirant schools were chosen for the study.

VICE PROVOST CHRISTINE CURTIS explained that, since we were using the data bank at Oklahoma State, we had to choose from universities whose data were contained in the bank, and operate within the parameters of the data bank. In April, the 2011 information will have arrived in the databank, at which time our Office of Institutional Assessment and Compliance will ask Oklahoma State to run the study again to include the new data.

PROFESSOR KATJA VEHLLOW (Religious Studies) asked whether the survey considered wages and salary equity within colleges.

PROFESSOR KULKARNI responded that the study was not done college by college but department by department. However, she noted that it is possible to make these comparisons, as the data are available.

4. Reports of Officers

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES greeted his faculty colleagues throughout the University system and opened his report with an update on his recent fundraising activities. The President observed that there room for hope that our support from the state government might improve. The University requested from the Governor that \$55 million in funding be restored to the budget, although this amount would not replace all of the funding that the University has lost in the last 3 ½ years and four budget cuts. The President also presented to the House Ways and Means Higher Education Subcommittee, asking for specific new funding for University initiatives, including monies for academic core missions, including the upgrading of classrooms and technology.

We have, as well, asked for \$5 million in recurring funding for an initiative that we call “Palmetto College,” a path for baccalaureate degree completion for many students who receive an associate’s degree from one of our four regional campuses, but who are place-bound, economy-bound, or family-bound and cannot transfer to a campus like Columbia, Aiken, Spartanburg, or Beaufort in order to complete their baccalaureate degree. This niche is currently being filled by for-profit institutions which charge a high price for the product they deliver. The University of South Carolina can do a higher-quality job at lower cost to meet the needs of these students. President Pastides emphasized that this program will not change the dynamic of instruction here in Columbia; it will be an opportunity to bring baccalaureate completion in selected disciplines for which there are jobs in these largely rural communities of South Carolina.

The President also asked for \$5 million in research infrastructure funding to be able to provide our faculty with the tools, laboratories, and spaces that they need to conduct the cutting-edge and world-class research that happens here in Columbia. We asked for a contribution to the Law School’s building needs. President Pastides hopes that, with the guidance of the Provost and the faculty, that the Law School’s current building will someday be returned to the University in even better shape, with new occupants and with expanded classroom opportunities for the entire University.

President Pastides also highlighted to the Subcommittee the great work done at the University, including the fact that USC has the highest freshman-to-sophomore progression rate for students who enter the University with a Life Scholarship. A student’s ability to progress while retaining the scholarship requires certain academic success in the freshman year, and speaks to the quality of instruction and student support at the University.

The President noted that this is the year in which he and the Provost plan to advocate for increases in faculty and staff salaries. He noted that specific amounts have not been completely worked out and, in any event, must be approved by the Board of Trustees, but that he and Provost Amiridis are committed to making the case. Especially in the wake of the salary survey from the Faculty Welfare Committee, the University’s administrative team understands that a plan to address salary issues needs to get started in the next fiscal year.

President Pastides noted with sorrow the tragic student accident that took the lives of four young people, including two current and one former USC students. The University has been reaching out to the family and friends of the victims.

The President reported on the success of the University’s annual community service day on Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. Hundreds of students, faculty, and staff participated in community service projects throughout Columbia.

The University's Capital Campaign is moving along very well. We are having our best year ever in the history of the University and are on track for another record-breaking year. President Pastides is optimistic that this could be a sign that of long-awaited economic clarity.

The President reported on academic data from the Athletics Department. Our academic supervisors in Athletics, led by Raymond Harrison, report our highest GPA average for our varsity student athletes: 3.202 this year, the 10th consecutive year that the cumulative GPA was 3.0 or higher. Every team, including football and men's basketball averaged above a 2.7. The overall leader was the women's golf team at 3.664, followed by women's swimming and diving at 3.618, equestrian team at 3.545, and men's track and field at 3.252. President Pastides thanked Professor Zack Kelehear, our Faculty Athletic Representative, for keeping the emphasis on the educational aspect for our student athletes.

The President then introduced Ms. Amy Stone, the new Secretary to the Board of Trustees. Ms. Stone follows former Secretary Tommy Stepp, who recently retired after 23 years of service to the University of South Carolina. He was the University's 25th Board Secretary. Ms. Stone has a B.A. and a Master's in education, both from the University. She has served the Columbia Midlands Community working as a business developer and recruiter for the Columbia City Center Partnership. She has been a member of our Board of Trustees serving in her role as the President of the USC Alumni Association and currently serves as the Interim Executive Director of the USC Alumni Association.

The President opened the floor for questions.

PROFESSOR JOAN CULLEY (Nursing) observed that during President Obama's recent State of the Union Address, he specifically cited the need for colleges and universities to raise efficiency and control costs, and wondered how the President saw this happening at USC.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES noted that, while many people took those remarks as a negative, he does not. He agrees with the concept that a university must carefully consider the impact on students and families when making decisions to increase tuition. He observed that, although our University might appear on the surface to have a high sticker price, the State of South Carolina has chosen to provide some of its educational support in the form of scholarship funds from the State lottery, which the student may take to any university in the state that she or he chooses. So, while a year's worth of tuition at USC carries a sticker price of around \$10,000, the actual costs to the student becomes about \$4,000 after scholarships and other funding sources. However, this does not mean that the University does not need to be constantly sensitive to the cost of education. President Pastides believes that President Obama's comments were entirely appropriate and that our University cannot simply look to tuition increases to pay its bills.

Raising the overall efficiency of the University system is a way to further cost containment. We will be looking at the way we do business, at technology, at outsourcing. We will look at jobs as

they become vacant and evaluate whether we need to fill those jobs. The President noted that it is a constant struggle to contain costs, but that the University can no longer expect the State to support it in measures equal to the excellent work that it does.

PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS opened his report by presenting the 2011 Carnegie Foundation South Carolina Professor of the Year Award to Professor Susan Anderson (Theatre & Dance). This award is provided through the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Council for the Advancement and the Support of Education.

PROFESSOR ANDERSON graciously accepted the award on behalf of every faculty member at the University of South Carolina, noting that all were equally deserving.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS underscored President Pastides commitment to addressing faculty salary issues in the next fiscal year. The University's Administration Team has been working with the Faculty Budget Committee, and every scenario of a possible budget includes a raise pool for the faculty and staff. However, neither the Provost nor the President can guarantee at this point that raises will be approved. Provost Amiridis invited feedback from the faculty regarding the distribution of any raise pool that might be approved. This feedback will be shared with the deans and the Faculty Budget Committee going forward with the budget models.

The Provost then discussed a separate issue relating to possible salary compression or inversion, as suggested by the study initiated by the Faculty Welfare Committee. The Provost's Office is happy to have the data commissioned by the Committee and has done a preliminary review of it. The Provost notes that there is good news and bad news. The good news is that there is not a systemic, university-wide problem. There are problems in certain areas, and there are differences in salaries between faculty ranks.

The next step is to involve the administration in each of the colleges. Administrators will be asked to review potential instances of salary compression and identify the causes and the magnitude of the problem. Once we've identified the extent of the problem, we can predict how much funding we will need to address the issues and can plan a course of action.

The Provost then provided updates on some recent activities. The University has a dean search underway in Nursing. The search committee has a number of qualified candidates and is planning for on-campus interviews. Two dean reviews are currently taking place, Dean Bierbauer of Journalism and Mass Communications and Dean McNally of University Libraries. The respective review committees will be soliciting feedback from the Deans' units, and the Provost encouraged faculty in those units to participate in the process.

Provost Amiridis recently signed the letters for the year's first set of Provost Grants. These grants are for visiting scholars or visiting institutes. The Provost's Office is in the process of

reviewing the different grants in the Arts, Social Sciences, Humanities, and Clinical Research and all is on schedule.

The Faculty Replenishment Initiative has received the proposals for this phase of the initiative and we are looking at approximately 40 net new faculty positions. This committee is also on schedule. At the request of President Pastides, the Provost defined “net new faculty” as faculty hired in addition to the tenure-track faculty members that we have already.

The Provost opened the floor for questions.

PROFESSOR VARSHA KULKARNI asked how many proposals the Provost had received for the Faculty Replenishment Initiative. Provost Amiridis observed that this year alone, his office had received proposals for over 150 new positions.

5. Report of the Secretary

There was no report.

6. Report of the Chair

CHAIR KELLY echoed the commitment of our University Administrators to advocate for salary raises. She thanked the Faculty Budget Committee, chaired by Professor Camelia Knapp (Geology) and the Faculty Welfare Committee, Chaired by Professor Varsha Kulkarni, for their work in this arena, and pledged to advocate, as well, in her position as Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Chair Kelly then encouraged Senators to take seriously their mission of carrying information from the Faculty Senate meetings back to their units, and of bringing concerns of the unit to the Faculty Senate floor.

7. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

8. New Business

There was no new business.

9. Good of the Order

PROFESSOR CHRISTIAN ANDERSON (Education) announced an upcoming short symposium from the College of Education, to be held on Wednesday, February 8, from 5:00 – 6:00 p.m. The symposium will be held in the Museum of Education on the first floor of Wardlaw College and will focus on the life and works of Richard T. Greener. Richard T. Greener was the first African-American professor at the University of South Carolina. He was appointed in 1873 and

left the University when it was closed in 1877. He also served as librarian and brought the library back to life after it was in shambles after the Civil War. Dr. Bobby Donaldson (History) will give a short introduction about that era in our history, and some of our own students will speak, as well.

10. Announcements

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on Wednesday, March 14, at 3:00 p.m., in the Law School auditorium.

11. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed.