

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
March 4, 2015

1. Call to Order.

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

He asked for a moment of silence to honor the late Professor Raja Fayad, formerly of the Department of Exercise Science in the Arnold School of Public Health. Chair Knapp did not know Dr. Fayad personally, but by all accounts he was an accomplished researcher with the Colon Cancer Center, a respected and well-liked colleague, and a popular teacher and mentor with students. Qualities all faculty members might aspire to.

[The Faculty Senate observed a moment of silence.]

The Rayja Fayad Memorial Fund has been established through the Arnold School of Public Health to honor the memory of Dr. Fayad, and donations may be made through the link on the Arnold School of Public Health website. Chair Knapp urged members to consider a donation.

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR KNAPP asked for corrections to the minutes of the meeting of February 4, 2015. There were none, and the minutes were approved.

3. Report of Committees.

a. Senate Steering Committee, Elizabeth West, Secretary:

PROFESSOR ELIZABETH WEST (South Caroliniana Library) presented the slate of nominees for elected committees and thanked everyone who has volunteered to serve and those who are currently serving on the committees. Their willingness to serve is greatly appreciated. She also thanked Jeanna Luker and Yvonne Dudley for their great work in the Faculty Senate Office. The floor was opened for nominations.

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

PROFESSOR MILIND PUROHIT (Physics & Astronomy) brought forward six changes: two from the College of Arts and Sciences, one from the College of Education, one from the College of Mass Communications and Information Studies, one from the School of Music, and one from the Arnold School of Public Health.

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

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

PROFESSOR PUROHIT, on behalf of Professor Charley Adams, brought forward one change from the College of Engineering and Computing.

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

d. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Chris Robinson, Co-Chair:

PROFESSOR CHRIS ROBINSON (Art) provided a report to the Faculty Senate for the General Faculty to consider at the next General Faculty meeting the following changes to the Faculty Manual:

- Removal of prohibition of service of more than three consecutive years on faculty committees.
- All references to “Regional Campus (es)” will now be change to “Palmetto College Campuses.”
- The duration of nine-month faculty employment ending on “May 15”.
- Recommendation for a standing committee on Information Technology.

CHAIR KNAPP emphasized there would be no vote taken on these matters today. A comment period has been initiated online but also today here in the Senate if any faculty senators or faculty members would like to come to the microphone and share questions or concerns.

PROFESSOR LINDA SHIMIZU (Chemistry & Biochemistry) expressed serious reservation about the removal of the prohibition of service for more than three consecutive years on the same faculty committee. Shimizu gave two reasons. First, it would reduce the opportunity for new people to bring in new ideas. The second reason relates to an issue she has seen as Faculty Chair of the Provost Advisory Committee on Women’s Issues. Some units protect their junior faculty very well from too much service and some units do not, and Shimizu sees the Faculty Senate as the body that is supposed to look and protect the faculty who cannot speak for themselves. Women that she sees on the Advisory Committee and also other faculty members often times feel like they cannot say no. So it can be that the women are asked more so they can’t say no but it could also be from a negative perspective. For example, a faculty member who doesn’t have as much grant funding could be pressured into doing more service. The limit on service time protects those faculty members. Professor Shimizu believes removal of the limitation to be an ill-conceived idea that will help one or two people, and that having a limit protects faculty who feel like they can’t speak up for themselves.

PROFESSOR ROBINSON responded that the committee recognizes, sympathizes, and appreciates Prof. Shimizu’s concerns and they were discussed in Faculty Steering. There are some who see faculty service as an opportunity and a privilege; Professor Robinson shared from his own experience that just about the time a committee member starts to understand the workings of the committee over a three-year period and especially in a

leadership position, it is time to step down. It sort of takes away the opportunity of the right of the faculty to be involved in actual governance of the university from a year to year basis. So certainly it was not the intention of the proposal to put pressure on any gender. It will be up before the General Faculty at the next meeting.

CHAIR KNAPP thanked Professor Shimizu for sharing her concerns. One of the reasons that the committee moved in that direction is that history over many years has shown that many faculty committees are routinely short on members because of the lack of people stepping forward to volunteer. In many cases even if a committee has full membership, a member of the committee may leave the university or be promoted to a position where they can no longer participate and this causes frequent vacancies on the committees. Faculty members are generally good about stepping into those vacancies but with the current provision as soon as they do they are prohibited from continuing service on that same committee because of the three-year limit. So if they might have even been filling a 6-month or one-year vacancy and gotten onto the committee and appreciated the issues and started working on them, the way things are right now they are now required to step down off that committee and can no longer serve at least for a year. Those were some of the reasons that lead to bringing this forward but the committee certainly appreciates the concerns Professor Shimizu brought forward.

PROFESSOR SANDRA KELLY (Psychology) asked if the committee considered somewhat of a compromise because the idea of having no limits on a committee could lead to committees being almost owned by an individual group and not moving on and that is not healthy for faculty governance. She could see extending it beyond three years because she has been in that position of trying to populate committees but maybe extending it to a five year limit as opposed to limitless.

PROFESSOR ROBINSON replied that the committee had several discussions of these issues but it is vetted very carefully by Steering and Steering is very sensitive to whether people are serving on other committees, whether they have spent too much time on a committee, and finally the individuals have to be elected thus that seems to be an appropriate limitation.

CHAIR KNAPP reminded the senators that there was no vote on the measures by Faculty Senate. This will come before the General Faculty at its April 28 meeting. He encouraged faculty to register their insights, concerns, or support on the Faculty Senate website or through the channels of the Faculty Senate leadership, and expressed appreciation for the dialogue today.

5. Reports of Officers.

PROVOST MICHAEL AMIRIDIS stated that instead of giving an officer's report he wanted to use his last meeting of the Faculty Senate to thank the faculty for what they do in the classroom, for bringing knowledge and passion to teaching because they came to the university first and foremost to teach. The Provost thanked them for the innovation

they bring to the classroom because the faculty were essential to the success over the last ten years in recruiting, retaining, and graduating Carolina's students.

During an interview with the Daily Gamecock Provost Amiridis said that what the students expect and what the students come here for is the student experience and the core of the student experience is the interaction with the faculty.

The Provost also thanked the faculty for what they do outside of the classroom, including in research labs, studio and field assignments, and some of what they do on their own. Faculty produce scholarships in the humanities and in the social sciences because without it this university could not generate the knowledge that it has generated, could not have contributed to the knowledge that it has generated, could not have the impact that it has had on economic development, and could not have helped Carolina students succeed. During recruiting, prospective students and their families are always informed of the university's status as a Carnegie One institution that generates knowledge, has encoded in its academic DNA the ability to generate new knowledge and create opportunities to participate in this generation of new knowledge for students even for undergraduates. Many smaller schools tell them they can go there and the school will create opportunities for them. For Carolina these opportunities exist, they are natural because of the work faculty members do outside of the classroom.

The Provost also thanked the faculty for their work in the surrounding communities. Some examples are the work the College of Education faculty do in the schools and the school districts throughout the state; what some faculty do in clinics, or nursing, public health, medicine, and hospitals around the state; what many do in service organizations in the surrounding communities. Without these efforts, South Carolina and Columbia would be very different places than what they are today and the university would not have the tremendous amount of goodwill built around it because of the efforts of the faculty. Faculty involvement in surrounding communities in essence teaches Carolina students how we expect citizens to serve others and participate in these efforts.

Amiridis thanked them for what they do on campus, in faculty governance and in student life activities, in student organizations as advisors on campus, and as mentors of the students, as well supporting the arts and sports. Without faculty efforts on campus, the university would not be a vibrant and attractive community and would not be able to attract quality students and faculty.

Finally the Provost thanked the faculty for the trust and the support that they have shown to President Pastides and himself during the last six years of this administration. During the recession the administration asked the faculty to do more with less, and without the support and without the backing of the faculty the administration would not have been able to bring the institution to where it is today. This does not mean that it is perfect but it is in good shape and Provost Amiridis is happy to leave it in good shape as other people will come in and try to do the things that he was not able to do.

It has been an honor and a privilege for Amiridis to be a faculty member at the University of South Carolina and has been an honor and a privilege for him to serve with and along with them in faculty governance. Thank you.

CHAIR KNAPP commented on the emphasis that Amiridis shared with Faculty Senate on service. As much as faculty and university administration talk about the value of service and participation of faculty in so many ways and service, over the last number of years he has seen a significant erosion of how that service is treated particularly in the tenure and promotion process. Knapp was part of the revising of the Faculty Manual some years ago where specific emphasis was placed on research and teaching and but service was left out at a time when the faculty were generating all the new service opportunities for students including service learning, recognition and those types of things. Knapp suggests reflection on how faculty service is valued within the tenure and promotion process, whether it is in department committees, university service, or service in professional organizations.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS replied that a diminishing of the importance of service goes contrary to his statements today and goes contrary to what faculty have been trying to do. It is important to remember that faculty keep using the term “we are a community of scholars” and it is a great term but are they a community of scholars without service? Is it a community of scholars if the corporate model prevails? Where everybody shuts the door and does his or her business and goes home? If this becomes the model for a modern university, a lot will be lost but there will always be openings and people to step forward and who want to be involved.

