

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
December 3, 2014

1. Call to Order.

CHAIR JAMES KNAPP (Earth & Ocean Sciences) called the meeting to order.

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes.

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

3. Invited Guest

CHAIR KNAPP introduced Dr. Jim Augustine, professor in the School of Medicine and university Ombudsman to present the annual report of the Ombudsman.

Dr. JIM AUGUSTINE (Medicine and USC Ombudsman) provided background on the position of Ombudsman. The “ombuds” is a delegated neutral whose job is to deal with conflicts and concerns that faculty have either with one another or with various policies and procedures of the University. There are ombuds in various organizations around the world – in colleges and universities but also in corporations, hospitals, medical facilities, and governmental agencies.

I am an informal, neutral, confidential, and independent resource for the faculty. I labor under the umbrella of the International Ombudsman Association (IOA). They have their own code of ethics and their own standards of practice and about 900 members in their organization worldwide - about a third of those are in academic institutions. The University has an individual in the Division of Student Affairs who is the Student Ombuds and HR has an employee’s relations staff person who staff members can contact. A couple of years ago we instituted a graduate student ombuds – Dale Moore does that very ably. One of the associate vice chancellors at USC Upstate called me not very long ago and said he was the faculty ombudsman on that campus.

Sometimes the function of an ombuds is to come into a situation to help out in some way and then get out of the situation and allow the individuals to resolve the conflict or the concern on their own and make their own decision even in the midst of difficult conflicts and disputes.

Well what do we do? We listen, most importantly, try to talk about what the concerns are and clarify the issues and then look at a whole range of options. Someone could possibly leave the university, they could stay and do nothing, they could become involved in some active way in trying to deal with the problem. Perhaps we could call in others to help out but basically my task is to help those who come see me help themselves. They make the final decision and along the way I find out about problems that exist in the university that

may be benefited with new policies or some kind of change and will make those recommendations to the administration. What I don't do is make decisions for our visitors, participate in any kind of a formal investigation or in any kind of formal process. If a faculty member decides to get involved in a grievance process, then I quietly back out. I don't offer medical or legal advice or counseling of any sort. I am not an agent of notice for the university and I don't serve as an advocate for any particular individual. And, I don't make and keep records of those who have come and spoken to me.

Each year in making out my annual report I use a template that the International Ombuds Association has put together. There are nine specific categories and within each of those categories there are subcategories of concerns that a problem might be allocated to. So in the annual report I put all of the concerns and conflicts that have come to me in one of these categories and then quantify them. This past year I met with about 53 faculty members. There are a lot of people who call my office first but really need to talk to the Student Ombuds or the Graduate School Ombuds or someone on the staff side but I do get a number of calls like this from parents of our USC students.

I have just finished my eighth year and I'm into my ninth. I have assisted about 413 faculty members and that is an average of about 52 faculty a year so it is very stable - about one a week. Sometimes it involves a number of meetings and discussions. Sometimes these things go on for a while but nevertheless one visitor a week is normal. I have done a survey over the last seven years of Carnegie One institutions and of those that provide annual reports the average there is about 49 visitors but it is extremely important to appreciate that not many schools make their annual reports public.

This is a summary of the last eight years. The current year 2013-2014 is on the right in red, all years are summarized there in the second to the last column, and then the percentage of concerns in individual categories are shown in the last row. Things like Evaluative Relationships obviously involve questions, concerns, issues, or inquires about people in evaluative relationship - supervisor employee, faculty staff, etc. Then the next large category is Career Progression and Development - that is promotion and tenure, third year review, and things related to that. A third is Peer and Colleague Relationships and then other areas of concern include: Values, Ethics, and Standards; Legal, Regulatory, Financial and Compliance; Services/Administrative Issues; etc. So that gives you a summary of what kind of concerns I have dealt with. Again I do not keep names, records, and don't provide information other than what is here and using this particular template.

I am grateful that this body and the university administration and others have worked very hard to put together the new Workplace Bullying Policy. I began to write about it in my first year as the ombuds. It is heartwarming to me to see that Jan Breuer has taken on the task as the Faculty Civility Advocate and that we have a Committee on Professional Conduct that is going to help speed this process through.

Last year I suggested that the Faculty Welfare or some other group undertake a systemic study of issues related to non-tenure track faculty. I am really concerned the way some

of our non-tenure track faculty are treated and this is my effort to bring those issues to the attention of all concerned. Erin Connolly and last year's Faculty Welfare Committee started on this task and I know that there are other groups this year who are looking into aspects of non-tenure track faculty and that is a very encouraging sign. I hope that this body will see this process through. There have been some very extensive studies by other institutions of their non-tenure track faculty and a number of policies and procedures have been put in place as a result of those reports and the findings. I would encourage you to look at the one that the University of Maryland has done it was an excellent report.

I couldn't do this without the help of the university administration and the faculty leaders. They have been very, very helpful. I am especially appreciative that the administration is willing to support this office and hasn't done anything at any time to violate the principles of independence, neutrality, informality and confidentiality of the process.

I am glad to answer any questions. At the bottom of every slide, was the ombuds website that has a lot of information, a lot of self-help articles that I have gleaned over the years and put up there. I would encourage you if you have a concern or a conflict to give me a call. If you know a faculty member who perhaps needs some help, tell them to give me a call. I am glad to help in any way. I don't think that email is an appropriate means of communicating difficult situations. These emails often end up being looked at under the freedom of information act which may have nothing to do with the faculty member's concern or conflict so you want to avoid that I think if at all possible.

CHAIR KNAPP asked if there was any significance to the consistency in the number of cases Dr. Augustine receives each year.

DR. AUGUSTINE stated that he could not read anything into those numbers. He has dealt with a lot of different faculty members and each situation is a little bit different.

CHAIR KNAPP commented that it may be worth following in the years ahead whether there is a change in the number of cases with implementation of the new workplace bullying policy. The policy clearly makes reference to visiting the ombuds person first before following through with a more formal complaint so in some sense it may result in an increase.

4. Report of Committees.

a. Senate Steering Committee, Elizabeth West, Secretary:

PROFESSOR ELIZABETH WEST (South Caroliniana Library) reviewed the committee vacancies. Three would be appointed because they are less than one year and expire in 2015: 1) a new one on Curricula and Courses and 2) two on Professional Conduct. Vacancies expiring in 2017 on Faculty Grievance and the Tenure Review Board. She encouraged faculty to review the committee volunteer form and submit their names for the committees. Questions should be directed either to her or the Faculty Senate Office.

CHAIR KNAPP also encouraged faculty to become involved in committee assignments.

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

PROFESSOR MILIND PUROHIT (Physics & Astronomy) brought forward 50 pages of changes.

- College of Arts and Sciences – there are 9 sections of changes.
- College of Education – there are 3 changes.
- College of Engineering and Computing – there are 5 sections of changes.
- College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management – there are 2 changes.
- College of Nursing – there are about 10 pages of changes to create an updated Nursing curriculum and an additional attachment.
- Arnold School of Public Health – has several changes.
- Section 9 of the report has several additional items for consideration.

Dr. PUROHIT stated that all curriculum forms will be online very soon and changes can be proposed either on paper or electronically. The time of testing will end with the spring semester and in the fall of 2015 all changes will be submitted electronically.

There was no discussion and the proposals were approved as submitted.

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

PROFESSOR CHARLEY ADAMS (Communications Sciences and Disorders) reported that a year ago the Committee on Instructional Development began considering course proposals for any course offered by distance education at least 50% online to try to take some of the burden off of Curricula and Courses. Professor Adams put forth 15 courses for approval. The committee has a webpage with resources available to anyone wishing to submit for distance learning:

<http://www.sc.edu/faculty/committees/instructionaldevelopment.shtml>

There was no discussion and the proposal was approved as submitted.

d. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Professor Peter Binev, Chair:

PROFESSOR PETER BINEV (Mathematics) put forth a change to the bulletin regarding the transfer credit policy.

There was no discussion and the proposal was approved as submitted.

PROFESSOR BINEV put forth a second proposal on changing the grading policy. The committee recommends the establishment of a formal procedure for communication between faculty senates in the USC system. The grading policy should be system wide and any proposal which is not communicated with the other faculty senates would be inappropriate. The committee proposes to empower the Faculty Advisory Committee to

take action and to establish the formal procedure for communications between the faculty senates in the USC system.

CHAIR KNAPP provided background on the issue. At the end of the last academic year the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions brought forward the results of a survey that was conducted on the Columbia campus about a proposed change to the grading policy. What became evident was that this was a policy that would apply to more than just the USC Columbia campus and the rest of the faculty across the USC system had not been engaged in that discussion. At that time the motion was tabled and Chair Knapp instructed the Scholastic Standards and Petitions committee to consult with the Faculty Advisory Committee on how to move forward. The resolution before the Senate is:

“Therefore, given the results of careful study, the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions moves to empower the Faculty Advisory Committee to:
Establish a formal procedure for communication between faculty senates in the USC system.”

Chair Knapp expressed belief that establishing a mechanism whereby faculty can engage with each other across the sister campuses and actually act as a system, rather than isolated campuses, will be very beneficial.

There was no further discussion and the proposal was approved as submitted.

PROFESSOR BINEV put forth a proposal to make a bulletin change regarding admission requirements for the professional programs in Education.

There was no discussion and the proposal was approved as submitted.

e. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Janet Hudson, Co-Chair:

PROFESSOR JANET HUDSON (History & Extended University) reported that the Faculty Welfare Committee is working with the Transportation Master Plan committee. A survey will be distributed in the spring to gather faculty and staff input on issues around transportation and the comprehensive plan that is being developed.

The committee is also conducting a survey of non-tenure track faculty. Professor Hudson asked senators to notify those faculty in their departments of the survey.

Professor Hudson put forth a proposal to send President Pastides a letter requesting that the dependent scholarship fund be increased from \$1,500 to \$4,000, and in the letter there is greater explanation as to why.

CHAIR KNAPP stated that the increase was an initiative that came from the last survey that the Faculty Welfare Committee conducted of the faculty. It was identified by Columbia faculty as one of the highest priorities and a significant benefit for faculty to be

able to count on additional financial support for dependents who may choose to attend the University of South Carolina.

There was no further discussion and the proposal was approved as submitted.

5. Reports of Officers.

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES called to the faculty's attention two articles in the December 3 *New York Times*. The first article, "A Pox on Campus Life," examines what the author refers to as the increased isolation of groups of students who identify according to some homogenous characteristic, whether it be a fraternity, or a point of view, or an ethnic background. Pastides stated that universities need to encourage students to mingle and be less isolated for the benefit not only of the universities but for society at large.

The President stated that Carolina already does a lot on this issue, though some could argue that the living, learning communities on campus are somewhat isolating. He does not think they are. He cited several of these communities, including the Green Quad for students who identify themselves as being disposed towards sustainability, Capstone Scholars, the Women's Quad for female only residential preference, and the International House at Maxcy College. The International House is not only for international students but for American students who wish to travel abroad and get to know students from other cultures very directly and from many other places. There is a Leadership Residence Hall and an emerging Social Justice Residence Hall that will open next year. The article comes at a time when many pundits and others are pressing universities to stay on mission and not do extra things. The President stated that the university's mission is workforce development, teaching skills of life, and other things like civic engagement and professionalism. He plans on working with more state leaders and business leaders so they will embrace the fact that extra things are part of the mission. Not to isolate students but to enrich the diversity of the experience while on campus.

The second article, "Blowing Off Class," described how universities are doing more with the data they have to advance student success. The early identification of students in academic difficulty, for example, may lead to faculty advising supplementing electronic advising, getting simple answers to simple questions electronically rather than scheduling appointments, or even using upper class students to be mentors or e-advisors to freshman and sophomores. Before One Carolina much of our data was isolated in different systems...the registrar's data separate from the bursar's data, for example. Connecting data could help administrators see that a student is in financial duress or having more difficulty in completing their work. Ultimately the completion of One Carolina will improve those areas. An example in the article was Arizona State University's e-advising system which helped to increase 4-year graduation rate for lower income students from (a terrible) 26% to 41%.

President Pastides then discussed the partnership between the University of South Carolina and IBM. They specialize in big data and analytics. The President is hopeful

that this partnership, which was basically about providing better service to faculty and students, will also provide opportunities to provide better learning and better student advancement, progression and graduation.

The university has committed for 10 years to partner with IBM to fundamentally outsource a large part of the UTS system - provide computing resources and access to IT to faculty and students. IBM will take UTS employees but the university will continue to provide them with university identities and they will not lose their benefits. Eventually they will be working in the new Horizon II Building and essentially be rebadged as IBM employees. The partnership will enable the university to better keep up with upgrades to hardware and software. There are out clauses if it doesn't work, but the President believes partnering with a major corporation will provide better service to the faculty and students. It can also demonstrate that USC is continuing to look for better ways to be efficient.

President Pastides reported that the university is requesting \$51 million new dollars from state government to add classrooms, to provide more faculty compensation for those who wish to teach both in the summer and shoulder season, an increase to faculty and staff salaries, more funding to attract more top performing students from around the country to the Honors College, to Capstone and other programs and many other things.

The President looks forward to reviewing the Faculty Welfare proposal to increase the student dependent tuition benefit. It is time for USC to do better in this area and he added that it must be a faculty/staff benefit. He will be working with the Provost and the CFO to look at what this would cost the university.

The President then discussed the installation of a new sculpture in the Charles S. Way Palmetto Courtyard of the new Darla Moore School of Business. Titled "Eternal Flame," it is by the renowned Mexican sculptor Leonardo Nierman who was here for the installation. This new piece of public art was subsidized by corporate sponsor Colonial Life. The President would like to see more installations of exterior public art and potentially faculty and student art deployed around the campus; the courtyard at the new Law School is possible location.

The President expressed condolences for the recent passing of three Carolina faculty members: Dr. Kendra Cusaac on November 17, Dean Emeritus and first School of Medicine Dean Roderick Macdonald on November 24, and Dr. Jim Copenhaver, Director of University Bands for over 30 years, on November 26. President Pastides also discussed the passing of student Diamoney E. Greene whose life was taken in a senseless act of domestic violence. It calls all of us to remind ourselves to look out for each other. The program Stand Up Carolina provides a method of asking for advice or assistance from a professional when someone becomes concerned about the welfare of a coworker.

The President concluded his report by recognizing student leaders attending the meeting. He suggested that they be invited to speak at a Faculty Senate meeting on what they do and what their issues are. They will be meeting with the President on a long list of issues,

including the prominent issue of sexual assault and how the university deals with it. Another area of concern is health insurance for graduate students and the impact the Affordable Healthcare Act may have on that.

President Pastides opened the floor for questions.

CHAIR KNAPP asked how Carolina's agreement with IBM might compare with similar such agreements they might have at other universities, and if this partnership is really stepping out in front in a unique way.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES responded that the university will be involved in a consortium that has Carnegie Mellon, MIT and quite possibly other universities as well. But USC will be developing its own theme and will be the lead university worldwide for IBM in that particular area.

There were no further questions.

6. Report of Secretary.

There was no report.

7. Report of Chair.

CHAIR KNAPP congratulated the administration on its major landmark agreement with IBM for moving our Information Technology forward. He believes it will benefit the university, potentially in a substantive way, and it is generating much enthusiasm from the Board, the private sector and the larger community. One of the issues that is very germane to this development of this evolving IT infrastructure is the role that the faculty might play in that discussion. Professor Knapp reported that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, upon recommendation from the Faculty Advisory Committee, has approved the formation of an ad hoc committee on IT, which will be empaneled immediately. Membership is made up of faculty and staff across the university. The principle will be fairly short lived because one of the charges of the committee will be to examine the possibility of bringing forward to the General Faculty a proposal to establish a standing committee of the Faculty Senate which will deal with IT issues for the university going forward, and really providing a mechanism whereby faculty can on a regular basis engage with the university administration and the university at large over discussions of IT infrastructure and priorities for the university.

One of the things that came to light in the evolution in this discussion is that while information technology has grown by leaps and bounds over the last number of decades the Faculty Senate has not been terribly responsive to those changes. Over the years, as concerns have been brought to this body what became clear was that there wasn't any formal mechanism to actually bring those concerns in some substantive way to the administration. This is ultimately going to be a great benefit both to us as faculty and

also most importantly to the university and how we best navigate those things going forward.

Chair Knapp commented on some of the issues that Jim Augustine reported. The hard work of Professor Augustine, previous Senate Chair Sandra Kelly, and many other faculty led to the implementation of the New Work Place Bullying policy, HCAP 1.8.0.

In late October, the Faculty Civility Advocate, Professor Jan Breuer, organized a one-day training workshop with Dr. Loreleigh Keashly, a recognized expert in the area of Work Place Bullying, from Wayne State University. As a participate in that workshop, along with members of the Committee of Professional Conduct and other senate leaders, Chair Knapp stated that it was a very useful forum to better understand of what is workplace bullying and what is not workplace bullying. Faculty would all benefit from additional opportunities to engage in those types of discussions and training to understand better where that dividing line may be and how that will play out in terms of improving the culture we have as a faculty here consistently with the Carolinian Creed.

Chair Knapp concluded by wishing everyone a relaxing holiday break.

PROFESSOR MARK COOPER (English) asked Chair Knapp to speak briefly on the scope of the IT committee charge.

CHAIR KNAPP responded that the charge includes identification of potential issues of concerns or priorities coming from the faculty, and in part in order to do that they are charged with implementing a survey of the faculty to try and identify what those issues are. Beyond that, depending on what information they get, they potentially will craft proposed language for a change in the Faculty Manual which would constitute a new standing committee of the Faculty Senate for IT. The intent would be for this to be a relatively short-lived committee that would then basically disband at the time we are able to establish the standing committee in the senate.

Those are the highest priorities that were identified and membership is representative of the broad university community. It includes members of the faculty, four ex-officio members that come from the Information Technology or UTS Community and there is currently a graduate student representative. The Steering Committee was very astute to recommend two changes for the proposed slate of the ad hoc committee: 1) a faculty member specifically from Arts and Humanities and 2) an undergraduate representative.

There were no further questions.

8. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

9. New Business.

There was no new business.

10. Good of the Order.

There was nothing 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 February 4, 2015, at 3:00 p.m. in the Law School Auditorium.