**FACULTY SENATE MEETING**
**November 5, 2014**

## 1. Call to Order.

CHAIR-ELECT AUGIE GRANT (JOURNALISM) called the meeting to order on behalf of Chair Jim Knapp.

## 2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR-ELECT GRANT asked for corrections to the minutes of the meeting of October 1, 2014. There were none, and the minutes were approved.

## 3. Report of Committees.

CHAIR-ELECT GRANT – Second item. Committee on Courses and Curricula, Professor Milind Purohit.

**a. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Milind Purohit, Chair:**

PROFESSOR MILIND PUROHIT (Physics & Astronomy) brought forward 24 changes on thirty pages. Nine are from College of Arts and Sciences;  three from the College of Education; five from the College of Engineering and Computing; two from the College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management; two the College of Mass Communication and Information Studies; one in the School of Music; one from the College of Social Work, and one other change. There was no discussion and the proposals were approved as submitted.

**b. Committee on Instructional Development, Professor Milind Purohit on behalf of Professor Charley Adams, Chair:**

PROFESSOR MILIND PUROHIT (Physics & Astronomy) – The Committee on Instructional Development brings forward two courses and those are listed on one page. There was no discussion and the proposals were approved as submitted.

**b. Committee on Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Janice Hudson, Co-Chair:**

PROFESSOR JANICE HUDSON (Extended University) alerted the Faculty Senate that the Faculty Welfare Committee is going to bring up a proposal next month and senators will receive this proposal in advance.  The committee would like for senators to review it and support it.  The committee is proposing that the Faculty Staff Dependent Scholarship Fund be increased significantly from its current cap of $1500 dollars per scholarship.

Hudson also reported that representatives of the Faculty Welfare Committee and a representative of Faculty Senate attended the Transportation Master Plan meeting. A dialogue has been started with the Transportation Master Plan Committee, which includes Derrick Huggins, his staff and a consultant from Sasaki Associates, who worked with the University on these issues previously. Faculty representatives raised many issues at the meeting. A survey is going to be held and faculty will be asked to participate and asked to submit productive comments. The greatest weakness currently is the lack of communication about what the plan is, who's making the decision, what these decisions are going to be, how's it going to enfold over time and so we strongly, strongly, strongly impressed upon them the need to improve their communication with the faculty and other parts of the campus.

## 4. Reports of Officers.

PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS thanked the Faculty Welfare Committee for their participation and their involvement in having a very successful Workshop in the last few days on the issues of Faculty Civility. The training that has started is consistent with a new policy that was initiated and supported by the Faculty Senate on bullying in the workplace and faculty civility issues.

We brought in an external expert, Professor Loraleigh Keashly from Wayne State University, who is a very well published expert in this particular field. Approximately 25 people attended this workshop that took place at the Darla Moore School of Business. They were members of the Welfare Committee, Faculty Senate leadership, and members of the Committee on Professional Conduct. Our new advocate, Jan Breuer from the Darla Moore School of Business was involved, as well as some of the Provost's staff and Vice Provosts.

Dr. Keashly walked through the policy step-by-step with our representatives and talked about the issues that she expects that we will be facing, how we should resolve them, and some work that we may have to do even on the policy standpoint. It was very useful and a very good example of the senate and the administration working together to address an issue that has the potential of affecting any of us at some point in our careers.

The Provost also thanked the Faculty Advisory Committee for taking up the call and trying to set up an advisory body on IT services. Over the last few months, the Provost's office created an ad hoc committee on Benner implementation issues chaired by Professor Juan Caicedo, from the College of Engineering and Computing. This committee is reaching the point that they have identified the issues and they have passed them on to the administration. A Research Computing committee was also created and chaired by Professor Qi Wang from the College of Arts and Sciences. He supports the senate's decision to create a committee on technology services and it is very good to see how all of these groups will be coordinated or maybe even consolidated.

Provost Amiridis then discussed the visit of the Vice Chancellor and the Principle of the University of Johannesburg, Professor Rensburg. Professor Rensburg is a unique

personality in the recent history of South Africa, both the political history of South Africa but also the educational history of South Africa. He was the leader of the Youth Arm of the African National Congress.  He was in prison on Robben Island, together with Nelson Mandala. In the post-apartheid period, he has been involved in several different tasks most recently as the leader of the University of Johannesburg, which is a huge institution, in essence, created by the merger of several schools in the area.  His views, his perspectives, his conviction on several issues associated with higher education, global higher education in several occasions, but also the role of Africa in global higher education and the role of higher education in the post-apartheid society in South Africa in particular, were really enlightening.

It gives us a good example of what a global university can do and what relationships with other partners can bring to us.  How they can benefit our students, and there were indeed a large number of students present at his lecture, since several of the students involved in the leadership programs were there. This kind of visit informs us as to the types of unique experiences that visitors from different institutions, different backgrounds, and different perspectives can bring to our campus.

Provost Amiridis then turned to a specific Provost's Grants Program, that has not received a lot of attention.  The program was created a couple of years ago for visiting scholars to be able to spend an extended period of time on our campus, ranging from one week to six months. This fall, only six proposals were submitted to the program. There are funds for more, and it has unrealized potential. People on sabbatical may be able to come for a few weeks, work on specific research or scholarship issues, or if students in the classroom, give a couple of lectures. The amount of money that we can put into this program is up to $25,000 per proposal. Some colleges have taken advantage of it.  A couple of years ago the Department of Physics used the funds to create a very successful workshop over the summer with a number of visiting faculty members.  It was short in duration, less than a week but it was very rich in terms of the number of participants. Other programs have brought in a scholar for a period of two or three months; Philosophy did this, a year and a half ago.  The opportunities are there, so keep it in mind and please pass the information. There is a rolling deadline for this program and we consider them twice a year.

The Provost provided an update on the faculty hiring initiative. Out of the 200 positions initially identified and funded, 167 have been filled, with 33 remaining. The university has over 1100 tenure-track faculty members and is approaching 1150. Amiridis expects that if we continue to replace these retired faculty members and with the additional faculty replacement initiative the university will be very close to the target of 1200 tenured/tenure-track faculty members within a few years of the start of the initiative. The Provost believes this is one of the most impactful aspects of this administration on the future of the campus and the future of the faculty of the campus.

The administration will continue to hire aggressively for every replacement because we cannot afford to go down in the size of the faculty. And in fact, there are commitments for additional faculty members with several new hires for Deans. But he does not expect

that in the near future there will be the magnitude of the effort that resulted in the 200 new hires across the university in the last four years.

If additional revenue is generated over the next two or three years, some other pressing needs can be addressed. Across the university new resources are needed to address among other priorities faculty salary compression. In fact, the salary compression issue becomes the number one priority this year and the Provost is very confident that Phase II can be implemented.

One of the areas that Provost Amiridis is not satisfied with is Undergraduate Student Advising. This is an issue that came to the forefront a few years ago, during a January academic leadership forum. Members of the student body attended to talk about their experiences and it became apparent that it needed to be addressed. In the last 2 ½ years a network of advisors across the different colleges has met every month to share information to talk about what is good, what is not good, what is happening in their colleges.

They have created a white paper with best practices that has been distributed to everybody that is involved into student advising, to look at what are the best practices nationally and what are the best practices being applied locally. We have enhanced the staff of the Cross College Advising office because students are very vulnerable in transferring from one college to another. The previous college kind of signs them off and the new college doesn't take them on for a while so they can be in limbo. The office of Cross College advising University-wide had two staff people and they were completely overwhelmed, so we added the resources to increase the number of people who are doing this work and that appears to be working okay. A system-wide conference has been created to bring in the experts in student affairs and student advising across the University of South Carolina system to discuss what are the national trends and what are we doing. Another step was to create a common email because we heard from the students that that was an issue.

The university has also purchased common on-line advising software, called "SARS Grid," that allows the creation of appointments and the addition of information. An electronic student advising portal was created, and there is a pilot for a student success cooperative with the Educational Advisory Board. This allows more data to be brought into the advising process about the grades of the students.

However, Amiridis doesn't see as much progress as he would like, and he hasn't heard from the students that they are thrilled with what is happening and they are overwhelmed by the services being provided. In fact, the impression that he is getting from the students is that it's business as usual. He and Helen Doerpinghaus continue to deal with horror stories that are directly associated with advising, including students being unable to graduate due to poor advising.

The problem is two-fold. One is that student advising is a very fragmented system that is very different from unit to unit and in many occasions you cannot reach the faculty

members that they play central role in this process. There are also resource issues and there may be some resources, this year, to put into the advisory project that would bring this to the front of the priorities as well.

The Provost stated his belief that faculty participation in the advising process is extremely valuable and that is what students want as professionals. They want to be advised by the professionals in their field, that they are going to direct them toward very important career choices for them. He does not want to take the faculty input out of the advising process, despite all of the challenges that this presents with a very broad or very fragmented system. At the same time, something must be done where the advising and the professional mentoring may not necessary be directly associated with the course selection and signing up for the courses, where the rules and regulations apply. Amiridis plans to seek the input of the Deans on what their expectations are and how this affects the performance of the colleges.

An ad-hoc group will be created that is going to work for 5-6 weeks only before the end of the year to make some very tangible recommendations. It will involve some of the professional advisors across campus and faculty representation. Student input may be through a survey administered across the undergraduate students to address the questions associated with advising. Student Government will be involved along these lines to have the survey done fairly quickly and simply so that we can get significant participation from the students.

Amiridis turned to the issue of the public/private partnerships. This semester there are 285 graduate students enrolled that came through the channels Academic Partnerships has created. They are enrolled primarily in the Education Programs - 240 of them are in the College of Education, with approximately 80 of them being Doctoral students. This is a net gain for the College of Education that had experienced significant drops in graduate enrollments over the last few years because some of the incentives that the state was providing for graduate education in this area have gone away.

A similar type of experiment is beginning in the area of recruiting undergraduate international students to come to our campus. Discussions are underway with a fairly well known entity that will allow us to recruit in 36 different international markets, thirty-three countries. There is the discrepancies because China is divided into four different markets. So there are 36 markets and 33 countries who will take our promotional materials and web pages and translate them into different languages, different formats and different types of environments, marketing material that is appropriate for these environments with the goal of bringing a few hundred new international undergraduate students to our campus every year. It will create a new pipeline for us, diversifying the student environment with international students coming in. But it will also provide a new pipeline that is absolutely necessary given the type of competition that we see nationally, for the out-of-state, and locally, for the in-state, students as well.

It is going to be a fairly enriched program with a first year for the students being a year that they spend in a special program containing three elements: part-time academic, part-

time English, and part-time a cultural adjustment program, so they are able to enter as sophomores knowing where they are, how the system works and being able to survive into our system.

A program like this will have the opportunity to enhance our EPI program, the English Program for Internationals, as well as our International Students Services program. There will be funds that will flow into them to be able to do all of these and both of these units on campus have been engaged in preliminary discussions with the potential partner. There will be a tuition-sharing model again with the partner taking a small piece of the tuition in order to finance their operations.

These are the types of public/private partnerships that we are looking at. The university has full control over the admissions in a program like this, deciding what our criteria are and how/who is admitted and who is not admitted into the program. But operation of marketing and recruiting in foreign markets is handed to somebody else. The benefit that provides is that we will be able to ramp up fairly quickly something that will be almost impossible to do with our own means in a similar time scale. If these discussions conclude the way the Provost expects in a couple of months and the Board of Trustees approves such a contract, within six to nine months recruiting can start. The hiring of a Student Affairs person to place somewhere in Southeast Asia has been under consideration for about nine months, and is still under consideration. This demonstrates the difference in the speed that the private sector moves in some of these cases and the speed that we are moving in some of these cases.

Amiridis may have more information on the program in the February Senate meeting.


The Provost opened the floor for questions.

PROFESSOR JOSEPH FLORA (Computing and Engineering) asked how the Provost sees the future of advising in terms of the flowcharting of the students through these courses. Flora stated his department's faculty spend 30 minutes advising, with up to 20 minutes just selecting courses, some of which should be able to be done automatically. For the remaining 10 minutes, they have a checklist for other things: "Do you have state scholarship? What do you want to do with your career? Do you want to go to Grad School…?" He asked it will be a checklist that comes out of this program.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS replied that there is a Banner component called GPS that has to do with professional career and advancement for the degree, that when implemented will allow people to compare the requirements toward the degree. He stated that this is relatively easy in programs in which there is a very structured curriculum. When he was advising students, he had the flowchart and 90% of the boxes were filled. There was nothing that said a student can take X, Y, or Z because that's the nature of some of the very structured curricula in Engineering and the sciences and so on. But that's not the case in English for example, or History, or Philosophy, some of the liberal arts, some of the social sciences, even in some of the professional degrees. There is a lot of flexibility

there. And that's when things go wrong usually because the faculty member is not very well aware of what the rules and regulations for the degree completion. Some of the professional advisors that we have in each college now can do this much faster and more effective than our faculty members can, but they are very limited in terms of numbers, and that's a resource issue that we are facing.  But these people cannot provide the insights that faculty have for students in terms of choices that they have.

Even in Civil Engineering, for example, there are a number of electives and faculty can ask a student, "What do you plan to do?  Are you going to Graduate School? My suggestion to you is that you probably should go to Graduate School, given your grades or are you going to work in the local industry and so on." In giving these choices, faculty can make recommendations, such as, "Since you are going to graduate school maybe you want to take a 600-level course or maybe you want to take this particular course because of your interest" and so on. That's the professional insight that the advising staff member does not have. They advise students in many different disciplines. So having this input from faculty, the students should be able then to go to one of the staff members and say, that's what I'm thinking, what are the rules and regulations and check them out.  This adds time to the process because now we are talking about two appointments instead of one, but it increases the value of the experience for the students and will help us avoid a lot of the mistakes that we are making.

PROFESSOR JOSEPH FLORA – We have a 30 page guideline that we have to follow today. There should be computer codes for that, right?

PROVOST AMIRIDIS – For some curricula, there can be a significant degree of flexibility, but not for others because they are very open curricula, they are not as structured. The example has been given to me about English. How English can be very, very broad and the selection of the students are numerous and very different. But the selections they make affect their professional development and their future.

PROFESSOR MARK COOPER (English) – disagreed with the characterization of English advisement, stating that the checklist makes it clear as to what types of courses count or which types are requirements. Cooper suspects that the trouble zones in English advising would look kind of similar to the trouble zones in Engineering advising. In other words: how to make sense of fulfillment of various Carolina Core requirements, particularly when courses are being added to fulfill those requirements all the time.; keeping up with that is kind of complicated; what to do when somebody wants to change their major; that cross college situation; how to help students think through a minor. All of these issues, the kinds of solutions being described, better technology, better availability of professional advisors who could help with the mechanical requirements, would be very helpful. There's probably overlapping problems across campus rather than that contrast that the Provost described.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS – Fair enough, but the problems with advising did not start with the new Carolina Core. It existed long time before that.

PROFESSOR SARA BARKER (Theatre) – stated that she believes the Theatre Department has solved the course-by-course advising problem by having one staff member who does that. She and several of the faculty felt the loss of any access or any culture in the department now where the students feel that they have mentors. That faculty member is somebody they can sit down with and really think about their future. Professor Barker recently met with a student after he had been advised and discussed a two-year plan for how he might prepare himself for graduate school and how he can get into the profession, but there is not the culture for that in the department. In fact, several faculty members have asked for a shift toward developing a mentorship, which is different, distinct from "here's the course you have to take." She would like for the Provost to send down an order saying that faculty have to develop a mentorship, but sees faculty as somewhat paralyzed.  Good ideas but no way to make it happen.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS responded that this is very consistent with what he talked about before.  That the faculty member provides a much different type of a discussion and experience for the student than what the professional advisor will. Currently there is a very fragmented system. Some units doing one thing, some units doing the other, some units trying to do both and doing nothing at the end. And that's part of what we have been trying to penetrate and we find it very difficult to penetrate.

If it is left up to volunteers, the students will eventually be directed to one or two faculty members in the department. That is the kind of situation in many places, because they want to talk with them and they want to be involved with them and that's not right. It's not right for the one or two faculty members and it's not right for the students as well.

Amiridis stated he will need the support and the advocacy of the faculty if they are going to make this work. Student advising is teaching. It is teaching of the best form. It is mentoring of the students. It is developing their skills and it should be valued, recognized and rewarded as part of the teaching experience.

The Provost stated that student advising should be included in tenure and promotion and post tenure review. He takes the advising issue very seriously but it cannot happen without the support and the participation of the faculty.  And these discussions have to be taking place in the units.

PROFESSOR JORGE CAMACHO (Languages, Literatures, & Cultures) stated that he thinks that tenure track professors give the best advice probably to the students, undergraduate students and all tenure track professors that do advising. Sometimes other universities' graduate students, PhD level, also advise undergraduates. Is that possible? Is that permitted here too?

PROVOST AMIRIDIS did not know the answer to that question, but he did not think that the graduate student has the depth of professional experience, to be able to be a very informative source. But the graduate student has a perspective that may be important for the undergraduate, especially for the short term. Amiridis is open to suggestions, which is

why he is opening up a task force to look at some of these issues very quickly and hear the opinion of the students, as well.

PROFESSOR CAMACHO pointed out that advising is very stressful in programs where they have large number of students and a small number of tenure track faculty.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS agreed that resources are a problem.

PROFESSOR ERIN ROBERTS (Religious Studies) asked what kind of training the students actually receive for advising, whether it's part of their orientation. Because one of the biggest problems is that students come in over and over again without absolutely no idea what they should be doing, and faculty end up walking them through the basics. If they could somehow have that emphasized to them in their orientation, it may have a significant improvement for the departments.

PROVOSOT AMIRIDIS stated that she made an excellent point. Part of why he likes the common advisory software, the SARS Grid, is because before the student makes an appointment they have to answer some questions and that forces them at least to spend a few minutes to consider the answers to these questions. Students want to have a meaningful experience and they want information. There may be a few that just want a signature but the vast majority of them want information. So the SARS program allows us to request some information.

PROFESSOR ROBERTS stated they haven't seen this version. We haven't seen this happen.

(UNIDIENTIFED SPEAKER) - Some areas are doing pre-check list and some aren't.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS replied that if the task force recommends making the pre-check mandatory, then it will be implemented.

The Provost thanked the senators for their questions.


## 5. Report of Chair.

CHAIR-ELECT GRANT reported that there will be some really important issues that are coming up for a vote in December and February. Among them, a change in the grading scale which is a matter of coordinating with the other campuses because this is a change that affects all of the campuses. This is a vote that has to be taken, not only here, but across the Faculty Senates.

There will be a report back on parking and solicitation for more information on that. There is going to be a report coming in the December meeting, a motion that comes from the Faculty Welfare Committee regarding increasing the Dependent Scholarship.

And finally, there is a new set of guidelines that all faculty need to be familiar with regarding sexual harassment and how are or are not protected. Information will come not only through the Provost's Office but some through the Senate.

So there will be opportunities for this level of interaction on many topics coming up.

## 6.  Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

## 7.  New Business.

There was no new business.

## 8.  Good of the Order.

There was nothing for the good of the order.

## 9.  Adjournment.

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