

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
April 2, 2014

1. Call to Order.

CHAIR JAMES KNAPP (Earth & Ocean Sciences) welcomed all senators, members of the administration, faculty members, and distinguished guests and called to order the April 2, 2014, meeting of the University of South Carolina – Columbia Senate.

Chair Knapp observed that the Senate had a particularly full agenda with important business to conclude, including balloting for the position of Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate and voting on a posted resolution on academic freedom which was derived from this body.

The Chair acknowledged an outstanding slate of candidates for the Chair-Elect position:
Augie Grant (Journalism and Mass Communications)
Jim Hunter (Theatre and Dance)
Charles Mactutus (Psychology)
Tom Regan (Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management)

He believes that the robust slate is a reflection of the health of the Senate and the interest of our faculty to lead this body. Chair Knapp thanked the four candidates for their willingness to serve as Faculty Senate Chair and their continued dedication to the university.

The candidates' one-paragraph bios and CV's have been posted on the Blackboard website and copies of the bios were distributed onsite at the meeting at the table as Senators signed in.

Chair Knapp briefly reviewed the election procedure:

In the case of elections for single positions such as the Chair-Elect, voting shall be by secret ballot and a majority is required for election – a majority of the members onsite voting. There is a further provision that if a candidate receives a majority on the first ballot, then he will be declared the winner of the election. If no candidates receive a majority on the first ballot, then the candidates receiving the highest and the next highest number of votes shall be the nominees for a second vote. The ballots were distributed as Senators signed in on the attendance sheet. Each Senator received two ballots. One is for the initial ballot and the second blank piece of green paper is for a second ballot, if one is required.

Each candidate has the opportunity to appear before the Senate and make a brief statement and then entertain questions from the Senate. Each candidate will be allocated 3 minutes to make his statement and no more than 3 minutes for questions from the Senate.

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR KNAPP asked for corrections to the minutes of the 5th March, 2014, meeting. These minutes have been posted on the Faculty Senate website and on the Faculty Senate Blackboard website. There were no corrections and the minutes were approved as posted.

3. Invited Guest

CHIEF DIVERSITY OFFICER JOHN DOZIER addressed the Senate to talk about the work of his office. Dr. Dozier was appointed as of June 1, 2013, to be the first Chief Diversity Officer for the University of South Carolina. His appointment was an outgrowth of a concerted effort over a period of years to establish such a position here at the University.

Dr. Dozier opened his address with an overview of the definition of diversity:

“Diversity refers to the variety of personal experiences, values, and world views that arise from differences of culture and circumstance. Such differences include: race, ethnicity, religion, national origin, gender, age, disabilities, sexual orientation, gender identity, social economic status.”

Dr. Dozier also provided a definition of inclusion:

“Inclusion refers to the active, intentional and ongoing engagement with diversity in ways that increase one’s awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathetic understanding of the complex ways individuals interact within institutions. Inclusion is the act of creating environments in which any individual or group can feel welcome, respected, supported, and valued.”

Diversity is very structural in its nature and involves who’s here, who is present across a broad spectrum of characteristics. Inclusion, on the other hand, involves reframing rather than reforming our academic culture to address the needs of all populations, especially under-represented groups.

Dr. Dozier talked about the difference between recruiting and attracting diverse members to our academic community. For example, addressing the lack of women in STEM fields by recruiting more women faculty and young women students doesn’t solve the problem. To address the problem a more inclusion-focused way, we will emphasize *attracting*, rather than *recruiting*, and helping students, faculty, and staff thrive rather than simply focus on retaining them.

Dr. Dozier offered the following explanation: If I am recruiting you as a faculty member to the University of South Carolina, I am attempting to understand your values, I am attempting to understand what your needs are. And, in trying to make sure that I am matching your needs and your values with what is provided by the university. Conversely, if the university attracts you, you are seeking membership into the

university's community. You already get how the university will help you to achieve success and you see yourself fitting in. Similarly, if the university is focusing simply on retaining you, all the university is doing is looking for ways to keep you engaged so you can complete your goal. If the university helps you to thrive, it is purposely seeking to understand who you are at your core and creating an environment that supports your academic work and social well-being to an extent that helps you to exceed even beyond your expectations of yourself.

Dr. Dozier presented statistics from our undergraduate enrollment data for the fall of 2012. Approximately 21% of our students are minorities, which is broken down as 11% African American, 4% Latino Hispanic, 3% Asian, and 3% who identify as two or more races or ethnicities. Of note also, is that 55% of our students are females. Regarding our full-time faculty composition, minority faculty makeup about 20% of all full-time faculty, which is broken down as 5% African American, 3% Latino Hispanic, 10% Asian, and 1% who identify as two or more races. While female students make up 55% of the student body, women only make up 41% of our faculty.

According to a January 2013 report in *The Chronicle for Higher Education*, in 2012 49.9% of our nation's children younger than the age of 5 were identified as minority. For every 100 18-year-olds, there are only 95 4-year olds and as race and ethnicity trends shift from ages 18 to 5, so does family income. The population is coming poorer.

Three factors are causing great concern for many universities: Our recruitment pools are becoming more diverse both nationally and in the State of South Carolina, the number of white and black children from age 18 to 5 is declining while the number of Asian and Latino students is increasing. This pool is our future. In 13 years this will be our recruiting pool, and it is decreasing in size and also becoming poorer. So the question is, "How ready are we to attract and serve the needs of tomorrow's students both inside and outside of the classroom?" The University is working hard to address these concerns. We have minority recruiting in place – it is very active. We have the academic coaching and engagement program that helps to support our minority and low-income students. We also have an LGBT coordinator in the Office of Multicultural Student Affairs. We have a Gamecock Guarantee and the Opportunity Scholars Program. Another vehicle for access is the new project Palmetto College that provides online access for many of our residents but, most importantly, we have the Carolinian Creed.

Dr. Dozier expressed his pride in the fact that our faculty has adopted, as a faculty commitment, within the Faculty Manual the Carolinian Creed. The Carolinian Creed is one of the most eloquent documents that speak to our values in a unique way and it also provides a vision that stretches our university to reach beyond tolerance to inclusivity.

Dr. Dozier noted that one of the challenges of his work is that diversity and inclusion require change. Change is often difficult work and is often done in the face of resistance. It takes time and commitment and persistence. In addition to challenges associated with change we also must consider who we are as an organization, our organization's personality. Dr. Dozier used an analogy comparing a cheetah to a wolf pack to illustrate

the value of teamwork and collaboration, and as a springboard to ask relevant questions regarding our efforts at inclusion. So what kind of organization are we? Are we like the cheetah, are we crisis driven? Do we have isolated efforts? Do we lack coordination? Do we lack point leadership around diversity issues? Do we have only symbolic support? Are our solutions to diversity and inclusion simple and mechanistic? Conversely, are we strategically focused? Are we connecting and synchronizing efforts? Are we collaborative? Do we have defined leadership roles with engaged senior leadership? Do we have both symbolic and material support? Are we innovative and creative? Are we disciplined and relentless? Are we accountability focused?

Dr. Dozier noted that if we recognize the challenges that we face and we embrace the values as reflected in our Carolinian Creed, we have the building blocks from which we can create a more inclusive university. He presented strategic objectives for success in the areas of diversity and inclusion:

1. Improve the visibility and integration of diversity and inclusion as a strategic imperative.
2. Increase the representation of under-represented students who apply, are accepted, and enroll in the USC system institution.
3. Increase the number of faculty, staff and administrators from under-represented groups in terms of recruiting retention, decision making committees, councils, and administration.
4. To enhance the campus climate for diversity and inclusion by continuing to build an environment that is inclusive, safe, and respectful for all people and one that fully embraces our Carolinian Creed.
5. Fostering an environment that enhances teaching, research, and scholarship around issues of diversity and inclusion.
6. Encourage K-12 partnerships that build the educational pipeline by reaching students at an earlier age.
7. Improving our accountability.

Dr. Dozer emphasized his belief that it is his job to work himself out of a job. His vision for the University of South Carolina relative to diversity is that we become a place that no longer needs an LGBT coordinator, that we become a place where an Office of Multicultural Student Affairs is no longer necessary, that we become a place that no longer needs a Chief Diversity Officer. Not because budget constraints dictate these are no longer core functions but because we provided space, a culture where diversity is not just a visionary set of values but core to the teaching, learning, and research experiences that we provide to every student. Where we attract, students, faculty, and staff who represent the spectrum of diversity and help them to grow and thrive. Dr. Dozier offered his support to all departments as they make this university a better place. He then opened the floor for questions.

PROFESSOR JORGE CAMACHO (Languages, Literatures, and Cultures) asked to whom the chief diversity officer is accountable and whether the Diversity Office has the budget to support these strategic objectives.

DR. DOZIER responded that he is working with the Provost, President, and Human Resources now to build a budget for the new fiscal year. With each of the strategies that he has described, his office has very specific objectives to meet those strategies. One idea that he has been considering is a mini grant program to assist with funding activity focused on inclusion and diversity here on campus. He looks forward to involving and engaging all faculty in this discussion.

PROFESSOR MAJOR RAY HAMMOND (Aerospace Studies) observed that perhaps Objective #6 in Dr. Dozier's list should be the #1 priority, then asked Dr. Dozier to clarify his vision of accountability.

DR. DOZIER noted that he is working with the President to set measurable goals regarding the University's structural diversity and on developing plans for achieving them.

4. Report of Committees.

a. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Rebekah Maxwell Secretary:

PROFESSOR REBEKAH MAXWELL (Law Library) presented three nominees for two-year terms on the Committee on Professional Conduct:

Professor Ed Dickey (Education)
Professor Suzanne McDermott (Public Health)
Professor Lucia Pirisi-Creek (Medicine)

She left the floor open for further nominations.

Professor Maxwell then introduced the Elections Committee, consisting of herself, Secretary-Elect Elizabeth West, and Parliamentarian Bill Sudduth. The Elections Committee has the responsibility for handling the ballots in the election of the Faculty Senate Chair-Elect.

Each of the four Chair-Elect candidates briefly addressed the Senate, giving background information and their reasons for running for the post. Professor Maxwell requested that the Senators give the election their consideration and mark their ballots, and reported that the ballots would be collected before the reports of the officers, with the results to be announced during the report of the Secretary. She thanked the candidates for their willingness to be nominated.

CHAIR KNAPP added his commendation, noting that all of the candidates are outstanding faculty members and leaders in their own right, and their willingness to run makes a strong statement about the health of the Senate and the university.

b. Committee on Admissions, Professor Joan Donohue, Chair:

CHAIR KNAPP presented the report on behalf of Professor Donohue (Business), reminding Senators that at the March meeting Professor Hunter Gardner from the Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures presented a report from the Committee on Admissions introducing a change to the Admissions Policy for the university. The recommendation from the Admissions Committee, which has been posted on the Blackboard website, is to accept Advanced Placement Computer Science in fulfilling the Math or Science requirement for the purpose of admissions to USC. This recommendation was introduced at our last meeting and it has been posted on the website. There was no discussion and the recommendation was approved as posted.

c. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Sarah Barker, Acting Chair:

PROFESSOR SARAH BARKER (Theatre & Dance) brought forward proposals from the College of Arts and Sciences, the Moore School of Business, the College of Education, the College of Engineering and Computing, the College of Mass Communications and Information Studies and the College of Pharmacy on pages (please see attachment, pages 1-11). There was no discussion and the proposals were approved.

d. Committee on Instructional Development, Professor Ernest Wiggins, Acting Chair:

PROFESSOR ERNEST WIGGINS (Journalism & Mass Communications) brought forward proposals from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education. There was no discussion and the proposals were approved.

e. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor John Grego, Acting Chair:

PROFESSOR JOHN GREGO (Statistics) presented a brief report on the Faculty Climate Survey that was conducted last year. The Faculty Climate Survey was developed by the Faculty Welfare Committee during the 2012-2013 academic year. The Committee first envisioned the survey as focusing on faculty civility, but it transmogrified into a survey covering a large number of issues on campus. It was administered by UTS in the spring of 2013 and includes responses from over one-third of our faculty members. The survey included tenured track faculty, non-tenured track faculty and tenured faculty, as well as adjunct faculty. Statistical analyses were conducted during the summer of 2013 by Stat Lab and the report was finalized in February of this year.

Some items of greatest concern include faculty involvement in selecting institution-wide software and technology, and improvements in campus accessibility for persons with disabilities.

Most of the items with the greatest level of satisfaction related to a supportive-unit atmosphere. This includes respect from colleagues, respect from chairs, and respect from

students. However, the long-form responses showed that these very same items can also be sources of great concern. Other issues of concern focused on three demographic factors: gender, faculty rank, and race/ethnicity. Most of the gender disparities were related to issues of unit atmosphere. Another issue that generated concern was that of available health care options for families/households, which produced a gender disparity in that female faculty members were more dissatisfied with current campus policies and procedures than male faculty members.

The survey contained 34 items that revealed strong faculty rank disparities. Most of them focused on differences between non-tenure track faculty dissatisfaction with current conditions and policies, and tenured and tenure-track faculty's attitudes toward policies. There were also some issues related to tenure and promotion but those tended to breakdown by rank in ways that one would typically expect. A question about post-tenure review revealed a disparity between tenured faculty and tenure-track and non-tenured track faculty. The data regarding race and ethnicity has received some descriptive analysis but no statistical analysis, as there were a very low number of minority respondents.

The Faculty Welfare Committee is interested in sharing these results in more depth with various groups around campus. The Committee is working with Vice President Dennis Pruitt to talk about tuition-assistance resources and has spoken recently with Vice President Bill Hogue on information technology issues. It is reviewing non-tenure track policies at other universities, as well as policies related to such topics as hiring, faculty governance, and research space. The survey results, in full and in summary, are available at <http://www.sc.edu/faculty/meetings.shtml> (choose the link for "Faculty Climate Survey 2013").

5. Reports of Officers.

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES greeted his colleagues across the University system and thanked Professors Regan, Mactutus, Hunter, and Grant for volunteering for greater service to the University. The President also thanked Dr. John Dozier for his insights on diversity and inclusion at the University.

On March 19th President Pastides attended the Student Government Association Inauguration at historic Rutledge Chapel when Lindsay Richardson was sworn in as the new Student Body President.

President Pastides reported on some great desegregation events coming up in the next few weeks, and thanked Professors Val Littlefield, Lacy Ford and others who led our desegregation commemoration committee. The President invited everyone to attend the commemoration of the desegregation garden on April 11 at 11:00 a.m. The garden is being created just below his window outside of the Osborne building, inside the brick wall on the Pendleton street side of Osborne. The garden will feature three topiary sculptures by topiary artist Pearl Fryar, representing USC's first three African-American

students, as well as a granite monument engraved with a poem by USC's own Professor Nikky Finney.

The finale, *Our Journey Forward*, will be held the following evening at 7:30 p.m. at the Koger Center, a free event for the entire University and broader community. It will be a multimedia performance (and President Pastides thanked Professor Jim Hunter for his involvement) with original choreography for the evening by the Wideman/Davis Dance company, a new composition by Professor Bert Ligon from our School of Music, and performances by the USC Gospel Choir.

President Pastides reported that we are cranking up our admission and recruitment modalities. We had nearly 25,000 applicants for a freshmen class of approximately 5,000. This is the largest number of applicants in the history of our university. The University flew in counselors from high schools around the country, from good high schools which would bring diversity and excellence to the applicant pool. They came from as far away as Maine, Louisiana, Colorado, and California, and they had a wonderful time here.

For the 22nd year USC students have been named Goldwater Scholars. We have two this year: Connor Bain, who is a double major in computer science and mathematics, and Sophomore Eric Bringley, who is a double major in chemical engineering and chemistry. We also had an Honorable Mention Goldwater Scholar, junior Daniel Utter, who is a marine science major. All three are in the Honors College. The two who received the Goldwater will bring our total cumulative count now to 45 since 1990.

Five Points continues to be a problem. The President noted that the situation is everyone's problem, but that he is not comfortable with how our community is responding. The University has been working to improve transportation, to improve education, to improve lighting. President Pastides is disappointed that we still haven't seen that kind of change with respect to law enforcement – a move to prohibit vehicles coming down there at night, a move toward a pedestrian-comfortable fun zone as opposed to a darker car-filled zone. Until he feels that the changes that have been made will make a true impact, he will continue to recommend to students that they either not go there or be particularly careful, travel in groups, and take other precautions. We've got to see the change in Five Points that we all know are vital not only to our students but to our own families, as well.

President Pastides recently traveled to Washington, D.C., visiting eight of the nine elected members of the House and Senate from South Carolina. He advocated in particular for things he thinks we can win. One is continued support of the Pell Grant and Federal Direct Student Loan Program. We must keep that valuable resource. Our university families pull down \$300 million a year in grants and loans from the Federal Government and they would not be able to go to school here without help from the Federal Government. The President asked, as well, that that program be increased for summer utilization so that students could use those grants and loans in the summer. He also advocated for increased support for basic science research, the life blood not only of

the University of South Carolina but the United States of America with respect to our competitiveness. He framed this issue as a matter of national security and national competitiveness, not as a set-aside for this university or for any particular university. NIH, the NSF, and other agencies are a major reason for America's ongoing competitiveness and innovation and lead role in the world in so many areas. The University will be monitoring and following the legislators to see how their votes go.

USC will be hosting the South Carolina General Assembly's constitutional officers, cabinet members, and local government at the Carolina Baseball Park for a bar-b-que to thank state government and to ask them to be in our court as we move into the real throws of the negotiation about how the university will fare in the appropriations process.

SECRETARY MAXWELL delivered the results of the first round of balloting in the Chair-Elect race, announcing the need for a runoff between Professors Augie Grant and Tom Regan. She explained the procedure and pledged to return with the results during the unfinished business portion of the meeting.

6. Report of Chair.

CHAIR KNAPP opened his report with an update on the implementation of the Workplace Bullying Policy ACAF 1.80. The Faculty Senate has been working diligently to populate the Committee on Professional Conduct, a new Faculty Senate committee that was created through changes to the Faculty Manual from last fall. It consists of ten members of the faculty who will serve to evaluate alleged issues of workplace bullying mediated through the Provost's Office. As of this afternoon, we will have seven members on that committee with provision for three more to be assuming one-year terms. As the policy provides, Chair Knapp has been working closely with the Provost's Office to try to fill the position of the Faculty Civility Advocate. We will be fully implementing that policy in the coming months.

Chair Knapp then presented the resolution on academic freedom for consideration by the Faculty Senate:

"We strongly support the vital importance of academic freedom in our institutions. This freedom and the occasional controversies it can cause are vital to the pursuit of knowledge and truth in every discipline. Further, securing this freedom is a key obligation to accrediting bodies of our faculties, institutions, and governing boards. We therefore condemn any effort on the part of the government to restrict through legislation or otherwise free academic inquiry."

This text is posted on the Faculty Senate's Blackboard website. Chair Knapp delivered an update on activities around the state regarding similar resolutions. USC Upstate passed a resolution with their Senate on March 7 – it was actually much longer and included some additional language but, subsequently, Winthrop passed this language on March 7. The College of Charleston passed this language on March 11. MUSC has a slightly modified version which they approved on March 11. Clemson likewise on March

11; the Citadel on March 18; South Carolina State University on March 20, and we are now the next in line. USC Aiken has drafted a lengthier resolution that is similar to the one from USC Upstate and USC Sumter is looking for some direction from what USC Columbia does. Chair Knapp believes that South Carolina's institutions of higher education have come close to the intent of trying to have a unified voice, but proposes one friendly amendment to the above language: rather than saying just "We" in the first sentence, to insert the language "We the Faculty of the University of South Carolina Columbia Faculty Senate," to make sure that it is specific on who we are and how we are voting. Chair Knapp then opened the floor for comment or discussion. After discussion among the Senators, and suggestions for amending the language, Chair Knapp presented the amended language for the consideration of the Senate:

"We, the Faculty of the University of South Carolina Columbia Faculty Senate, strongly support the vital importance of academic freedom in our institutions. This freedom and the discussions it can cause are vital to the pursuit of knowledge and truth in every discipline. Further, securing this freedom is a key obligation to accrediting bodies of our faculties, institutions, and governing boards. We therefore condemn any effort on the part of the government to restrict, through legislation or otherwise, free academic inquiry."

The Senate adopted the resolution as amended.

7. Unfinished Business.

SECRETARY MAXWELL returned to solicit nominations from the floor for the vacancies on the Committee on Professional Conduct. There were none, and Professors Dickey, McDermott, and Pirisi-Creek were elected.

Secretary Maxwell then offered congratulations to Professor Augie Grant as the winner of the run-off election, and the new Faculty Senate Chair-Elect.

She announced that there are still vacancies on the Grievance Committee and the Tenure Review Board, and encouraged interested Senators and faculty to get in touch.

8. New Business.

There was no new business.

9. Good of the Order.

There were no announcements for the Good of the Order.

10. Adjournment.

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on June 4, 2014, at 3:00 p.m., in the Law School Auditorium.