

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
June 4, 2014

1. Call to Order.

CHAIR JAMES KNAPP called the meeting to order and welcomed senators, members of the University's administration, faculty members, and distinguished guests to the final meeting of the 2013-2014 academic year.

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR KNAPP asked for corrections to the minutes of the meeting of April 2, 2014. There were none, and the minutes were approved as posted.

3. Invited Guest

CHAIR KNAPP welcomed the Vice President for Transportation and Facilities, Mr. Derrick Huggins, to address the senate.

VICE PRESIDENT DERRICK HUGGINS (TRANSPORTATION & LOGISTICAL RELATIONS) reported on his department's parking and transportation master plan. Vice President Huggins has had several meetings with key staff members on campus to get some direction and some history of where parking and transit has been for the last ten years. The University has never had a major study of this nature, and the Vice President is committed to facilitating the participation of our faculty in the planning

Vice President Huggins and his team have researched transportation plans at some other SEC schools, and have found some appealing paradigms, but understand that our plan has to specifically address the needs of USC. They hope to arrive at a hybrid solution that will advance transportation and safety on our campus.

Vice President Huggins is very happy with the turnout of the Assembly Street project, from Pendleton down to Blossom Street. He hopes to mimic that success across campus, particularly with regard to Pickens Street, because he sees some opportunity there.

He will also engage our student groups and, after a series of meetings with our various constituencies, will return to the Faculty Senate to present a plan. Vice President Huggins introduced the consultants whom his group is working with, Andy McClurg with Sasaki and Michael Towns with CDM Smith, and asked them to report on the activity getting underway in the next few months.

MR. ANDY McCLURG (SASAKI ASSOCIATES) noted that Sasaki Associates is a multidisciplinary planning firm out of Boston. He introduced Michael Townes with CDM Smith, which has an office here in town. Both Mr. McClurg and Mr. Towns have done a lot of work in the area over the years. CDM Smith is on board primarily to help with the

transit side of the whole transportation picture but also because of their local knowledge and engineering expertise.

Mr. McClurg delivered an overview of the first phase of the transportation planning process. It's a fairly focused effort and the main idea is to bring together all the different threads of access and mobility as they apply to the university campus. The goal is optimizing the ways in which the various components can support each other and how the mobility options and opportunities for faculty, staff, visitors, alumni throughout the campus can be improved through a coordinated approach.

Mr. McClurg noted that this process will include a number of exciting individual initiatives. He sees a real opportunity for the University to extend the quality of the Horseshoe and the Historic Campus over into the Innovista area through the design and function of streets. At the same time, Mr. Towns will be looking at how the transit system of the University can be better integrated and coordinated with the city's CMRTA services and how all of that plays into people's access to parking and their ability to move quickly and comfortably between parking and their ultimate destination. At the same time, the team will be looking at bicycle access and at the fine points of pedestrian circulation through the campus, how walking across campus can be made more attractive, comfortable and, particularly, safe. The plan is in the service of a new vision of the campus as more pedestrian-orientated, safer, and less dependent on cars.

The planning team understands and supports the idea of unfettered vehicular access, but a college campus is a special place, a national trend is emerging where colleges realize that transportation and mobility are key to the improvement of the academic environment. All over the country colleges and universities are improving the ability of people to move around on foot and to mingle and to collaborate and collect in campus open spaces. All of these are all transportation issues, and they have great effect, not only on people's enjoyment of the campus but on the quality of the learning environment and, in turn, SAT scores, recruitment, all the things that are an important matrix of the university's success.

Mr. McClurg noted that he and his team are going to be doing a lot more talking and listening, but over the next couple of months are going to develop a high-level set of recommendations for priorities and implementation strategies that they hope will lead to a more detailed and finer-grain assessment as we move forward in the months after July/August. The team will want to hear from the faculty, individually and collectively.

MICHAEL TOWNES (CDM) added that USC is a special place. The campus is a special place, but it is not a place that stands alone. It exists in the environmental of the City of Columbia, South Carolina, and the two systems to fit together. Mr. Townes noted that the buses that are provided on campus need to work in an integrated fashion with what's provided in the city.

Mr. Townes echoed the sentiments of Mr. McClurg and Vice President Huggins that this planning process needs to be and will be totally collaborative, so that all of the

stakeholders will have significant input - the students, the faculty, the workers, and the city. His goal is to bring better connectivity by all modes to the campus.

VICE PRESIDENT HUGGINS opened the floor for questions.

PROFESSOR AUGIE GRANT (SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM and FACULTY SENATE CHAIR-ELECT) asked for data on the faculty representation on the strategic planning committee.

VICE PRESIDENT HUGGINS is working with Chair Knapp to determine the composition of the committee, but assured the Senators that they will be included in the decision-making process.

PROFESSOR GRANT wondered if there is a target number of faculty for the planning committee.

VICE PRESIDENT HUGGINS pledged to work with the Provost and Chair Knapp to make ensure inclusion of the faculty.

PROFESSOR GRANT noted his concerned that there be representation of the faculty on the committee.

He then asked if statistics are available on the number of parking spaces currently available to faculty and how that has changed over the last few years and will change over the next few years.

VICE PRESIDENT HUGGINS confirmed that his office has that information and that he will send it to Professor Grant.

PROFESSOR GRANT noted the changes taking place in the Coliseum area, and asked what the plans are over the next year for parking and how will that specifically impact faculty, staff and students.

VICE PRESIDENT HUGGINS noted that there has been some reduction in parking. The University will be adding more surface lot spaces, probably on the back side of 743 Greene Street (the USC Facilities Center). Vice President Huggins is unable at present to know how many spaces will be created, but expects that they will be available in August of this year. There also is capacity for paid spaces in the Discovery Garage.

PROFESSOR GRANT asked whether at this point Vice President Huggins is able to determine what the net reduction is in number of spaces for faculty is going to be this August versus last August?

VICE PRESIDENT HUGGINS will have that after working with the campus architect, but estimates that the number is around 200 spaces. He noted that there is capacity in the Discovery Garage.

PROFESSOR BRIAN HABING (STATISTICS) recognized the difficulty of managing parking issues, but asked Vice President Huggins to avoid equating the capacity of the Discovery Garage with free surface-lot parking. The \$720.00 charge to park in the Discovery Garage amounts to either a fee increase or a salary reduction, so garage capacity is not interchangeable with surface-lot parking.

PROFESSOR DIRK den OUDEN (COMMUNICATION SCIENCES & DISORDERS) wondered if the planning team had considered the idea of providing incentives to use alternative means of transport.

VICE PRESIDENT HUGGINS described a portion of the master plan called Transportation Demand Management (TDM). As a part of it, the team will look at different types of parking scenarios and alternate parking strategies.

MICHAEL TOWNES expanded on the idea: TDM is a broad discipline that seeks to maximize the transportation network as a whole, and it are incentives and disincentives. Parking pricing is clearly an issue as it relates to more choice. Incentives for transit use could be lower cost. It could be better service. It could be combined service with CMRTA. It could be a situation where a student or faculty pass becomes a transit pass and the user has an alternative that is free. All of these things will be analyzed in this process.

CHAIR KNAPP noted that, as a logistical aspect, the next couple of months will not be ideal for engaging faculty during the course of the summer. The faculty reporting date is August 15. Certainly there are some faculty here on campus during the next couple of months but if the planning teams wants to adequately engage the faculty, the planning process has to extend well into the start of the fall semester so that faculty don't feel like they are being disenfranchised by being away during the summer.

Chair Knapp observed that the faculty does have representation here in the University and it is largely through the Faculty Senate. The faculty tends to be well represented, but this is an issue that affects other groups, including the staff. The University's staff members often don't have the same voice and so Chair Knapp cautioned Vice President Huggins and the planning team to make sure that the staff is included in this discussion. They are a central part of this University, as much as any other group of stakeholders.

MICHAEL TOWNES agreed that Chair Knapp's observations are well taken, particularly with regard to the survey portion. Any study like this comes at a cost and his group tries to do it as effectively and within the cost as possible. Earlier that day, Mr. Townes was advocating for a broader outreach. He noted that technology such as Survey Monkey would allow the team to communicate with the faculty even though they are not here during the summer, but agreed that the study period needs to be extended to get the broadest input. While Mr. Townes honors the Faculty Senate and believes that it is great representation for the faculty, he suggested that individual surveys might speak even better for faculty members on these types of issues.

CHAIR KNAPP asked if the plan includes the elimination of free parking for faculty and staff, especially given that there is an increasing competition for space on the campus footprint for other uses.

VICE PRESIDENT HUGGINS acknowledged that free parking for faculty and staff will be eliminated at some point in the future. He does not at present know what the parking fee will be per month. He is considering the issue of parking as a whole, and some segments of the University's population cannot continue to subsidize the others. We have asphalt deterioration all across campus. His department gets a lot of phone calls about pot holes and other maintenance issues. Currently, the only groups that are paying for parking are the garage holders and our students and we can't keep pulling money from our students to put into faculty lots. Vice President Huggins pledged to be forthcoming with details when the parking system is revised.

PROFESSOR JOSHUA TARBUTTON (MECHANICAL ENGINEERING) expressed confusion at the idea that we cannot increase faculty salaries and then increase the parking costs. He asked how that decision came about.

VICE PRESIDENT HUGGINS acknowledged that he could not speak to the issue of faculty salaries, but noted that we have deterioration of lots on campus and we have to pay for those lots. The infrastructure has to be brought up to speed, and we cannot keep pulling from other sources where we have a deterioration of a product that the faculty and staff are using and not paying for.

CHAIR KNAPP noted that this clearly is an issue that affects a lot of people across the campus. Vice President Huggins and the consultants will return at later dates to share more information as the process evolves.

4. Report of Committees.

a. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Rebekah Maxwell Secretary:

PROFESSOR REBEKAH MAXWELL (LAW LIBRARY) announced the appointment of Professor Andrew Graciano (ART) to fill a one-year vacancy created by the retirement of a sitting member of the Faculty Advisory Committee.

She announced vacancies on several other committees:
one vacancy for a full term on the Grievance Committee;
two vacancies for full terms on the Tenure Review Board;
three vacancies for one-year terms on the Committee for Professional Conduct

She invited interested parties to get in touch with her and, after the middle of August, to get in touch with incoming Secretary Elizabeth West.

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

PROFESSOR BRIAN HABING (STATISTICS) presented course proposals from the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Education, the College of Engineering and Computing, and the College of Hospitality, Retail and Sports Management (please see attachment, pages 1-3). There was no discussion and the proposals were approved as presented.

c. Committee on Instructional Development, Professor Charley Adams, Chair:

PROFESSOR HABING, on behalf of Professor Adams, presented proposals from the College of Arts and Sciences; the College of Education; the College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management; the College of Mass Communications and Information Studies, and System Affairs and the Extended University. There was no discussion and the proposals were approved as presented.

d. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Professor Joan Culley, Chair:

PROFESSOR JOAN CULLEY (NURSING) reported on a petition submitted to the Committee from a faculty department representative to the Faculty Senate from the Darla Moore School of Business to reexamine the current grading policy to a plus/minus system.

The Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee recognizes the complexity of this issue, which includes: appropriate input from regional and senior campuses; a study of policy and procedural changes that would be impacted; identification of barriers to implementation; and the implementation of any changes that are the purview of central administration, most particularly the Registrar.

The Committee spent the past academic year carefully studying this proposal and reviewing implications of a plus/minus grading system. Its review included a survey that was distributed to all faculty on the Columbia campus (1,846 faculty members) using Class Climate. Five hundred thirty-seven faculty responded, a 29% response rate. Faculty were asked whether they prefer to keep the current plus-only grading system or prefer to change to a plus/minus grading system.

Faculty were also asked to review arguments that were offered in support of changing the system and arguments in support of keeping the current system. Of the 537 respondents, 444 or 86% of the faculty preferred a plus/minus grading policy, citing greater precision and comparability with major universities across the United States.

Of the arguments in support of changing to a plus/minus system, respondents indicated first, greater precision. That will enable faculty to award grades more precisely that reflect students' performance in courses – 80% of the respondents indicated that.

Consistency with other major universities – 70% responded with that. In the United States, 76% of the universities have a plus/minus system. Twelve universities or 19% have a traditional system with no plus/minuses. One university has a plus system (Baylor), but they are changing to a plus/minus system this summer. Two universities were classified as atypical and those were Wisconsin and Stanford.

The current system is viewed as inflated at USC, where plus grades count as a 0.5 versus 0.3 or 0.33 for a plus grade at most other universities that use the plus/minus system. 57% of the faculty responded to that.

Of the arguments in support of keeping the current plus only system, only 11% of the respondents indicated that the proposed system may have negative effects on scholarships, retention and graduation. Only 12% indicated that the proposed system may result in student confusion and require adjustments by departments. Only 10% indicated that the proposed system does not allow for replicating of grade points of the current system.

It is clear that faculty support a change and the Committee recommends that the University Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions work with the Faculty Advisory Committee to complete a report and to present a proposal to the Senate for a grade change next year.

Professor Culley opened the floor for questions.

PROFESSOR SCOTT TURNER (MANAGEMENT) thanked Professor Culley and the Committee for the work that they have put into this issue. He asked whether the Committee planned to make the survey results, and a summary, available on the Faculty Senate Website, so that Senators can have it as reference.

PROFESSOR CULLEY noted that the survey results, and a summary, are available now on the Faculty Senate website.

PROFESSOR TURNER asked for clarification of the process going forward regarding a potential change to the grading policy.

PROFESSOR CULLEY confirmed the recommendation of the committee that they work with the Faculty Advisory Committee on the four specific issues that she mentioned in her report today, so that the Faculty Senate would have a more thorough report to work with, and that that the Committee bring a motion forward, next year, for a grade change policy.

PROFESSOR TURNER offered another comment for the general information of the Committee going forward. He noted that there has been concern by some in the University community that changing to the plus/minus system may have a negative effect in terms of the average GPA for undergraduate students, which could have an impact for retention of scholarships. During his search for data on the subject, he discovered data

from the University of Florida, which went from a plus-only system to a plus-minus system in the summer of 2009. Their data showed a small drop in the undergraduate GPA of about 1/10th of a point, but by the next fall semester, it had actually bounced back up 1/10th of a point. Overall, there was no net affect from changing from a plus system to the plus/minus system, aside from the temporary drop.

PROFESSOR CULLEY noted that the Committee had seen that data and that much depends on the definition of a minus grade. She acknowledged that it is very difficult to come up with that kind of statistics and to make any projections. But that is a concern and the committee is looking into that.

PROFESSOR DUNCAN BUELL (COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING) asked whether there was no consideration of going to a straight A, B, C, D, F system. He noted a study from the University of Chicago's Statistics Department that indicated more variation in grading from one instructor to the next when a system has more gradations of grades to assign.

Professor Buell also reported that, in collegial discussions, most of the faculty in his department indicated that they would oppose giving plus/minus grades to the same firm extent they oppose giving plus grades now. He wondered if the Committee envisions a compulsion to use the plus/minus grading. The Faculty Manual now states that faculty are not compelled to give plus grades.

PROFESSOR CULLEY described the sources of the data the Committee used, including that from the literature, from the Registrar, and from the Admissions Office. There was discussion about A, B, C, D system, as well as a strict numerical system. The Committee did not go as far as to decide which of those systems might be the most appropriate.

PROFESSOR CULLEY observed that faculty academic freedom allows faculty to grade according to what is in the course syllabus or in the standards of their department or their college or their school. There is nothing that requires faculty to use a particular grading system.

CHAIR KNAPP recognized Professor Culley and her committee for the effort that they expended on this analysis and also designing a survey that might be a future format for digital voting for bodies like the Senate. It was a very well thought out and very unbiased survey and Chair Knapp applauded the committee for all of the thought and effort that went in to pursuing this process over the last year.

Chair Knapp also commented on an issue that came to light during the Committee's survey process: we as faculty have no formal mechanism to reach out to and communicate with our colleagues on the regional campuses. And so the faculty on the regional campuses, who are subject to the Faculty Manual and the Bulletin here at the USC Columbia Campus, were not able to participate in that survey. Chair Knapp felt that it was inappropriate for the Committee or the Senate to come forward with a resolution without having fairly engaged those faculty in the process, even though they are part of

our Senate and they have representation on some of our Senate committees. That was part of the reason for deferring any formal resolution before this body until we have fairly included those people in the process. That will be one of the first orders of business for the fall semester.

PROFESSOR CULLEY emphasized that this is a very complex issue because between the regional campuses and the other campuses there is one shared academic record. Professor Culley noted that this issue came before the Senate in 1998 and, while it was approved by the Columbia campus, it was not approved by the regional campuses. The issue did not move forward because there has to be one shared academic record. Although there is a need to survey the other campuses, there is no comprehensive mechanism between faculty on all of our committees to engage in conversations with our sister campuses. We know the survey has to be distributed to the other campuses. One of the things that have to be resolved next year is to develop a mechanism.

e. Faculty Budget Committee, Professor Varsha Kulkarni, Chair:

PROFESSOR VARSHA KULKARNI (PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY) presented a resolution on behalf of the Faculty Budget Committee regarding salary compression. In anticipation of action on the resolution, she delivered a summary and highlights.

Salary compression is a long-standing issue at the University of South Carolina and is an issue of great concern to any faculty. The Faculty Budget Committee, along with the Provost's Office, has been looking into this issue. The Committee particularly has been studying the salary data from the Oklahoma State Data Base and comparing the salaries at universities comparable to USC, i.e., our peer and peer aspirant institutions.

Based on this analysis, we can clearly say that salary compression does exist. The extent to which it exists is different in different departments and at various ranks.

In June of 2013, the Faculty Senate voted in favor of a resolution that the salary compression issue should be resolved in the next three years. The Provost allocated one-third of the necessary funding to do that in the first year and in the fall of 2013, the most severely compressed individuals received compression raises. The Faculty Budget Committee carried out a survey of Department Chairs to find out how this was perceived in various departments and what improvements the units would like to see in the future. It was clear that this salary compression allocation in the first year was greatly welcomed by faculty, as well as department chairs.

In the coming year, the Faculty Budget Committee resolves that the salary compression issue must continue to be addressed. It recommends that the second-year allocation should address compression in those academic units and ranks with the next most severe level of compression, based on the most recent Oklahoma State salary numbers. These data are issued every year and the most recent figures will be used.

Following this in the third year, the allocations will address the remaining faculty salary compression issues based on, once again, the most recent numbers from the Oklahoma State Salary Study.

The Faculty Budget Committee further recommends that the Provost's Office provide the heads of each academic unit with guidelines for allocations of those compression funds.

Professor Kulkarni, on behalf of the Faculty Budget Committee, requested that the Faculty Senate endorse the above recommendations prior to their being forwarded to the Administration of the University of South Carolina. The Committee is very much aware that this may not be possible, depending on the funding available. But in case the funding does become available, the Committee would like to make salary compression a top priority. To that effect, the Committee also supports merit raises and cost of living adjustments but regards salary compression as the most severe and the most pressing issue at this point.

If a salary raise pool is available for 2014-2015, the Committee recommends that salary compression allocations be made first, and that the remaining funds be used for allocating merit raises and/or cost of living adjustments. In the event that a uniform cost of living adjustment is mandated but additional funds are available, the Committee recommends that salary compression allocations be given the highest priority for discretionary spending. The Committee fully realizes the extent to which this can be done this year may or may not be to the extent that it is requesting, but in the event that the salary raise pool is available, this is what it would like to see.

There were no questions and no discussion, and the resolution was approved.

5. Reports of Officers.

PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS opened his report by thanking the Faculty Budget Committee for the work that they have done through the year, and for being present at a large number of budget meetings with the individual academic units.

The Provost reported it has become almost certain that there is going to be a raise pool this year. Unfortunately, the preferences of the Faculty Senate - that first we need to address compression - have been trumped by the decisions of the General Assembly. It is very likely that the final product that we are going to have from the General Assembly is a mandated across-the-board cost of living adjustment of 1.5%.

The General Assembly also still appears to retain a one-time bonus for all state employees, regardless of salary level or years of service, which is a minimal amount anticipated to be on the order of \$200 or \$300.

Provost Amiridis noted that the reality is that when the General Assembly decides on a raise pool, they do not provide the raise pool. They only provide the fraction of the raise pool that corresponds to the fraction of the salaries that are covered by state money. In

our case, when they say that there is going to be 1.5% cost of living adjustment, they probably will provide somewhere between .3% and .4% of the 1.5% and we have to raise the rest through tuition.

Also factored in is the fact that we have a de facto tuition cap throughout the state; every year we received a letter from the General Assembly with specific directions not to increase the number beyond a specific limit. This year's number appears to be 2.95%, with an additional small percent that goes up to 3.2%, but there is a proviso that this additional percentage should be used specifically for maintenance costs. The University is left with a very significant issue of allocation. What are the priorities? What are the necessary costs that we have?

Provost Amiridis observed that it appears we will have an across-the-board salary raise and an across-the-board one-time small bonus, but there will not be enough funds in the budget for an additional pool for compression. The Provost is not giving up hope until he has the final budget. He hopes that the Provost's Office will be able to scrap together at least a fraction of the 1.7 million dollars that was supposed to be the second step to address salary compression. Both the President and the Provost remain very committed to the issue and will do the best that they can. Provost Amiridis cautioned that any increase in tuition is not guaranteed, and still must be approved by the Board of Trustees. The Board decides what the increase in tuition is going to be and that some members of the Board are, in fact, advocating for 0% increase in tuition this year.

The Provost offered his views on the report of the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions regarding changing to a plus/minus system. He noted that as a faculty member, he like the idea of flexibility and being able to assign plus/minus grade and thus, differentiate the performance of the students further. He noted, however, that the issue is fairly complex, because not only does it affect Columbia, it affects the entire system and that's a decision that we will have to involve the faculty members in other parts of the system as well. And it is fairly complex because it affects the students.

We have approximately 1,000 students who could be negatively affected by a .1 shift in their GPAs, and explaining to 1,000 families why their students no longer have scholarships would be tough to do. Provost Amiridis, while believing that the grading of a course is the prerogative of the instructor, suggested that it may be wise at some point to have a consultation with the Student Government Association and ask them what they think about the proposed change in the grading system as well.

Provost Amiridis thanked Professor Edsel Peña (Statistics), the outgoing Chair of the UCTP, for the work by that Committee during another very busy year, including examining a large number of files. This Committee does some very significant work. The Provost observed that in his assessment, and in that of the UCTP and the President, the quality of the files continues to improve. Every year, disagreements on the files between the Committee, the Provost, and the President actually appear to be less and less regarding what the Provost would call the borderline cases. This speaks volumes about

the quality of the people that we hire. The Provost asked for the assistance of faculty members in all units in retaining our outstanding junior faculty members.

Provost Amiridis reported that the University is on target in terms of the size of the freshman class. The number of fulfilled deposits that we have right now, compared to the number of fulfilled deposits that we had last year differs by only one. Once again, the freshman class is going to be the best class that we have brought in. The facts are very clear that the academic quality of the institution has improved significantly over the last eight years. Every year we have brought up the record in terms of the SAT scores of the incoming class and the Provost expects this is going to be the case again. We are going to pick up a few points and at the same time, we have also brought up the record in terms of graduation rates, retention rates and placement rates.

Our institution is becoming very attractive to out of state students. Provost Amiridis observed that the out-of-state students have a much bigger variety of choices than in-state students. They spend more money and they can go wherever they want in the country. How attractive we are becoming to this segment of the market is a clear sign of the continuing strengthening of our brand over the last few years. The Provost noted that the key contributors to this are our faculty members. It doesn't make any difference what we tell the students ahead of time. It doesn't make any difference how much money we put into PR or promotional material. At the end, the best indicator is the word of the students, the word of mouth, from student to student. When the students come here, they check with the other students and the level of satisfaction of the current students is a clear indicator of how strong we can recruit the next generation of students. We are doing very well in this area.

Provost Amiridis provided an update on two deans searches that are underway at the University. At the South Carolina College of Pharmacy, Dean DiPiro has resigned and is starting a new appointment as Dean in the next few weeks at another institution in Virginia. The Provost expects to announce soon the appointment of a new interim dean. As Dean DiPiro was the Executive Dean of the South Carolina College of Pharmacy, the University will be examining, with the Medical University of South Carolina, the Memorandum of Understanding that we have and determining the best model for governance in this college going forward.

The University is also in the middle of a search for a new dean of the School of Medicine. The Provost is co-chairing this search together with the President of Palmetto Health, John Singerling, because the position will be combined for a new Executive Dean of the School of Medicine and CEO of a medical group that we are creating. The University has engaged in external search firm. At this point, the first report that we have is this is a very attractive position and we are building a very strong pool of candidates. The Provost expects that we will be able to bring candidates to campus sometime in the fall, and hopes to be able to have an appointment by late fall or early 2015.

Provost Amiridis reported that more faculty are teaching over the summer than was the case last year, and that it appears that we have a very significant increase in enrollment

over the summer. He noted that our current budget model sends all of the summer school tuition funds back to the colleges; central administration does not keep any of the summer tuition money. The Provost hopes to report in the fall that the University saw double-digit increases in summer enrollment.

Provost Amiridis wished everyone a productive and rejuvenating summer, and warned faculty members to be on the lookout in the fall for his memo stating that no classes will be cancelled on Thursday afternoon, no matter what kind of football game is scheduled for that day. Then he opened the floor for questions.

PROFESSOR GEORGI PETKOV (PHARMACY) asked where the interim dean of the College of Pharmacy will be based – here on the Columbia campus or at MUSC.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS responded that the location will be clear as soon as the appointment is announced. He asked for the faculty's patience while the agreement is worked out with the candidate, but expected within a week to be able to announce the appointment.

PROFESSOR PETKOV asked whether the Provost would be informing individual faculty members regarding their present level of salary compression, or would this information be shared only with the Deans.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS explained that the University never looks at salary compression as a unit problem or a discipline problem or a college problem. It is an individual issue, and is considered at the faculty level. We identify the faculty members who are compressed, not departments, not units. In some units there are significant numbers. In some units there is only one. Those identified are picked up, put into a spread sheet, and sent back into the college, with specific instructions on how to address it. Some of the data is shared with with the Faculty Budget Committee, but it has been sanitized to remove individual names. The Provost is amenable to making this data available.

PROFESSOR TONY REYNOLDS (MECHANICAL ENGINEERING) noted that faculty travel a great deal for their work and many travel almost exclusively on grant money, which means the money they spend traveling isn't used for other things that the grants could support. He wondered if it is possible for the University to use its purchasing clout to negotiate deals with airlines and car rental agencies to help conserve grant money. Professor Reynolds recounted an anecdote in which he traveled to Texas several weeks ago and spent \$560 to rent a car for 4 days. He was there with an employee of Kaiser Aluminum who reported that it cost him \$150 for the same type of rental.

PROFESSOR AMIRIDIS suggested that negotiations with airlines might be very difficult, but noted that the idea is worth exploring. He expected that we have a better probability of success with rental car companies. He also expected that the more impressive discounts were related to an entity's overall volume, and suggested that our volume for rental cars is something we should look at.

On the subject of travel, the Provost noted that the level of per diems while traveling have not been changed for 20 years. The per diem is state-mandated, even when a faculty member is traveling on federal money. The University made it a legislative priority for our lobbying efforts to change the per diem at the state. We had an agreement with Clemson University, the other research university but we didn't manage to get it through.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER ED WALTON (BUSINESS AND FINANCE) affirmed that the University is working on the per diem amount. As the legislative session is over now, there will be no action on the issue for the rest of the year, but we are not giving up.

Mr. Walton has asked Ms. Helen Zeigler to research the issue of volume discount programs for travelers. He noted that while deep discounts exist under special circumstances, there are a lot of 10-20% discount programs out there that usually are there for the asking. Mr. Walton suggested that Ms. Zeigler would send the results of her research to the Chair of the Senate.

PROFESSOR REYNOLDS reported that, as a point of reference, LSU has programs like this.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS invited faculty who knew of other such programs to contact Ms. Zeigler to assist with the research.

6. Report of Secretary.

CHAIR KNAPP, while noting that the Secretary had no report to deliver, asked Secretary Rebekah Maxwell to the podium. He noted that Professor Maxwell has been serving in the role of Secretary of the Faculty Senate, as well as the Secretary of the General Faculty. This meeting is her last in the role, concluding two 3-year terms as Secretary of the Faculty Senate. He thanked her for her service and presented her with a small gift.

7. Report of Chair.

CHAIR KNAPP delivered his last report of a very busy year. We began with welcoming in a new Parliamentarian at the beginning of the year, Bill Sudduth, who has served admirably. We'll be happy to have his continued service.

The Senate successfully shepherded a Work Place Civility Policy into existence over the course of this year, including the first called General Faculty Meeting in recent memories, since 2001, in order to approve changes to the Faculty Manual. We're working with the Provost Office at this point to implement that policy, including population of the Committee on Profession Conduct and appointment of a Faculty Civility Advocate. Chair Knapp hopes that there will be an announcement forthcoming in the near future.

We engaged in one of the more lively elections of the Chair-Elect, again in recent memory of the Faculty Senate, where we had four highly qualified candidates, including a runoff in the senate chambers orchestrated by the newly-conceived Faculty Senate Election Committee and, hopefully, that body will go forward as a good tradition in the Senate for running elections for us.

We visited the issue of Academic Freedom on a number of occasions. It's has been and will continue to be the focus of discussions. This process over the last number of months has brought together the faculty governing bodies of institutions across the State of South Carolina, in a way that hasn't been done recently, at least in my memory. It really reminded us of this fundamental aspect of our profession, despite the many different views and opinions which are represented by our faculty members.

Chair Knapp thanked all of the outgoing senators for their service on the Senate over this past year. We appreciate your engagement and your dedication to the university.

He also acknowledge all those who have served on Senate committees over the past year. This is really where so much of the work of the Senate takes place and the work that these committees do was represented by the number of reports that we heard today.

Chair Knapp thanked the chairs of the Faculty Senate Committees for their dedicated service over the past year:

Professor Divya Ahuja – Committee on Academic Responsibility
Professors Joan Donohue and Hunter Gardner chaired the Committee on Admissions
Professor Tom Regan – University Athletics Advisory Committee
Professor Kathleen McCallister – Bookstore Committee
Professor Brian Habing – Committee on Curricula and Courses. He's done a tremendous job.
Professor Jennifer Vendemia – Faculty Advisory
Professor Varsha Kulkarni – Faculty Budget Committee
Professor Mathieu Deflem – Faculty Grievance Committee
Professor Erin Connolly – Faculty Welfare Committee
Professor Charley Adams – Committee on Instructional Development
Mr. Scott Phinney – Intellectual Property Committee
Ms. Katherine Barbieri – Committee on Libraries
Professor Joan Culley – Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions
Professor Edsel Peña – University Committee on Tenure and Promotion
Professor Joshua Gold – Tenure Review Board.

Please join me in thanking these people for their dedicated service over the past year.

Chair Knapp extended a special thank you to the members of the Faculty Senate Office Staff, Ms. Jeanna Luker and Ms. Yvonne Dudley. These dedicated individuals do so much of the work to keep the Senate running and do so typically behind the scenes and without much recognition. We appreciate their service.

In closing, Chair Knapp wished everyone a refreshing, restorative and reinvigorating remainder of the summer. The Senate will not meet again until the second week of September, but the Chair anticipates a full agenda when we re-convene.

8. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

9. New Business.

There was no new business.

10. Good of the Order.

There were no announcements for the good of the order.

11. Adjournment.

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Wednesday, September 10, 2014, at 3:00 p.m. in the Law School Auditorium.