CHAIR KNAPP asked if, at their recent retreat, the Board of Trustees made a decision on or were focused on an effort over the next 10 years to considerably expand the size of the university.

PROVOST AMIRIDIS stated that no decision that was made at that meeting. It was just a discussion that took place between the administration and the Board. It is an appropriate discussion because the five-year plan is coming to an end next year. Now what? What are the next targets? It is very appropriate for the Board of Trustees as the governing body to try to work with the administration to set up this passage. At that time there were different options that were discussed specifically referring to the size of the university. Should it stay constant or go up or down? The Board has asked the administration now to put a plan together looking at moderate growth. Moderate growth means maybe a growth in the order of 2% a year. The freshmen class right now is 5,000. The university went from 3,600 incoming freshmen to 5,000 within a period of approximately 5 years so the Board is not talking about an increase like this. They are talking about a growth in the order of 2% a year, which is around 100 students per year in the freshmen class. They are asking the questions of what resources are needed. How can the student to faculty ratio be maintained? Does the university have the infrastructure, especially in terms of labs, and so on. This is the discussion that is taking place and the administration has been charged to put a plan together and present it by

sometime this summer and in preparation for the new provost because the new provost may have completely different ideas.

6. Report of Secretary.

No report.

7. Report of Chair.

CHAIR KNAPP stated the university community was jarred, and for some faculty, staff, and students life was forever changed, when four weeks ago tomorrow, on the afternoon of February 5 the Crime Alert message entitled: “Active Shooter” was issued at 1:15 pm in response to a 911 call reportedly received by the USC Police at 12:56 pm.

Many of the faculty know various aspects of the incident and their own personal experiences but over the ensuing hours and days they came to learn that a fellow faculty member was tragically killed in what appears to have been a case of domestic violence. State Attorney General Alan Wilson opined on the incident in The State newspaper recently as awake up call to the State of South Carolina in addressing the prevalence of domestic violence in the state, and Chair Knapp has heard similar comments from faculty colleagues. For many faculty members of this university community, the murder of a colleague during working hours on university property in the performance of his job duties is disturbing, to say the least.

Although not comprehensive, Knapp heard from enough faculty members to know that the faculty response to the active shooter alert was highly variable. Some faculty members dismissed their students from class; others who received training followed the procedures for sheltering in place by barricading doors, turning out the lights and waiting for further instructions. In some cases with the students in their class texting their families and breaking down in tears. Some faculty continued teaching as a means of keeping students engaged during the crisis, while others apparently felt the alert was not a serious one. Many faculty admitted they did not feel adequately prepared for responding to the prospect of an active shooter on campus.

Knapp had the opportunity to meet with the senior administration on February 18 to convey some of his concerns as Chair of the Faculty Senate, both about the potential vulnerabilities in the alert system and the campus facilities. As many faculty will be aware, many of the facilities on campus cannot be properly secured in the event of an active shooter, which prompted a question Knapp received from some faculty colleagues: “What is the proper response when you are in an auditorium with 400 students? How do you adequately shelter in place without causing additional potential harm to the students in the classroom?” Chair Knapp met with the administration to express some of these concerns as well as the state of preparedness of the university community in responding to an active shooter alert. In the wake of the Virginia Tech shooting the university took some very concrete and serious steps in preparing the university community for such an eventuality. The active shooter training course that is put on by the USC Police

Department and Law Enforcement; Knapp has found to be a very effective one, so effective that he took it three times in the wake of those years following 2007. And he still felt there were inadequate measures in place even for someone like himself who had made every attempt to inform themselves about how to respond in the case of an active shooter. This is not something that anyone wants to be learning at the time they need to respond.

Chair Knapp made clear to the administration that these views expressly do not represent the consensus of the faculty but he felt it important that the faculty have a voice at the table in preparing for such future events. In his view it was a question of when, not if, the university will be faced with such a tragedy on campus and the better prepared it is for responding to that he thinks it will lessen the trauma. He did not request one of the faculty committees to bring forward a proposal on how the faculty might respond to this event because he feels it is potentially much more productive to engage the administration first in that dialogue and confirm in fact that faculty are partners at the table for that discussion. He hopes that dialogue will continue and that as members of this community the faculty will take part in it and take seriously their collective obligations to themselves, their fellow faculty colleagues, and the students they meet with every day in terms of their health and safety on this campus.

Turning to other issues, Chair Knapp stated it is fair to say that the institution is in transition, and now, perhaps more than usual, the engagement of the faculty is vital. The Provost Search Committee remains dedicated to concluding that search in a way to facilitate seating of a new provost by or near the beginning of the Fall 2015 semester – a few short months away. In the last few weeks, announcements of other administrative changes have been made as well. Dean Tony Ambler of the College of Engineering and Computing has accepted a new position in the USC Office of Economic Engagement, and a search for a replacement dean has been initiated with a goal to have a new dean of the College of Engineering and Computing in place by fall of 2015. At their February meeting – a week and a half ago – the USC Board of Trustees approved creation of a new position of USC Vice President for System Planning as well as appointment of Dean Mary Anne Fitzpatrick of the College of Arts and Sciences in this very important new system-wide position. They will have oversight across the entire USC system. An interim dean for the College of Arts and Sciences will be named in the near future, and a search for a new dean of the largest college here the campus representing nominally 500 faculty will be initiated following appointment of the incoming Provost. The search for a new dean for the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sports Management continues. The dean of yet another large college on the Columbia campus has announced to his faculty his intention to step down. So between the provost and the deans of at least four of the university's largest colleges, it is a fair statement to say that the institution is in a state of transition. Of course, those are often challenges but also times of opportunity and all the more reason that we as faculty need to be engaged in those processes.

The Faculty Advisory Committee has brought to the faculty for discussion a set of proposed changes to the USC Columbia Faculty Manual which will be brought to a vote by the General Faculty on April 18. Included in those provisions is the creation of a new

standing committee of the Faculty Senate for Information Technology. This body approved the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee for Information Technology which has been hard at work meeting essentially every two weeks for the last several months and they have developed and brought forward that proposal through the Faculty Advisory Committee for the creation of this new standing committee. In the process of doing so, it became apparent that while information technology has grown by leaps and bounds over the last several decades and is an integral part of everything we do as faculty and as people these days, the senate has been slow to respond in terms of providing a mechanism for regular engagement with the administration on information technology issues. So it is long overdue to have this committee. Chair Knapp expressed hope that faculty members will show up at the General Faculty meeting to support that initiative.

The Faculty Advisory Committee is continuing to work on a proposal for instituting university procedures for promotion of non-tenure track faculty at the University of South Carolina. On any number of other major university campuses, non-tenure track faculty have not only been granted voting rights as members of the faculty but in some cases have taken on very significant roles in university governance including chairing Faculty Senate. This is not something necessarily that Carolina is out in front on but it is high time that Faculty Senate took a look at the role that one-third of the university's faculty play – the research faculty, clinical faculty, instructors, etc., in according them an appropriate place of dignity within the faculty community. While the Faculty Advisory Committee does not have that draft proposal ready at this time, there is still the hope that they may bring it to the General Faculty meeting on April 28 for initiating a comment period for review by the faculty and the prospect of potentially voting on the matter at the September General Faculty meeting.

Chair Knapp urged the faculty to review and carefully consider these changes, provide feedback as appropriate and take this information back to their units and share with their colleagues. These are important issues that are moving forward in the university and the faculty are the front lines of the agents of change for making these things happen.

8. Unfinished Business.

Professor West returned to solicit nominations from the floor for the slate of committee nominees. There were none, and the slate was approved.

9. New Business.

CHAIR KNAPP – Is there any new business to come before the Senate? Please introduce yourself at the mike.

PROFESSOR CAMELIA KNAPP (Earth and Ocean Sciences), as Co-Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, invited the faculty to participate in the American Heart Association – Midlands Heart Walk on March 21. The Faculty Welfare Committee has a team, the Red Hot Chili Steppers, and their goal is to gather at least 15 faculty members

from the Columbia campus and raise \$1,500.00. They are still trying to reach their goals and have 18 days left.

CHAIR KNAPP asked if they were looking for people to walk with them or to sponsor them or both?

PROFESSOR KNAPP replied that they are looking both for people to participate in the walk – the walk is a loop on Blossom bridge and then loop around the Gervais bridge – and donations. The date is the 21st of March in the morning – a 3.8 mile walk.

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 April 1, 2015, at 3:00 p.m. in the Law School Auditorium.