

## **FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**September 12, 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 reported a correction to the minutes of the meeting of April 24: Dr. Gibbs Brown was reported as absent when, in fact, he was present at the meeting. The correction was approved.

CHAIR KELLY then asked for corrections to the minutes of the meeting of June 13, 2012. There were no corrections and the minutes were approved as written.

### **3. Invited Guest**

UNIVERSITY OMBUDSMAN JIM AUGUSTINE (Medicine) presented his annual report, which he opened with a brief history of the Ombuds Office. The office was created in August of 2006 to provide a supportive environment in which to air issues of concern to individual faculty members. The Ombuds Office labors under the principles of the International Ombudsman Association (IOA), which is the largest free-standing group of professional organizational ombuds. These principles are confidentiality, neutrality, informality and independence. There are about 640 individuals who represent organizations across the United States and the globe. About 240 of those are academic institutions. The current report is the 6th annual report presented by Dr. Augustine to the Faculty Senate. The full text is available on the Faculty Senate website in the link for materials for the meeting of September 12.

Because of the confidential nature of Dr. Augustine's work, he does not reveal that someone has come to talk to him without their permission. The reporting of the cases of individuals follows a series of uniform reporting categories that IOA has established. There are 9 categories:

- Compensation and Benefits
- Evaluative Relationships
- Peer and Colleague Relationships
- Career and Progression and Development
- Legal, Regulatory, Financial and Compliance
- Safety, Health, and Physical Environment
- Services/Administrative Issues

- Organizational, Strategic, and Mission Related
- Values, Ethics, and Standards

Those large categories have a number of subcategories under them. Dr. Augustine does not keep track of issues by gender, by department, or in any other way other than these reporting categories.

Dr. Augustine noted that the part of the report that is likely of most interest to faculty and Senators is the summary table on page 5 of the report. He has combined the statistics for visitors for the last six years on the summary. The largest number of individuals who have come – some 77 in the last six years - have had concerns about Evaluative Relationships between people in evaluative relationships, such as faculty and administrators or supervisors. The second largest group is Career Progression.

The Ombuds Office established a website about a month after the office was created. Dr. Augustine encouraged faculty and Senators to visit it at [www.sc.edu/ombuds/](http://www.sc.edu/ombuds/). It features a great deal of information about the office and its activities, including all six annual reports, as well as an outline of the office's standards of practice and code of ethics.

Dr. Augustine noted that this year the Graduate School has appointed Dale Moore to assist our graduate students with conflicts and concerns and to serve in the capacity of an ombudsperson.

Dr. Augustine wanted the individuals on the senior and regional campuses to know that he is available to help them. He noted that there is some reluctance on the part of faculty on the senior and regional campuses to seek his assistance. Those campuses are a little smaller and people are concerned that those in administrative positions might know that they have contacted somebody in Columbia, so he is having a bit of a difficult time in reaching them. Dr. Augustine noted that he serves not only tenured but tenure track faculty, and non-tenured track faculty, as well.

Dr. Augustine observed that an issue of concern to him is the way in which these non-tenured track members are being treated. He recommended an article in the September 4 online issue of The Chronicle about contingent faculty and how some of the ways in which they are treated in higher education perhaps is counterproductive to what we are trying to accomplish. Dr. Augustine reported that many of the non-tenure-track faculty who come to him feel that though they are underappreciated and underpaid, and that the way in which the contracts are handed to them is often at the last minute. He recalled speaking with one individual who reported that he was not allowed to take the contract out of the building. Another was given an hour to sign his contract, and another individual who had a 5-year contract was then given a 3-year contract and then the next day was given a 1-year contract. Of course, he didn't feel like he had any choice but to sign the 1-year contract, which the administrative assistant gladly took from him after he signed

it. This is a cause for great concern. Dr. Augustine really believes that we as faculty need to stand up for those who are in non-tenured track positions and make sure that they are recorded the respect that all of us would want to be accorded, even if they are “at will employees”. They know that they don’t have grievance rights. It is a concern that we treat them with all due respect.

Dr. Augustine then addressed the issue of the civility and conduct of faculty, and what we might do about those who are uncivil and whose conduct is problematic. Dr. Augustine has been writing about this now for six years. In 2009, the General Faculty approved a change in the Faculty Manual that put the Carolinian Creed into the Faculty Manual – it made it into the preface but it didn’t make it any deeper than that. Dr. Augustine noted that it is time for this body, and perhaps the University Administration and the Board of Trustees working together, to do something substantive about prompting civil, professional, ethical, respectful and courteous interactions among all members of the University community and hold accountable those individuals who do not adhere to this standard of conduct.

Dr. Augustine closed his report with two final points. The Emergency Management Team of the university has produced a faculty/staff preparedness guide in case of an emergency which tells us how we are to conduct ourselves, the policies and procedures in the case of an emergency situation. He encouraged all faculty and Senators to get a copy of the guide and read it. We all know of incidents around the United States and various campuses that have been emergency situations and this little booklet is very helpful in telling us what we are to do during an emergency situation, what we are to do afterward and policies and procedures regarding to recovery from those sorts of situations.

Dr. Augustine commended those in the University Administration, faculty, department chairs, deans, and others who have been extremely helpful to him in resolving some of these issues brought to the Ombuds Office. In most cases, he thinks that the Office is able to provide a fair and just resolution to the issues that are brought to its attention but he particularly wanted to thank the administration’s willingness to support the work of the Ombuds Office without violating the independence, neutrality, informality or confidentiality of the office.

CHAIR KELLY reported that at our June meeting, a number of people asked for data about faculty civility issues and Dr. Augustine will return in October to report on those issues.

#### **4. Reports of Committees**

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

PROFESSOR MAXWELL (Law Library), on behalf of the Steering Committee, announced the appointment of Professor Jan Yow (EDUC) to fill a one-year vacancy on the Faculty Welfare. She thanked Professor Yow for her willingness to serve.

**b. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Brian Habing, Chair**

PROFESSOR HABING (Statistics) reported changes for the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management, The College of Mass Communications and Information Studies, the Arnold School of Public Health, the College of Pharmacy, the College of Social Work, and University Libraries. The changes were adopted.

**c. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor David Mott, Chair:**

PROFESSOR MOTT (Medicine) presented a follow-up to an issue presented at the June meeting: discussion of a faculty code of conduct. To aid in the discussion, Chair Kelly has created a link on the Faculty Senate Blackboard site marked “Faculty Governance and Codes of Conduct.” This link contains examples from other institutions of codes of civility and faculty conduct.

PROFESSOR MOTT noted that some of the issues that could be addressed by a faculty code of conduct would include those just reported by Dr. Augustine – workplace bullying and faculty civility. His purpose in addressing the Senate was to generate discussion about the body’s level of interest in such a document and, if there was interest, what form the document should take.

He began by presenting a definition of workplace bullying that is in use by the Ombuds Office at Kenyon College in Ohio: “Workplace bullying is deliberate, disrespectful, and repeated behavior toward another individual (the target) in the workplace. Most commonly these repeated acts of workplace aggression are passive, indirect, and nonphysical. What these acts have in common is that they harm both the targeted individual and the organization.”

Professor Mott noted that the key elements are “repeated behavior and that these acts “harm both the targeted individual and the organization.” They harm this university when things like that happen. At the June meeting there was discussion about how often does this occur, how big of an issue is this? That is an important consideration, and one that Dr. Augustine is going to address at the October meeting. Professor Mott posed the question, “How many times does workplace bullying need to occur before a policy is needed? Is one time enough?” These events can be very damaging to people’s careers, to their retention at this university, to a variety of things.

Currently what we have is a written affirmation of our core principles, and that is in the Carolinian Creed which is a preface to the Faculty Manual. The general understanding is that

since it is not in the body of the Faculty Manual, it does not carry the sort of the weight that the Faculty Manual does. It is the preface to that Faculty Manual.

One option is that we can leave things as they are. We can leave the Carolinian Creed as the preface to the Faculty Manual, and we can try to publicize it more or talk about this issue more. So that is one option – to leave civility as an option.

Another option would be to take that affirmation of our core principles, that Carolinian Creed, and move it down into the body of the Faculty Manual. We could talk about doing that.

Alternatively, we could have something like the Carolinian Creed and then we could add to it, some sort of policy that would stipulate in general terms procedures – resolution of conflict or consequences - if these core principles are violated. That would imply some sort of action taken against the perpetrator.

Finally, we could have that same sort of thing – an affirmation of our core principles, and then one of these more detailed legalistic-type documents that stipulates very precisely what is going to happen for different types of actions. That sort of document is what a number of universities across the country have done at this point. There are examples posted on the Blackboard website of what others universities have done. Some of these, like the University of Connecticut, have an extremely detailed large document. The University of California system has a very big document that really gets into the nitty-gritty of all the procedures and policies that are involved.

Professor Mott opened the floor for discussion and ideas from the Senators.

PROFESSOR DAN SABIA (Political Science) asked for clarification of how aggressive behavior could be passive and indirect.

PROFESSOR MOTT suggested that an example could be a situation where somebody could do something to undermine a tenure decision or do something to undermine somebody's reputation. He speculated that such behavior could be what is generally called passive aggressive. He noted that the Kenyon College definition is but one example, and that we are free to come up with our own.

PROFESSOR CHRISTIAN ANDERSON (Education) noted that another way that aggressive behavior can be passive would be when the perpetrator involves students in the middle of the aggressive act some way. Especially graduate students - using them as the means to direct attention or refusing to sit on committees and saying "I'm not going to sit on that committee with that professor" and that puts the students in an awkward position and creates unneeded tension.

PROFESSOR MOTT asked the Senate if this is an issue that Faculty Welfare should continue to pursue.

PROFESSOR MARCIA ZUG (Law) noted that, while we would hear more about the issue in October from Dr. Augustine, she would like to know more about the perspective of the people who visit the Ombuds Office. What do they think about the bullying issues?

PROFESSOR MOTT noted that while the Ombuds works in a context of confidentiality which precludes specifics, he can give us an idea of the types of behaviors that he sees. Examples might be how somebody could undermine somebody else, how they could make it so that person doesn't want to come to work every day. How they could communicate information with other colleagues that maybe wasn't true about a person. There are all sorts of ways you can bully someone.

PROFESSOR ZUG wondered if there are incidents where one party thinks they are being bullied and the person doing it doesn't think they are bullying.

PROFESSOR MOTT agreed that such a situation could happen. Depending upon how we want to move forward, one option would be that these sorts of cases would go to some type of mediation, or there could be a policy in place for resolution of these conflicts. If one person perceives they are being bullied and the other person doesn't see that as bullying, then maybe they need to talk to an independent third party – maybe a departmental chair, maybe somebody else – to resolve the issue.

PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS entered the discussion to offer his perspective. In the three years that he has been in the Provost's Office, he has seen three cases he had to be involved with. Each of those cases involved either individuals or groups of individuals who conducted continuous undermining of the professionalism of the group or individual – “Not good enough to be here,” “Not doing a good job,” using students and junior colleagues in the process so it was not necessarily direct, talking to students, talking to colleagues about that particular individual or that group of individuals. It was clear that the group which was targeted or the individual who was targeted was under a lot of distress and, at the time that the situation reached the Provost's Office, was not productive and the unit was dysfunctional because of the situation. It was, indeed, the case that one group or one individual was viewed as bullying and another individual and another group viewed their actions as freedom of academic expression.

PROFESSOR ERNEST WIGGINS wondered if the Provost were describing an environment of general incivility that was being manifested in bullying.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS saw a chicken and egg type of paradigm: he was not sure whether there was already an environment that encouraged this type of behavior or if the incidents of the behavior created the environment. It was difficult to get the bottom of the issue.

PROFESSOR MARCO VALTORTA (Computer Science & Engineering) offered another example of bullying. A colleague in another unit (who has since left the University) answered honestly a strategic planning exercise within the unit, and complained about unit procedures. As

a result, the person was ostracized by the rest of the unit, and from that point found collegial support only outside the unit.

PROFESSOR BARBARA KOONS-WITT (Criminology & Criminal Justice) wondered whether there is a policy in place at the Provost's Office to respond to these types of situations.

PROFESSOR MOTT responded that to his knowledge there is not currently such a policy. Such issues initially go to the Ombuds Office first and may eventually make their way to the Provost's Office. But there is not currently a policy.

PROFESSOR SABIA noted that department chairs are frequently called on to deal with such issues, and deans do as well.

PROFESSOR MOTT agreed, noting that his response regarded an official University policy.

PROFESSOR DIRK DEN OUDEN (Communication Sciences & Disorders) asked if Provost Amiridis' job would have been easier if we had had a definition of bullying at the time he was called on to deal with the bullying incidents.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS observed that responding to these situations would be easier if there was a definition of bullying and if there was a policy. He noted that the aim of the Faculty Welfare Committee was to find out from the Senate to whether it wanted to proceed with an exploration of the issue.

PROFESSOR YOW (Education) recommended to the Senate a number of articles that Professor Mott has circulated to members of the Faculty Welfare Committee. She felt that the articles helped her to see the issues from a research perspective.

PROFESSOR MOTT noted that the articles are accessible from the Faculty Senate Blackboard site.

PROFESSOR GAIL WAGNER (Anthropology) noted that there are likely more issues than bullying to a faculty code of conduct. She suggested that the issue should be pursued.

PROFESSOR MOTT noted that the aim of his report was to gauge faculty support for developing such a code, before the committee invested the time and resources.

PROFESSOR JERRY HACKET (Philosophy) observed that, generally speaking, in the past it has been the chairs of the departments who have to deal with these matters first. It might be worthwhile for the committee to talk to many chairs on campus to see to what extent this is a factor in a variety of departments before deciding on a policy.

AN UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR observed that we should be careful with that approach, because sometimes the chairs and administrators can be the bullies.

PROFESSOR MOTT thanked the Senators for their thoughts and encouraged anyone with further comments to contact him.

CHAIR KELLY encouraged Senators to visit the Faculty Senate Blackboard site and review the examples of Faculty Codes of Conduct, as well as the links to articles and research on the issues. She suggested that a review of these materials will enrich the Senators' perspectives and prepare them for Dr. Augustine's more detailed report on faculty incivility and bullying within the University. Dr. Augustine is necessarily bound by his own confidentiality principles so he won't be able to give details. He feels his job is not to determine policies and he'll be very careful about doing that. It undermines his ability to be the Ombudsman at this university if he is viewed as taking sides and being very politically active. However, he has agreed to give us more details and data.

Chair Kelly emphasized that the Senators would not be asked to approve a policy next month, but perhaps to approve a direction to go in.

## **5. Reports of Officers**

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES was in Hong Kong at the time of the meeting, and the report was delivered by PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS reported that President Pastides had been in Beijing for the meeting of the Confucius Institute, and went from there to Hong Kong to sign an agreement with the Chinese University of Hong Kong for a corporate program with our Darla Moore School of Business.

The Provost observed that he had been very pleased to welcome over 100 plus new faculty members at the General Faculty meeting of September 5. To a large extent, this much-needed wave of new people was funded by the Faculty Replenishment Initiative. We have allocated 132 positions of the Initiative's planned 200/220 positions. Every college has participated in the Initiative, and the increases in faculty have been more or less proportional to the increases in the size of the student bodies that the colleges have experienced.

Provost Amiridis is also happy with the success rate of the University's dual career policy. We had a number of couples who joined the University this year from other institutions, and the Provost is confident that if we did not have the policy, it would have been harder to attract these strong faculty pairs.

Provost Amiridis expressed his gratitude to the departments, administrators, and faculty members for their hard work in the last recruitment round and in the one to come. We're nearing the last leg of the Initiative and expect to allocate some 30 to 35 positions in the coming year. The Provost is not sure yet whether there will be an open competition for positions or whether

the allocations will go to the colleges with the most critical needs. The Provost's Office is collecting that data now and will be consulting with the deans.

Provost Amiridis notes that the Faculty Replenishment Initiative is the most exciting thing that's happened in the three years that he has been Provost at USC. He expects that by the time the Initiative concludes, we will have achieved a 20/25% increase in our tenured/tenure-track faculty numbers, from around 1,000 to 1,200-1,250. He stated that this increase will be transformational for the institution and will fuel many of our activities in the future.

The Provost presented highlights from a report from Vice Provost Tim Doupnik on classroom enhancement initiatives carried out during the summer. We upgraded 25 classrooms and two large auditoriums, one in the Jones Physical Sciences building and one in Swearingen. Some of the work is ongoing, but is almost complete. We are already working on next summer's schedule, and another 25/30 classrooms will be upgraded, along with the auditorium in the Booker T. Washington complex. We will also be looking very seriously at the undergraduate labs, especially the chemistry labs.

Provost Amiridis delivered an update on Palmetto College, which is garnering some attention from The Chronicle of Higher Education. A Chronicle reporter has contacted various University personnel, including Chair Kelly and the Committee on Curricula & Courses. The Provost was scheduled to talk with her that afternoon. Palmetto College is a big success legislatively. In a very difficult economy, the University was able to secure \$2.8 million in recurring funds to support Palmetto College, as well as a little over \$2 million in one-time funds. Palmetto College is a system-wide initiative. USC Columbia will be offering an Education degree online. USC Aiken will offer two degrees programs online, one in Criminal Justice and one in Nursing. USC Beaufort will offer a Human Services degree, and USC Aiken will offer a business degree. We have just advertised for the position of Chancellor for Palmetto College, and that will consolidate the four regional campuses – Union, Salkehatchie, Lancaster and Sumter – under one administrative umbrella.

The University is very close to finishing an agreement for a contract with a technology partner, an external provider that is going to help us significantly with converting our traditional delivery of courses into a top-of-the-line online delivery system for courses in both Palmetto College and for potential graduate programs coming out of Columbia. We have selected the six degree programs that are ready for conversion, and we are looking very broadly at recruiting the students. The aspect of Palmetto College that made it such a big success in the General Assembly has been the fact that we are trying to reach and serve a segment of the population that does not have access to a traditional higher education. We have been running as a pilot the Back to Carolina Program, which brought 30 new students this year. Their average age is close to 35, and several of them are former students of the University of South Carolina who no longer live in the state, but want a USC degree. The average student in the Back to Carolina Program has around 80 to 90 credit hours, so they need only 30 or so credit hours to graduate, but they had no

way of accessing what we are offering now through asynchronous online course delivery. The Provost will continue to report on the developments at Palmetto College, and is happy to answer any questions about it at any point.

Provost Amiridis announced the conclusion of the dean search at the College of Nursing. Dean Jeannette Andrews will be arriving in January. She is currently Associate Dean for Research at the Medical University of South Carolina in Charleston. She is a graduate of USC and it is wonderful to welcome her back. The Provost expressed his gratitude to the search committee at the College of Nursing for their work in bringing the search to a successful conclusion.

Dean Hildy Teegen has decided to step down and the search is underway for a new dean at the Darla Moore School of Business. The search committee has been constituted, and the University has engaged a search firm to assist with the process. The Provost is hopeful that by the end of the calendar year, or very early in 2013, we will be able to name a new dean in the Darla Moore School of Business. He is confident that the reputation of the School of Business will guarantee us an excellent candidate pool.

The University is moving ahead with dean searches at three of our four regional campuses, including a reopening of the search for a new dean at USC Union. Dean Carpenter stepped down in May at USC Sumter, and Dean Catalano at USC Lancaster has announced that he will be stepping down at the end of the calendar year. The University is moving ahead on these searches, also utilizing an external search firm.

Provost Amiridis delivered an update on the University's Family-Friendly Policy, which has been extended from the tenure and promotion procedures to the post-tenure procedures, as well. Our former policy was silent on the application of the Family-Friendly Policy to the post-tenure review, and it is now clear that the University extends the same benefits to the post-tenure review. Faculty may request an extension of one year of the post-tenure period, as long as it is requested within one year of a precipitating life event such as the birth of a child, the adoption of a child, the placement of a foster child, a serious illness within the immediate family, or death in the immediate family. The Provost is pleased that the University has corrected the initial oversight and notes that he has never seen an abuse of the policy.

PROFESSOR MARCIA ZUG (Law) observed that a number of other law schools have been very interested in our Family-Friendly Policy because South Carolina's is considered one of the best.

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

There was no report.

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

CHAIR KELLY observed that one of the great things about being Chair of the Faculty Senate is coming into contact with a lot of really great people who serve on our faculty committees, with the common goal of bettering the University. She opened her report with an update on the activities of some of our committees.

Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Chaired by Professor Joan Culley (Nursing), is dealing with some important issues with respect to transfer students, and also may be talking about the student code of conduct later this year.

Professor Jim Knapp (Earth & Ocean Sciences) chairs the Faculty Advisory Committee and also is our Chair-Elect for Faculty Senate. We approved a few changes in the Faculty Manual at the September 5 meeting of the General Faculty. The committee will continue addressing some of the issues relating to tenure and promotion.

The Faculty Budget Committee is currently chaired by Professor Tom Regan (HRSM). Faculty Steering Committee had an interesting conversation with Provost Amiridis about salary compression as being, perhaps, the focus for this year. We received a 3% raise across the board but that doesn't really address faculty salary compression, which is a big issue at this university. We need the data and the analysis of the data. Faculty Budget will be reviewing the salary compression data with the goal of working with the Provost's Office on resolving any issues.

The Faculty Welfare Committee is chaired by Professor David Mott (Medicine). The committee is not only investigating a faculty code of conduct and the possibility thereof, but also planning for flu shots later on this fall. The Committee also hopes to conduct a Faculty Climate Survey or a Faculty Satisfaction Survey. There are some good ones out there that have already been used at other institutes and the Faculty Welfare Committee is interested in using the data from a survey to, in part, drive what the activities of the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Chair Kelly encouraged Senators and interested faculty to visit the Faculty Senate's Blackboard site and to let her know if they experience access or navigation problems.

## **8. Unfinished Business**

There was no unfinished business.

## **9. New Business**

PROFESSOR MARCO VALTORTA (Computer Science and Engineering) moved that the report from the Committee on Curricula & Courses return to the previous format, where it was broken down college by college and the changes from each college were voted on separately. A voice-vote was conducted, and the Senators endorsed the new format of presenting the report en masse and breaking out particular sections if discussion was necessary.

## **10. Good of the Order**

DIRECTOR DAVID AURICH (Academic Integrity) addressed the Senate to introduce himself and to commend the Senate for its consideration of a Faculty Code of Conduct. He offered his assistance to Senators and faculty regarding academic responsibility and issues involving the University's honor code policies.

PROFESSOR (AND PAST CHAIR) PATRICK NOLAN (Sociology) addressed the Senate to recommend the active shooter short video prepared by Homeland Security. Campus Law Enforcement has incorporated aspects of it into their training programs. Professor Nolan will send the link to the video to Chair Kelly, who will make it available to the faculty.

## **11. Announcements**

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

## **12. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed.