

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

March 14, 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 February 1, 2012. There were no corrections and the minutes were approved as written.

3. Reports of Committees

a. University Athletics Advisory Committee, Charley Adams, Chair

PROFESSOR ADAMS (Public Health) provided an update on the Committee's recent activities, and opened his report with a little background on the Committee. It is comprised currently of six elected and seven appointed members. The Committee is charged with reviewing and monitoring several things including: Title IX compliance, reports from the NCAA regarding any changes in policy and regulations, academic performance and progress of all student athletes, the annual budget of the Athletics department, and any major hires.

Title IX is federal legislation passed in 1972 which mandates equal participation by men and women in collegiate athletics. In terms of compliance that falls into three categories:

- 1) Athletics Participation. USC has a higher level of compliance in this area than any other school in the SEC. We are trying to do even better to balance participation of male and female student athletes to reflect the ratio of males to females in the student population. We are currently within 5% and would like to get that down to about 3%.
- 2) Athletics Financial Aid. 56% of student financial aid went to male student athletes and 44% to female athletes. These figures closely match the actual demographics, as 55% of our student athletes are male and 45% are female.
- 3) Equal Opportunity and Equivalency. A certification review is being conducted currently. The Athletics department is already aware of some needs to be addressed and those include: volleyball, soccer, equestrian, and renovation to the softball facility.

Professor Adams then reported on two major NCAA regulation policy changes this year:

1) Multi-year Scholarships: Historically colleges and universities have only offered one-year scholarships to student athletes and these are renewed every year. This is changing. As of fall of this year, student athletes may be granted multi-year two-, three-, or four-year scholarships. Some schools are already offering a lot of these. USC has only offered a handful of them this first year but we will be offering more.

2) A \$2,000 Stipend for Full Scholarship Student Athletes: Although this change appears to be going forward, the NCAA is still sorting out some details – how this is going to work – because many smaller institutions are going to have a harder time affording that. Professor Adams will report further details as they become available.

Professor Adams announced that Chris Rogers has been hired as the University's new Associate Athletics Director for Compliances. The search was extensive and the candidate slate was excellent, and Chris was the top choice. He is an attorney, and also has a master's in sports administration. He comes to us most recently from Ohio State, where he was the number two officer in compliance there. He was previously at Minnesota and Utah. Chris reports to President Pastides and Eric Hyman, our Director of Athletics.

Professor Adams reported on the NCAA allegations against us for violations occurring in 2009 and 2010. USC responded to these allegations in final report which was issued in December of 2011. The NCAA held a hearing 2 or 3 weeks ago to consider that, the results of which will be released in 6 to 8 weeks of the hearing date, so more information will be forthcoming. The allegations were that certain student athletes were staying at a local hotel at discounted rates. The other major allegation concerned the impermissible involvement of two representatives of the University's athletics interests in the University's football recruiting efforts. Included in our response to the NCAA were some self-imposed sanctions and those fell into two categories:

1. Corrective Actions: The corrective actions included increased oversight of housing for student athletes; enhanced monitoring, education and training in many realms for boosters, for student athletes and for their parents; banning of specific boosters in specific events; and also some compliance monitoring and education involving elite student athletes.

2. Punitive Actions included 3 years of probation (remember these are self-imposed); some scholarship reductions; some reductions in official visits; and letters of reprimand for four Athletics Department staffers, one of whom was demoted.

Details of all these allegations and the University's response can be found on the USC website. Interested parties can go to the homepage, search "NCAA Response," and read the entire 111 page document.

Professor Adams noted that Eric Hyman, our Athletics Director, got his start in compliance. The Office of Compliance under his leadership has grown from a staff of 2 to a staff of 10. Our

President serves on the NCAA Board of Directors and also on an executive committee for compliance. USC was extremely prepared at the NCAA hearing and was very well represented. Professor Adams is confident that under the lead of our new Director for Compliance, USC has a great deal of depth, experience, and commitment to compliance as we move forward.

DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS ERIC HYMAN addressed the Senators to provide an overview of recent activities in the Athletics Department.

The purpose of the Athletics Department is to develop students to their fullest potential through athletics. The department, in concert and harmony with our student athletes, coaches, and administrators, has developed this set of core values:

Core Values:

- 1) Integrity. Committing to do what is right at all times.
- 2) Respect. It is treating others as you want to be treated.
- 3) Pursuit of Excellence. Striving to reach the highest level of success in all endeavors.
- 4) Teamwork. Cooperating with each other to succeed in a mutually set of goals.
- 5) Commitment. What is Commitment? And our students have said “Promising to do what it takes to reach the goals.

The Athletics Department continuously encourages our student athletes to prepare themselves for life after sports and for successful careers. We are very proud of our football players and the success that they have had this past year. The year before, we had 27 football players graduate, and that rate is as good as there is in the country. We have achieved some highs in GPAs across the board in our athletic programs. Our football team has achieved the highest GPA they have ever obtained at the University, as well as our men’s basketball program. Our student athletes are excelling in the classroom. This has been taking place over the last 6 or 7 years through our commitment to the academic center, which supports our student athletes so they could realize their goals academically and athletically.

The breakdown of majors of our student athletes is: 23.7% are in Business, Sports and Entertainment Management – 10.2%, Exercise Science – 7.2%, and Psychology – 6.1%.

The NCAA uses a measurement tool called the APR that evaluates the academic performance of an athletics program. USC has experienced a remarkable transformation in the elevation of its APRs across the board Official data will be available sometime this spring.

Director Hyman delivered a financial report from the Athletics Department, noting that the Athletics Department takes no state dollars in support of its programs. It is an auxiliary enterprise and is self-supporting. The Athletics Department provides funding for the University, including \$250,000.00 each year for the Carolina Scholars. Approximately 2 million dollars of

the new Southeastern Conference TV revenue goes to the University in the form of direct support (e.g., scholarships). In addition, the revenue generated by licensing and merchandizing sales goes directly to the University.

Director Hyman related several inspirational stories that illustrated the ways in which the Athletics Department has touched the lives of our student athletes and their parents, and has helped our student athletes leave USC with a degree and a positive experience.

b. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Rebekah Maxwell, Secretary

PROFESSOR MAXWELL (Law Library) presented the slate of nominees to Faculty Senate committees for the coming academic year, and moved that the Senate accept the slate. The Senate accepted the slate. Professor Maxwell left the floor open for further nominations.

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

PROFESSOR BINEV (Mathematics) reported changes in the Undergraduate Bulletin (which were also reviewed by the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions), and changes from the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Education, the Moore School of Business, the Arnold School of Public Health, and System Affairs and Extended University (please see attachment, pages 17 - 30).

The changes were adopted.

d. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Professor Ron Davis, Chair

PROFESSOR RON DAVIS (Music) presented a request from the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate for a change in the Grade Forgiveness Policy. The current policy states:

“Under the grade forgiveness policy, the forgiven and repeated class must both be taken at the same University of South Carolina campus.”

The Regional Campuses Faculty Senate requests that this be amended and replaced with:

“Under the grade forgiveness policy, the forgiven and repeated class must be taken at the University of South Carolina-Columbia campus or a Regional campus.” (Please see attachment, page 31).

The reason for the request is that the Regional campuses are two-year campuses and after two years most of the students are ready to move onto the 4-year. If students want to take advantage of grade forgiveness, they are required to stay for an extra semester at the 2-year campus. If they are given the opportunity to move onto the Columbia campus, they can go to their junior year on time. While the committee was discussing this proposal, Scott Verzyl from Admissions and Aaron Marterer from the Registrar’s Office argued very much in favor of adopting the proposal

for several reasons: The Regional Campuses to the Columbia campus is very consistent. The catalog numbers and the course descriptions are all identical and from the Admissions point of view they are very much interested in graduation rates and retention saying that this would allow students to progress through without accruing so much debt by the time of graduation. Professor Davis brought the proposal forward and Chair Kelly opened the floor for discussion.

PROFESSOR DOROTHY DISTERHEFT (English) expressed concern that the curriculum might not be as rigorous at the 2-year colleges, based on information from former graduate students who have taught on both our 2-year and 4-year campuses.

PROFESSOR DAVIS observed that this issue had come under discussion in Scholastic Standards and Petitions. He noted that forum-shopping for making up forgiven classes already exists system-wide, since students are always aware of the most attractive makeup options, and that students do not have to campus shop to take advantage of such opportunities. Professor Davis noted that a student wishing to take a course at another campus needs the approval of her/his advisor, and that the proposal would not change this requirement. The Committee also discussed the desirability of a more seamless and global University system, and achieving more uniformity between the different campuses.

The Faculty Senate approved the proposal by a majority vote.

PROFESSOR DAVIS then brought forward the Committee's second proposal (please see attachment, page 32), from the Classroom Scheduling and Enhancement Committee. The subject has been under consideration since 2010 by the Provost's Office, through an ad hoc committee to the standing committee, and through Standards and Petitions. For the fall of 2013, the Committee proposes a revision to the University Class Schedule to begin the school day at 8:30 a.m. and extending the class times to later in the day and widening the gap between classes from 15 to 20 minutes. On behalf of the Committee, Professor Davis moved that the Faculty Senate adopt the proposal. Chair Kelly opened the floor for discussion.

PROFESSOR ALAN JAMES (Geography) asked for confirmation of his assumption that the modification to 20 minutes between classes was the result of the geographic expansion of the campus.

PROFESSOR DAVIS answered in the affirmative, noting that just getting across Assembly Street is a substantial safety concern. The Music Department is now located across Assembly from the rest of the University. When the new Moore School is completed, thousands more students will be crossing the street and 20 minutes between classes will enable these students to cross more safely. Professor Davis explained that the traffic signal at College and Assembly takes 1 minute 50 seconds between cycles, motivating students who are already late to jaywalk and to dodge through moving traffic. He further observed that it can take as long as 5 minutes to

simply exit from the top floor of many of the buildings on campus, leaving less time to get to class.

PROFESSOR JAMES asked if the Committee had considered safety issues associated with extending the school day into the evening hours.

PROFESSOR DAVIS explained that we are looking at a cut-off of 8:50 in the evenings and that we currently have classes ending that late. VICE PROVOST TIM DOUPNIK noted that this concern was not raised by the Classroom Enhancement Committee.

PROFESSOR CHARLES BRICE (Engineering and Computing) spoke in favor of extending to 20 minutes the time between classes. He has observed students crawling under railroad cars of a stopped train in order to get to the Engineering building on the other side of the tracks. He notes that it takes longer than 15 minutes to walk from one corner of the campus to the other and, while he is not excited about extending the class times into the evening, he believes that it is necessary.

PROFESSOR ED GIESKES (English) suggested that, while he doesn't disagree with the need to extend the time between classes, speaking as the Undergraduate Director for his department, he wondered about the effect the change would have on administrators' ability to schedule courses at the same time that we are losing classroom space and gaining more students.

PROFESSOR DAVIS replied that the proposed change would take advantage of time when classroom space was underutilized, noting that Admissions office was very determined to propose a schedule that did not sacrifice a minute of classroom time for the number of slots allowed.

PROFESSOR GIESKES suggested that the proposal would seem to inhibit flexibility of scheduling class times and creating more constraints at a time when we don't have enough flexibility to begin with.

VICE PROVOST TIM DOUPNIK addressed these concerns in his capacity as Chair of the Classroom and Enhancement Committee. The proposal would extend the day by about an hour on Tuesday/Thursday. The time slot that is currently 3:30 to 4:45 p.m. would be the 6th period of the day on Tuesday/Thursday. The 6th period of the day under the proposed schedule would not begin until 4:25 and would go until 5:40 p.m. That would extend working day for faculty by an hour on Tuesday/Thursday in order to get the same number of class periods that we currently have. On Monday/Wednesday/Friday, in order to get the same 9 class periods that we currently have, we would have to extend the day by an hour and a half. The Registrar provided information about the utilization of classrooms at 8 o'clock in the morning; a very low percentage of classrooms are utilized at that time of the day. The Classroom and Enhancement Committee suggests that an 8:30 a.m. start time will be more popular for both faculty and

students. The Committee hopes that there will be greater utilization of classrooms for that first time slot during the day and that that might actually relieve some of the strain on classrooms that we have currently. The rationale for the proposal is to more fully utilize classrooms at the earliest class period during the day while simultaneously expanding the passing time to give students more time to safely get from one end of campus to another. Regarding evening classes, classes held at 5:30 p.m. would go until 6:45. With a 20 minute break before the next class, classes that are now scheduled at 7:00 p.m. would start at 7:05 p.m. and go until 8:20 p.m.

PROFESSOR JOAN CULLEY (Nursing) observed that she routinely teaches on Tuesday nights every semester until 8:00 p.m. She has spoken to the Campus Police Department about the security issues and learned that they provide escort services to any student who wants them.

The Faculty Senate adopted the proposal.

e. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Jim Knapp, Chair:

PROFESSOR JIM KNAPP (Earth and Ocean Sciences) presented a proposed revision to the Bylaws for the Faculty Senate (please see attachment 4, page 34, of agenda packet). These proposed revisions were first provided to the Faculty Senate at the February 1st Faculty Senate meeting. There have been two amendments to these materials since they were last presented to the Senate. An amendment was offered from the floor at the last Faculty Senate meeting that changed the term “vetted” to “reviewed for eligibility by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. The second amendment regards the Guidelines for Faculty Senate Chair Nomination. The Faculty Senate Office recommended that we modify the nomination process to provide for the use of paper ballots. Faculty Advisory will have the slate of nominees established by beginning of April and paper ballots could be provided to the Faculty Senate for the last Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year. At the time of nomination, a candidate who is willing to be nominated as Faculty Senate Chair would provide a one paragraph bio and CV. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee would review those nominations and the election would be conducted at the April meeting. In accordance with Section 8 of the Bylaws, these revisions were presented at the previous Faculty meeting. Professor Knapp moved that the Faculty Senate adopt these as revisions to the Bylaws in the Faculty Manual.

PAST CHAIR PATRICK NOLAN rose to speak in favor of the revisions and to propose another friendly amendment. In Section 1 of the proposed changes, the list of the officers of the Faculty Senate does not include the Past Chair of the Faculty Senate, although the Past Chair is referred to later in the document as having responsibilities and duties. Past Chair Nolan proposed that the list include the Past Chair. Professor Knapp noted that the amendment was very reasonable, as the Past Chair continues to serve on some of the committees. He amended the document to include the change.

The Faculty Senate adopted the revisions as amended.

f. Faculty Budget Committee, Professor Camelia Knapp, Chair:

PROFESSOR CAMELIA KNAPP (Earth and Ocean Sciences) brought forward a proposal on behalf of the Committee (please see attachment, page 39). The proposal was developed in consultation with the Provost's Office and the Faculty Welfare Committee through its Chair, Professor Varsha Kulkarni. If/when adopted, the proposal will be a recommendation from the Faculty Senate to the University's Administration to (1) urge our administrators to secure a raise pool for the faculty, and (2) provide a matrix for distribution of such funding for raises. The proposal factors in the cost of living (COL) increase since July, 2008, when University faculty and staff last received such raises. Professor Knapp suggested that the estimated 3.5% COL increase referenced in the proposal was perhaps conservative, but would be at least 3.5%.

In the event that there should be a salary raise, the Faculty Budget Committee proposes the following guidelines:

Funds would be first allocated such that all faculty in good standing would receive a COL increase. The proposal also introduces merit and compression components. The merit portion would be determined by colleges and schools depending on individual performance reviews. The Committee suggests averaging performance reviews over the last 5 years.

The committee's proposed matrix for distributing the potential raise is as follows:

1. If the raise would be within 0 – 2.0%, to be distributed as COL only.
2. If the raise is between 2.0 – 3.0%, 2% to go to COL increase and 0-1% to be distributed as merit.
3. If the raise would be in excess of 3.0%, then 2% to go to COL increase and then 50% of the remainder to be merit and the other 50% of the remainder to be salary compression.

CHAIR KELLY opened the floor for discussion.

PROFESSOR ALLAN JAMES (Geography) asked whether the proposal was offered in an advisory capacity and who has the jurisdiction and authority to make decisions regarding raises and distribution of raises.

PROFESSOR KNAPP noted that, although the proposal is only a recommendation, the committee wanted the Senate to have a voice in the matter. Chair Kelly added that the unanimous approval by the Faculty Senate of such a proposal would lend more weight to an individual's (such as herself) efforts to make the case for a raise to the Board of Trustees.

The Faculty Senate adopted the proposal.

4. Reports of Officers

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES had to leave for another meeting, and PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS presented his report.

Provost Amiridis noted how good it is to have the students back on campus after the spring break. He observed that he was very interested in the discussion about scheduling class times. This initiative was not lightly put together, but has been under consideration and development for almost two years. The committee has visited different campuses in an effort to benchmark, has looked at the Duke model, has looked at the possibility of nesting courses around particular areas of the campus, and the current initiative is its best effort. Hundreds, if not thousands, of students are already taking evening classes. Campus safety is extremely important and Campus Police will be involved to provide support.

Provost Amiridis praised the many student outreach initiatives that were conducted during Spring Break: USC had groups involved in community service projects in many different places, including New Orleans, Nashville, Ecuador, and the Dominican Republic. The students are doing good in many communities and are benefitting from the principals of USC Connect to connect what they learn in the classroom and what they are doing outside the classroom. We have more “alternative Spring Break” service projects and groups every year.

The Provost observed that we are entering the season for annual awards, and that he is always joyful when our faculty members get recognized. We are extremely proud that Professor Hendrikus E. van Bulck, of the division of Business Administration and Economics at USC Sumter, has been named the Governor’s Professor of the Year in the 2-year-colleges category. We are also very proud of our two finalists for this award, Professor Edward J. Callen, Chair of Psychology at USC Aiken, and Professor James S. Cutsinger of the Department of Religious Studies in Columbia.

Provost Amiridis noted that it is also the time of year when we struggle with budget questions, and he thanked the Faculty Budget Committee for the work that they have done. He stated that one of the administration’s highest priorities is a faculty raise, and pledged to think seriously about the resolution just approved by the Senate regarding the distribution of any funding for raises.

The House would be debating the state budget on the floor the afternoon of the meeting, and the Provost noted that this is the first year since he became Provost that we are not talking about budget cuts, and for that he is thankful. We have seen the inclusion in the budget of some small but important onetime items, and we hope that they will be approved. The recurring items have been approved already, such as the funding for Palmetto College, and the Provost will present more detailed information at the April meeting. There is a state employee raise in the House Budget; at this point, it is at the 2% level. To some extent, this increase is offset by an increase

in health care premiums that is also a part of the budget. The Provost explained that when the state talks about a 2% increase, what they are referring to is a 2% increase in the portion provided by the state of the University's salary funding. For us, that translates to something less than .4%. The University has to make up the difference with funding from elsewhere, and if we are going to give raises above the 2% level, those funds have to come from somewhere else, as well. Provost Amiridis observed that this is part of the reality of being a privately funded institution.

The Provost concluded his report with an update on the various searches underway at USC. The search for a Chancellor at USC Aiken is underway. We are in the process of initiating a search for the new Dean for USC Sumter in the wake of the announcement last month by Dean Carpenter that he will be retiring. The Dean search at USC Union has been reactivated, and is moving at full speed. In Columbia, we have an open search for the Dean of the College of Nursing, and the Provost has received some preliminary recommendations from the Chair of the search committee. The pool is good and the Provost expects to have some strong finalists to bring to campus.

5. Report of the Secretary

There was no report.

6. Report of the Chair

CHAIR KELLY summarized a number of initiatives from Faculty Senate committees. The Committee on Curricula and Courses just put through key changes in the Bulletin for the Carolina Core. The Committee expects to be very busy through the spring, summer, and into the fall with the new courses that will be coming through for the Carolina Core, so the Senate will be called upon to approve the courses and related curricular changes.

Chair Kelly expressed optimism that the recent scheduling changes from the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions will help to alleviate some of the issues involving classrooms.

The Faculty Advisory Committee just passed some procedural changes on the nomination and election of the Faculty Senate Chair. Chair Kelly noted the importance of faculty participation to assure that the faculty voice is heard on the committees and by our administrators. She thanked present committee members for their service, and encouraged the Senators to participate in faculty governance and to encourage their colleagues to do the same. She compared faculty governance to a government system and noted that if the faculty doesn't perform the governance functions, the system becomes unbalanced. The faculty voice can only be advanced through the faculty committees, and Chair Kelly encouraged participation at all levels of the faculty.

Chair Kelly noted that, although the day's resolution from the Faculty Budget Committee was advisory in nature, a strong recommendation from the Faculty Senate carries weight and is important as an expression of the faculty voice.

7. Unfinished Business

PROFESSOR REBEKAH MAXWELL returned to invite nominations from the floor for vacancies on the Faculty Senate committees. There were none, and the nominees were elected as presented on the slate.

8. New Business

There was no new business.

9. Good of the Order

There were no announcements for the good of the Order.

10. Announcements

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on Tuesday, at approximately 3:10 p.m., in the Law School auditorium, following the General Faculty meeting at 2:00.

11. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed.