

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
October 3, 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 then asked for corrections to the minutes of the meeting of September 12, 2012. There were no corrections and the minutes were approved as written.

3. Invited Guest

UNIVERSITY OMBUDSMAN JIM AUGUSTINE (Medicine) addressed the Senate to provide further data regarding faculty incivility and bullying. He opened his report with a quotation from author Stephen Carter: “How we treat one another is what civility is all about.” Carter speculates, and Professor Augustine agrees, that a big part of the problem “stems from the fact that we don’t know each other. Some of us don’t care to know each other, and the not knowing seems to make people think that how we treat one another doesn’t matter.”

Professor Augustine presented a classification of uncivil student behavior from the University of California, Santa Cruz.

- Annoyances
- Minor Disturbances – cellphone going off, a newspaper being read, a student trying to dominant the discussion.
- Aggressive Challenges to the Instructor

Professor Augustine noted that common passive ways for someone to undermine the authority of a colleague is to utilize students to challenge a colleague’s authority, to question a colleague’s ability in front of students or behind the colleague’s back.

Professor Augustine recommended a classic 2008 text entitled “Faculty Incivility” by Twale and DeLuca. The authors note that people in the academy have become less civil to one another and that incivility in all of its forms is on the rise. A central tenant of the book is that incivility is often hidden and perhaps even denied. The authors further define incivility as bullying, mobbing, camouflaged aggression, and harassment.

Professor Augustine used the mnemonic RUDE to define bullying:

Repeated
Unwelcome
Directed
Escalating

Unfortunately, the individual is usually unable to escape from the bullying and is humiliated, offended, and distressed. Over time, this process draws others into the sphere of influence of the bully - students, staff, and other faculty. To say the least, especially in academic settings, it is this power imbalance between the bully and the target that is often a serious problem.

Lewis (2006) has written that bullies are highly manipulative, very socially skilled, very charming, very good at self-promoting and being promoted by others, and they have zero respect for their targets.

Many types of bullying behaviors arise in academic settings. There are active behaviors that threaten an individual's professional status. There are active behaviors that threaten an individual's personal standing, and there are passive types of behaviors that exclude individuals or isolate them from departmental gatherings, meetings, or opportunities. There are behaviors such as giving them the silent treatment, withholding information, keeping them from teaching courses that they want to teach or having students assigned to them that they want to have assigned to them, or preventing their getting a piece of funding that might be available in the department.

Another behavior is that of adopting unreal expectations and literally setting people up to fail. Professor Augustine reported that he has dealt with a number of faculty members since August 15 and in one case it was obvious that the person was being set up to fail. A common pattern involves overworking someone and then when it comes time for promotion and tenure not giving them credit for all the service they've been asked to do and that other people in the department don't therefore have to do. These unreal expectations are sometimes devastating to an individual's career. Other tactics involve destabilizing individuals by taking credit for their work, or giving them meaningless tasks to do.

There has been very little research done in the academy about bullying, but Professor Augustine presented some data on what we know. The first serious study of workplace bullying in the United States was carried out in 2007. Some 37% of the U.S. workforce said that they had been bullied at work. Another 12% said they observed bullying. Most bullies in this survey were bosses, more perpetrators were men than women, and most targets were women. Women do bully and target other women, and men target other men. Bullying is 4 times more prevalent than illegal discriminatory harassment. Sixty-two percent of employers ignore the problem. Forty-five percent of the targets suffer

stress-related health problems. Forty percent of bullies never tell their employers and only three percent of them filed law suits.

Two other studies in the United States were noted, one of 7,000 workers – 12.3% of them indicated they had witnessed bullying. Another 12.6% said they had personally been bullied in the same period of time. So that again comes up to a figure of about 25%. This data comes from the general working population. The data would be different in different organizations and occupations, but workplace bullying is a part of the lives of many adult workers.

In academic settings in other countries the statistics on first hand experiences with bullying look like this: 20% in Finland, 18% in Wales, UK 18, 25 and 42%, and 67% in New Zealand. On average, the figure is around 25 to 30%.

Two studies were conducted in the United States on bullying in the academy. In a study at Loyola University, 36% of faculty members reported having experienced it in the previous 5 years. A 2008 survey reported a figure of 32%.

Informal calculations from university ombuds offices suggest a figure of 5% of faculty who visit to talk about incivility or bullying issues.

The costs of bullying are enormous individually. It costs people their physical and mental health. It frequently creates absentee problems - people stop coming to the office; they look for other ways to get their work done. Bullying has a devastating effect not only on the individual faculty member, but on their families. Institutionally, it costs us people's productivity. It costs us absence from work and a lot of turnover.

C.K. Gunsalus describes the problem of bullying in academia as-“low incident, high severity.” There may not be a lot of them but they are devastating. It is analogous in her opinion to research misconduct - maybe few in number but devastating in their impact. She identifies the aggressor's misuse of the concepts of academic freedom and collegiality as a commonly-used strategy.

Mary Wright Edelman contends that civility's foundations are in our hearts and in our love and respect for our fellow human beings. Our institution's cultures, communities and country – she contends – cannot long survive the loss of this basic and essential gradient of civilization.

In response to questions, Professor Augustine gave several examples of the misuse of collegiality. The aggressor can pretend that the target is not even present in the room.

S/he can freeze the target(s) out of opportunities to be productive as teachers, researchers and as university servants. Professor Augustine, in his role as University Ombuds, has heard from many people that issues came up in their tenure and promotion process that had nothing to do with the unit's criteria, but still influenced a negative vote on the files.

Collegiality used to be a word that we embraced and used and welcomed in the academy, but Professor Augustine notes that, from the data and from his experience, it seems that we are pushing this concept aside. Seventeen states have already proposed legislation that addresses the problem of incivility and bullying in the public sphere. So far none of it has come into law, but if we don't address incivility ourselves, Professor Augustine suggests that the federal government eventually is going to deal with the issue in a labor law context and we will be forced to maintain some degree or standard of civility.

The PowerPoint presentation that accompanied Professor Augustine's report is available on the Ombuds website at <http://www.sc.edu/ombuds/doc/IncivilityFSOct2012.pdf>.

4. Reports of Committees

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

SECRETARY PROFESSOR REBEKAH MAXWELL (School of Law Library) reported on two unplanned vacancies on the Faculty Grievance Committee. These vacancies were created when sitting members were elected to UCTP. One term expires in August of 2013. Professor Jerry Hilbish (BIOL) is willing to serve. For vacancies of a year or less, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee is able to appoint. On behalf of Steering, Professor Maxwell announced the appointment of Professor Hilbish. She thanked Professor Hilbish for his willingness to serve and for his support of faculty governance at USC.

A second vacancy regards a term that expires in August of 2014. Professor Maxwell brought forward the name of a nominee, Professor Ed Dickey (EDU). She left the floor open for further nominations.

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

PROFESSOR BRIAN HABING (Statistics) reported changes from the College of Arts and Sciences, the Moore School of Business, the College of Engineering and Computing, the College of Mass Communications and Information Studies, the College of Nursing, and System Affairs and the Extended University. The changes were approved.

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

PROFESSOR DAVID MOTT (Medicine) invited Senators to continue the discussion from last month's meeting of a faculty civility policy or code of conduct. He reminded

the Senators that the Faculty Welfare Committee will move forward on the issue only with positive feedback from the Senate, and asked for guidance in addressing the issue.

He reviewed the three possible options that he brought before the body at the September meeting:

1. Move the Carolinian Creed into the body of the Faculty Manual to give it the same enforceability as the other contents of the Faculty Manual.
2. Wrap the Carolinian Creed in language that would outline procedures for conflict resolution or even consequences if these core principles are violated.
3. Construct a more legalistic document that would specifically state what is going to happen in terms of resolution, conflict resolution, and consequences.

Professor Mott asked the Senators for their thoughts on whether Faculty Advisory should move forward with any sort of policy and, if so, what level of policy should the committee consider.

PROFESSOR JENNIFER VENDEMIA (Psychology) stated that moving forward with some sort of policy is a very good idea. She noted as a concern the fact that bullies tend to use policies and procedures as part of their tactics of bullying, and suggested thoughtful consideration in working with the second option.

PROFESSOR ROBIN DIPIETRO (Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management) agreed that a policy or code would be a good idea, and echoed the concern that bullies sometimes twist an institution's policies to suit themselves.

PROFESSOR MOTT asked for a motion that Faculty Welfare move forward with a civility policy of some sort. The motion was made and seconded.

PROFESSOR DAN SABIA (Political Science) suggested that the Welfare Committee and the Senate connect a civility or bullying policy and the Carolinian Creed with the policies that the University already has in place regarding such behavior as sexual harassment and discrimination.

CHAIR KELLY asked for a vote on the motion. The Senate voted to go forward with the development of a civility policy or a faculty code of conduct. Chair Kelly then asked if the Senators would like to discuss the format of a policy, or if Senators had a preference among the options presented by Professor Mott.

PROFESSOR MICHAEL HILL (Languages, Literatures, and Cultures) expressed a desire to hear more about how such a policy works in specific cases. How would it make distinctions between what counts as strong disagreements, strong sustained disagreement, and bullying. How would resolution of civility issues or consequences work in the context of the tenure system?

PROFESSOR SABIA recommended to the Senators the policy of UC Davis, which is posted on the Faculty Senate Blackboard site, and which features many principles, specific cases, and how to resolve them in great detail.

CHAIR KELLY noted that the Blackboard site contains many different examples of this type of policy at other institutions, and offers many examples of the kind of code that we might consider.

PROFESSOR DAVID MOTT invited Senators' thoughts and commentary after they have reviewed the sample policies on the Blackboard site. He is happy to hear any thoughts on the issue that Senators wish to share. He will forward all comments to the Faculty Welfare Committee to be used in its consideration as we move forward.

CHAIR KELLY noted that at our next meeting we will discuss the format of the policy and perhaps formulate some definitions to be used. She suggested that it might take the full academic year to construct a policy that everyone is happy with and that we can approve. She thanked Professor Mott and the Welfare Committee for their current work and the work to come.

5. Reports of Officers.

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES greeted his faculty colleagues and opened his report with an update on events on the Horseshoe in preparation for ESPN Game Day on Saturday, October 6. More than 2 million eyes around the nation will be focused on the Horseshoe and, while it is an exciting time, the University community will be uniting in the common purpose of facilitating a secure environment for our students.

President Pastides expressed concern about the recent security issues in Five Points and beyond. He noted that while we have a safe campus, we have fluid boundaries where the campus ends and/or begins relative to the city of Columbia and other neighborhoods. Clearly, there has been an uptick in reporting of incidents and the President has spoken to the Mayor several times about security issues. The Mayor has pledged a significant increase in the patrolling of Five Points during the coming weekend. Relations between the USC police force and the city's are very good but it takes a lot of cooperation. The President and the Provost are concerned first and foremost for the safety of our students, faculty and staff, but also for our reputation. While we believe we continue to have a safe campus, we all have to take responsibility and take care of ourselves and take care of our friends. Those who are involved in law enforcement and security take care of everybody. President Pastides invited comments and insights from the Carolina Family regarding security issues.

On October 10th, there will be a summit on public higher education hosted by the Governor. President Pastides will serve on a panel looking at Higher Education Funding Reform, also known as Accountability Based Funding. The University's perspective has always been one of transparency. We are transparent, we are proud of how we spend the dollars, but there are not enough dollars to do the work that we feel that we have to do.

America and South Carolina are slipping in college enrollment; our college enrollment is flattening and beginning to decline at the time when nations around the world, notably China, India, Brazil, and many others, are pouring lots of public funding into higher education. The conversation at the summit ought not only be about what the University wants but what the state wants, and where the future of the state is going. As always, the University will tie our welfare to economic development, to job creation, to growth, and to the greater well-being of the state. We will talk about an initiative this year that the provost, the deans, and the faculty will be discussing, and that is to have a more robust selection of courses available in the summer. Our goal would be, if it is accessible to the faculty, to have a full a reasonably or relatively full semester in the summer.

As the President mentioned in his State of the University address, students who matriculate will need to graduate on their time rather than on our time. President Pastides described several student-timeline scenarios that would vary from the traditional 4-year college experience and observed how the increasingly sophisticated technology, as well as creative use of beyond-the-classroom experiences, has made scheduling more flexible and fulfilling than it ever has been. With the faculty's endorsement, the University plans to request funding from the State of South Carolina to provide the infrastructure – the faculty salaries, the classroom, the technology, and the advising - that would be necessary to allow students increasingly to graduate on their time.

President Pastides provided an update on the University's leadership initiative. The initiative is focused on all USC students throughout the system and will afford them an opportunity to learn the principles and the concepts related to leadership, including community service, voting, civil discourse, and core values development. The President is very excited about the initiative. He introduced Dr. Cameron Howell, who is working with the President and with Vice-Provost Helen Doerpinghaus, the Provost, the deans, and Dennis Pruitt to develop our leadership initiative. Dr. Howell will be returning to address the Senate in the future and to provide an update. He is happy to answer questions that the Senate and the faculty may have.

President Pastides closed his report with an update on upcoming University events. That night, he and Mrs. Moore-Pastides were hosting the President's Society. On Friday, October 12, they will be hosting the annual Faculty Food for Thought event, a night of fellowship, good food, and beverage. He invited all faculty and Senators to save the date for Food for Thought.

PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS greeted the Senators and faculty and opened his report with the highlights of upcoming events: our dormitory population is expected to double for the weekend, as students take advantage of a policy that allows each student to host a friend or relative for the Friday and Saturday of the ESPN game. Students will also have the opportunity to camp out on the Horseshoe on the Friday night before the game. Campus Security will be making every effort to ensure a safe experience and will be allowing access only to those with USC credentials. Provost Amiridis urged the faculty to spend a few minutes talking with their classes to be mindful of security issues every day, but especially on the ESPN Game Day Weekend.

The Provost offered to the Faculty Welfare Committee the resources of the Provost's Office as the Committee begins to explore and develop a faculty code of conduct. Vice-Provost Dr. Christine Curtis, along with the Legal Counsel Office and the Equal Opportunity Office, will be happy to assist, as well, to be certain that the Committee gets the support it needs in this initiative.

Provost Amiridis reported on the five active dean/chancellor searches currently underway at the University. Three of these searches are for deans at Regional Campuses – Lancaster, Union, and Sumter. We are also in the process of searching for the new chancellor for Palmetto College. Provost Amiridis is chairing this search, and expects to name the Chancellor by late 2012 or early in 2013. Although the search is in the early stages, we have strong interest in the position. We have staggered the Regional Campus deans searches a month or a month and a half behind the chancellor's search to give the opportunity to the new chancellor to be involved in the searches of the Regional deans. We are also moving fairly quickly with the dean search in the Darla Moore School of Business. In all of these searches, we have engaged an executive search firm to facilitate the processes.

The Provost delivered an update on support for doctoral students and for graduate students in general. The University has found the funding and secured an agreement between the Office of the Provost and the Office of the Vice President of Research to continue supporting the Presidential Doctoral Fellowships that the Graduate School has been providing in the last few years. The Graduate School's webpage showcases the Fellows and their accomplishments. Provost Amiridis encouraged faculty and Senators to visit the site and to continue the nomination process for Fellows. The University has also secured for this year funding for travel grants for graduate students, enabling doctoral as well masters students to attend conferences and meetings. The travel grants have received very positive feedback across the University and the Provost is pleased to continue the travel grants this year.

Provost Amiridis provided further information on the contract in process by the University to secure an external partner for technologies and for converting some of our onsite courses to an online format. As part of Palmetto College we will have to convert the last 60 credit hours of a number of undergraduate degrees to an online asynchronous format. One degree from Columbia, two degrees from Upstate, one degree from Aiken, and one degree from Beaufort will be involved in the contract. Another part of the contract will involve converting some of the master's degrees from Columbia to an online format.

Very early on, the University leadership realized that if we are going to be able to attract, retain, and graduate students in an online environment, we have to be state of the art. We are seeking an external partner with the technological expertise to help us produce a collection of high-quality, attractive, online degree programs. The partner will bring in course designers who will work with faculty members to develop the online courses. The content of the courses remains the property of the University. The technological partner

will not be dictating content to the University, but will work on the format, presentation, and delivery of the courses.

There are two elements to the contract. One element involves the undergraduate courses. The partner will help us convert the courses and this will be the extent of its involvement. Regarding graduate courses, the partner's involvement will be more expansive; it will also help us significantly with marketing and with recruiting students.

The University will be very clear in defining the roles of both sides in the process. It is the university's role to make admission decisions. The role of the partner is to develop and deliver marketing information (approved by the university), and to assist with recruitment, to visit companies to conduct outreach to the working adults who would be the potential students in the programs. The role of the partner will include working with the faculty to help the University to convert the courses that are slated for online delivery. The last phase of the process is to stay in touch with the students and to coach them procedurally, keeping them on track with administrative issues such as registration and fee-payment schedules. Advisement and mentoring of the students will remain the purview of the faculty.

This model has been successful in a number of other universities, although we are at the forefront to a large extent. When we put the RFP out, we attracted the national leaders in the industry. The top companies sent us proposals for the RFP. When they came to make presentations to us, they came *en mass*. Provost Amiridis was surprised that they flew in 6 or 9 people from across the country to tell us exactly what they would do. It is very desirable for them to have a partner like the University of South Carolina.

We look very carefully at the financial terms of such a contract. A common model in this industry is a tuition-sharing model, so a university pays no money up front. The partners invest in converting the courses, in marketing, and in recruiting, and then the institution gives the partners a percentage of the tuition. We are, of course, interested in negotiating a very good deal, and the Provost believes that we are almost there. Once the deal is negotiated, the University will take it to the Board of Trustees. Provost Amiridis is unable to provide further details until the contract is finalized, but he will be happy to report further on the details and the numbers once the Board of Trustees has finalized the agreement.

The Provost observed that this pending agreement is exciting for many reasons. It will help us launch Palmetto College. It will help us be much more accessible within the State of South Carolina. It is already generating good press for the University – a complimentary story was recently published about Palmetto College. Our Provost was contacted recently by the Provost of a major research university; inquiring about Palmetto College and seeking information that would help them do the same thing. The relationship with a technology partner is critical to the success of the endeavor.

Provost Amiridis is also very optimistic that the initiative will help us in converting some of our master-level courses and marketing these courses to a bigger audience. The

College of Engineering and Computing has agreed to be one of the early adopters with a couple of new online degrees – Aerospace Engineering and the Engineering Management. The College of Nursing also has agreed to be early adopters with the MSN and the DNP degree programs. There is interest from a number of other colleges but we are planning to launch the initiative with a few offerings, evaluate their process and success, and build from there. The Provost is fairly confident that the online degrees will work well.

In response to questions from the floor, Provost Amiridis made the following points:

Faculty replenishment hiring initiative: approximately 100 new faculty members joined the University this fall. Between 120 and 130 new searches will be going on this year. We have allocated roughly 150-160 positions of the 225 that we have, and we have the flexibility to go to approximately 230 positions. The Provost has asked for departmental data to determine where the greatest needs lie for more faculty positions.

Factors in defining great need include:

Faculty/student ratio

Productivity

Doctoral students graduated

Research funding productivity (primarily STEM fields)

The Provost notes that, depending on the data analysis, we might not use a competitive proposal initiative this year, focusing instead on direct allocation to departments in greatest need of help.

Short notice and lack of faculty input in addressing space issues: Provost Amiridis will ask Vice-Provost Helen Doeringhaus to work with the registrar's Office to facilitate faculty involvement in and timely notice of space-planning issues. He noted, however, that our space issues have come to be a difficult problem and, especially in the short term, we may need to change the way we structure some of our activities at the unit level to maximize the utility of our spaces and infrastructure.

Full summer course schedule: The idea is still in the exploration phase, so no firm model exists. This summer, Dean Mary Anne Fitzpatrick chaired an administrative committee to frame the issues, which include:

- the financial model: funding, tuition rates
- the faculty model: staffing/scheduling issues
- housing issues: access to dorms
- maintenance issues: scheduling maintenance that usually occurs in summer

The Provost will report back with further information when he receives the report of the committee. He emphasized that he will not be in a position to prepare a functional model until he gets the involvement and input of the Senators and University Faculty.

6. Report of Chair.

CHAIR KELLY presented a few highlights of some of the very active Faculty Senate committees:

- Dr. Tom Regan is chairing the Faculty Budget Committee. Their goal this year is to target salary compression issues and work with the Provost's Office to figure out a plan to address some of the salary compression issues across the university.
- Faculty Welfare is very busy. They are working on a Faculty Code of Conduct; they are also looking at soft benefits for domestic partners. Towards the end of this semester, the Committee plans to distribute a faculty satisfaction survey. Chair Kelly encouraged Senators to outreach to colleagues and urge response to the survey.
- Dr. Charley Adams, who chairs the University Athletics Advisory Committee, will deliver a report to the Senate later in this academic year. The Committee's focus is pro-active; its members are working policies to prevent problems rather than being crisis-oriented. We are striving to avoid athletics crises of the sort that have appeared in the news lately at other institutions.

7. Unfinished Business.

SECRETARY MAXWELL returned to solicit nominations from the floor for the two-year vacancy on the Faculty Grievance Committee. There were none, and the Senate elected Professor Ed Dickey to the vacancy. Professor Maxwell thanked Professor Dickey for his willingness to serve and for his support of faculty governance at the University.

8. Good of the Order.

DIRECTOR JESSICA JOHNSTON (Healthy Carolina) presented a preliminary overview of a policy currently in development for a tobacco-free campus at USC. The policy would ban tobacco on all USC-leased and -owned property. Director Johnston addressed the Senate to provide background data and to gather feedback from the Senators.

The University's current policy, developed in 2006, reads that "that the intent of the university is to further develop the policy for a tobacco free campus." Currently, tobacco use is restricted to a 25 foot boundary from the buildings but all buildings are tobacco free. A proposal was submitted to request that a task force be assembled. The task force was just assembled in September. The task force is just beginning the policy developments, discussion, and resolution of the issues.

Director Johnston shared the following data from a faculty and staff assessment from 2011 (the next assessment will be conducted in 2013):

7.1% of respondents reported cigarette or tobacco use in the previous 30 days.
 The average response to this question in South Carolina is 20%
 2% of respondents to the USC assessment reported the use of smokeless tobacco.

Data from the National College Health Assessment reveals that:

13.8% of USC students smoke.
27.7% of South Carolinians in the 18-24 age range smoke.
Our Healthy Campus 2020 goal is 14.4%.

Our students hold the perception that 85.8% of the student body smokes.

4.57% of USC students report using smokeless tobacco.
4.4% report using hookah (water pipes).
Students believe that 65.6% of the student body uses hookahs.

On the 2011 faculty and staff assessment, 85% of respondents were in favor of a completely tobacco-free campus. 75% of respondents on the 2010 NCHA were in favor.

Director Johnston noted that studies have shown that 70% of smokers want to quit, and that universities that implement smoke-free policies have higher rates of cessation attempts and cessation.

USC's School of Medicine went tobacco free in July, MUSC in March. USC-Upstate has been tobacco free since 2008. Converse College just went tobacco free. Two of our peer and aspirant schools, Indiana (Bloomington campus) and Kentucky, have gone tobacco free.

Director Johnston presented the highlights of the revised policy:

- Grounds and spaces and that are university-owned and -leased property would include university-owned vehicles. That is already in the current policy.

- The policy that would prohibit receipt of funding from tobacco industry and recruitment/sponsorship activities. The task force is doing some investigation of any funding that is received here at the university. We certainly don't want to exclude any funds we receive for research and health-related topics.

- Including tobacco cessation services - if we are going to do this we definitely need to provide and enhance services which includes counseling and therapy.

- Improved enforcement – we know that we have some current issues with enforcement so we have a subcommittee that will be dealing with that.

- Routine communications –The policy is going to apply to everyone: visitors, faculty, staff, students, contract workers, vendors.

- Maintain our task force and make sure that task force stays in place.

Director Johnston emphasized that the policy is currently in the proposal stage. The proposal is to announce the intent of the policy in November along with Great American

Smokeout Day. The task force voted that June 2013 would be the best time to pass the policy because student orientation starts June 1st.

Director Johnston invited questions and feedback from Senators and faculty.

Feedback from the floor included the following questions and observations:

How will enforcement be implemented?

Where would smoking be allowed? City streets or private vehicles on city streets?

Has anyone talked to the smokers who congregate outside buildings and asked them whether a policy like this would motivate them to quit?

Wouldn't a more prudent expenditure of resources focus on underage drinking and drug use, instead of targeting people who are engaged in a legal activity?

How do you plan to use the statistics to frame the issues? If students think that 80% of the student body smokes, and it's actually only 7%, is this even a problem that needs addressing?

Several Senators/faculty thought the policy would be overkill or would affect students' attendance in class if they are driven off campus to smoke.

Director Johnston noted that these were good questions and that the task force was continuing assessment and hoped to be able to provide more information in the future. She stated that talking to those in "smoking pods" outside buildings was a great idea and the task force would follow up. She described policies at other institutions that were enforced through fines, but acknowledged that more assessment is needed. She invited input from faculty and Senators on ways to develop useful assessment. Her contact information is: 777-4752, jessiclj@mailbox.sc.edu, and www.sc.edu/healthycarolina .

8. Announcements

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Wednesday, November 7, 2012, at 3:00 p.m. in the Law School Auditorium.

9. Adjournment.

A motion to adjourn was passed and seconded.