

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 1, 2017, 2016

1. Call to Order.

CHAIR AUGIE GRANT (Journalism) called the meeting to order.

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR GRANT asked for corrections to the minutes of the meeting of December 7, 2016. There were none, and the minutes were approved.

3. Invited Guests

GUEST HOLLY PAE (USC UPSTATE) is a professor at the School of Education and is starting her first of two years serving as Faculty Chair at USC Upstate. The campus is between the I85 and I26 corridor in the north west part of the state. East of the Mississippi, the upstate ranks in having the most companies, foreign-owned, BMW being most notable. The campus is nestled in a 330-acre campus with a 12-acre arboretum that runs right through the middle. It was ranked most recently as one of the 10 Best Regional Colleges in the south. It was ranked 2nd in the Top Public Regional Colleges in the South. The mascot is the Spartan. There are 6,000 students representing 37 minorities, 26 states and 17 nations. About 11,000 of them live in campus housing. USC Upstate is ranked 4th Best Regional College in the South for Veterans, and ranked number 3 with the lowest student debt upon graduation in the Southern Region. They are the only institution of higher education with such ranking in the state of South Carolina.

This year is USC Upstate's 50th anniversary. The institution was started to produce nurses and now, along with the School of Nursing and the College of Arts and Sciences, there are over 40 programs and graduate degrees in education, nursing and informatics. Its mission is to serve the upstate and about 85% of the students do stay and work in the upstate of South Carolina.

There are about 500 faculty members and 246 are tenure track. As they go through the promotion and tenure process, their files will come to Columbia for signature from the President and also the Board of Trustees. In the past 11 years, 6 faculty have been awarded Fulbright scholarships

USC Upstate's Faculty Senate has unit representation. There are 12 units and senators are determined by an algorithm of one for every seven faculty members. There are 35 Faculty Senators, the Senate Chair, Past Chair Paul Grady and the Recording Secretary, Calvin Odhiambo. There are ten standing committees, ranging from Academic Affairs,

Academic Budget Facility Planning, Graduate Programs, Welfare, Promotion and Tenure, Student Services and etc.

4. Discussion on Proposed Revisions proposed by Faculty Advisory Committee

CHAIR GRANT stated that the Faculty Welfare Committee, a little more than two years ago did a survey of all non-tenured track faculty to look at what the work environment was on campus. Out of that survey came a recommendation from the Faculty Welfare Committee to constitute a committee of faculty that was equally comprised of non-tenure track and tenure track faculty to look at the work environment for non-tenure track faculty and make recommendations.

That committee issued its report in the Fall. Out of that report, there are five recommendations. The first four are strictly administrative and Grant asked Professor Janet Hudson to share those as background.

PROFESSOR JANET HUDSON (Extended University) read the following:

2. Multiple Year Contracts

The Non-Tenure Track Faculty Task Force recommends that colleges and departments implement multiple year contracts to NTT faculty as a reward and incentive for strong performance and a tool for retention. These contracts would continue to be contingent upon available funds.

3. Promotion:

To address the core issues of review, promotion, and support opportunities for Non-Tenure Track faculty, the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Task Force endorses the following principles:

- all faculty members should have clear advancement opportunities and criteria for promotion
- all faculty members are encouraged to have mentorship opportunities
- all faculty members should have regular performance evaluations

To uphold these principles, the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Task Force recommends:

- the creation of a web-based clearinghouse for system-wide Non-Tenure Track unit review and promotion criteria
- a university wide policy specifying that Non-Tenure Track faculty are eligible to serve as academic administrators
- units are encouraged to appoint mentors for Non-Tenure Track faculty at the time of their original hire for a minimum duration of their first contract

- budgetary support for Non-Tenure Track faculty professional development

4. Standardization of Titles and what this survey revealed is that currently there are 22 different titles for Non-Tenure Track Faculty where there are 3 titles on the Tenure-Track side.

The Faculty Task Force recommends that across colleges and schools that USC standardize job titles for Non-Tenure Track faculty so that titles correspond to the faculty members' primary responsibility and that titles communicate clearly consistent promotion opportunities. These standardized titles would be: assistant **clinical professor**, associate clinical professor, clinical professor, assistant **research professor**, associate research professor, research professor, assistant **teaching professor**, associate teaching professor, teaching professor. Instructor, senior instructor, and master instructor are recommended titles reserved for those without a terminal degree whose primary responsibility is teaching.

5. Awards

The Faculty Task Force recommends that, to the greatest extent possible, and that's outside of donor requirements, eligibility for awards and honors be expanded to all faculty, including Non-Tenure Track faculty—particularly for teaching, research, and service awards.

CHAIR GRANT stated that as recommendations to the administration, none of those require actions of the Faculty Senate.

The first recommendation is the one to be discussed today. That is a recommendation that voting rights be extended to all full-time faculty of the University for all matters except tenure and promotion. Tenure and promotions matters being of course, reserved for tenure track faculty.

The specific recommendation of the committee was referred to the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Faculty Advisory Committee who had been working through subtleties in implementation and actually creating a policy that can be implemented. So the Faculty Advisory Committee at the next meeting in March under its action is going to make a motion to approve the change in the Faculty Manual that would not only provide this change but there will be or a series of other changes that have to flow from that, small wording changes in different parts where the Faculty Manual refers to voting faculty when it's just tenure-track faculty or it should refer to all faculty.

What is before the Senate today is an opportunity to discuss the changes, to get further input before the actual vote takes place. The Faculty Advisory Committee is going to meet again this month to consider any further changes in the policy before its presented.

By the Parliamentary rules: anyone in the room is allowed to speak. Please keep comments to the point. Faculty should identify themselves and their unit and those

individuals who have not spoken have a chance to speak before anyone has a chance to speak twice. Chair Grant stated he had also received a number of questions and would address these questions as they come up. The floor was opened for comments.

PROFESSOR SOPHYA GARASHCHUK (CHEMISTRY) stated that the tenure track teaching and research service faculty have very different concerns and priorities than the non-tenure track which is teaching only or research only. Their concerns are much broader and only they have the perspective needed to balance that. If they follow the recommendation and allow all faculty to vote it would add a block of 6 votes to their faculty with no connection to graduate students' supervision. It's either research or teaching not connected to grants, recruiting reviewing of committee work.

CHAIR GRANT stated that his role is to moderate the discussion. Committee members will answer questions.

CHAIR ELECT MARCO VALTORTA (Department of Computer Science and Engineering) replied that the Chemistry faculty's concern is not unique. The University should have in place a mechanism to prevent non tenure track faculty from feeling that there could be retribution against them when they bring up a concern that is legitimate. In the Faculty Manual, there is on page 20 a comment about the University having a preference to abide by recommendations of the American Association of University Professors. This is an in principle kind of recommendation. And the American Association of University Professors has a very detailed policy on the participation of what they call contingent faculty in university governance.

Their position is that out of an issue of fairness and competence, the Universities will be better served if non-tenure track faculty participate in university governance. He recommended that everyone should read the document as it lists a series of objections and answers including the one just brought up.

Again the specific objection that non-tenure track faculty and contingent faculty do not have an interest in the welfare of students in their success and more specifically that their participation in faculty governance may be conditioned by the fact that they have short-term employment is one of the key objections that they address.

The issue of fairness is from this objection, and the correct way of addressing the concern is to create a mechanism in which retribution would not be served against contingent faculty members.

PROFESSOR GARASHCHUK replied that the questions from her colleagues were not about short-term vs a long-time interest, but people are concerned only about teaching or only about research. How do they balance when they vote? Basically, should the teaching faculty vote only on teaching matters and research faculty vote only on research concerning matters? Because there can be competing interests there.

CHAIR GRANT made a point of information. The proposal that is before the Senate extends voting rights on university-wide matters and representation of Faculty Senate. It recommends the units extend voting rights but the awarding of voting rights within the unit, is a matter of unit governance and the university does not dictate that.

PROFESSOR ERIK DOXTADER (ENGLISH) stated he had a number of questions some of which are specific to the text of the proposals. The first is a procedural question. Is it envisioned that these three will be advanced as a single package or are these three separate items for passage?

CHAIR GRANT – These are going to be proposed as a single motion by the Faculty Advisory Committee.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER - Following then from that and probably from the comments from his colleague in Chemistry, the first documents of the Faculties of the Colleges, Schools or Departments, page 13, indicates in the middle of the first paragraph, *except that only tenured faculty can vote on matters concerning tenure and promotion guidelines and advancement of tenure-track faculty*, that sentence is inconsistent with approved tenure and promotions documents that have been approved by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions specifically with respect to the formulation of the voting of guidelines.

CHAIR GRANT – Can you clarify?

PROFESSOR DOXTADER – There are departmental Tenure and Promotion documents which have been approved by UCTP which indicate that in fact, guidelines, tenure and promotions guidelines can be voted on by all tenure-track faculty members and not simply tenured faculty and so there is an inconsistency there that has to be dealt with.

CHAIR GRANT – Thank you.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER – The second questions follows directly from his colleague in Chemistry and that is does this particular document – and if so and under what conditions - supersede department bylaws. The document says *unless otherwise provided within the academic unit*, does that refer than to existing department bylaws? If it were passed, does this document then supersede department bylaws such that department bylaws will have to be revised and voting on?

CHAIR GRANT stated he would answer that as a member of the committee. The intention is to not supersede departmental bylaws The intention is to govern university-wide voting and representation on Faculty Senate again with the decision on departmental voting being made at the unit level.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER stated that he thinks there is merit to debating the question of whether to make that intention explicit within these documents. There is an ambiguity

in that phrase that begins, *unless otherwise provided within the academic unit*. One can read this to say that in fact this does supersede departmental bylaws.

In terms of the recommendation regarding the standardization of titles it means a revision to ACAF 1.06, is that correct?

CHAIR GRANT – Yes.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER asked when that revision will be released.

CHAIR GRANT – Cheryl Addy in the Provost Office is heading that effort. She is part of an effort that is going back almost two years, examining the titles and looking at options. So, she can answer that a lot better than anyone else in the room.

VICE PROVOST CHERYL ADDY (VICE PROVOST AND DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL) – This is going to be a two-part process. One of the things that will be done to basically facilitate the wording of the Faculty Manual is more clearly delineate the titles, the non-tenure track titles that are typically used for full-time faculty and separate out those that are clearly part-time, honorific titles and so forth.

The longer term process will be addressing the specific title request and the other recommendation because that becomes a more complicated issue as it is not just the wishes of this group but it also has some significant impact with Human Resources requirements.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER – Is there any sense of a time limit?

VICE PROVOST ADDY – The intent is to get the first part done this semester. Whereas the second one is more complex, but hopefully by the end of the calendar year.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER – The last question is, has there been any study of how this will change the apportionment of Senate seats and this is contingent again on the revision of ACAF 1.06 but as the existing 1.06 list which includes Professor Emeritus and a number of different categories, departments with under the proposed change, departments with a number of emeritus professors those would count.

CHAIR GRANT replied that it refers specifically to Section B.2 of ACAF 1.06 which does not include emeritus titles.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER asked which version of ACAF 1.06 Grant was using.

CHAIR GRANT stated he had a draft of the proposed revision. The changes are moving in parallel. As a point of information, in order for this policy that is going to be proposed in March to take affect if the Faculty Senate passes it in March, it then moves to the General Faculty for a vote on Reading Day April 25th. If it passes on Reading Day, the proposal then moves to the Administration. The Administration then moves it to the

Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the Board of Trustees. If it passes that it moves to the full Board of Trustees. So the earliest it could go before the Board of Trustees would be in June of 2017 and hence the intention to have the parallel tracks of revisions of ACAF 1.06 as revisions takes place.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER – In terms of the second document, Voting Membership page 4 the proposed language says, *and full-time, non-tenure track faculty as defined in section 1.B.2 of policy ACAF 1.06*, there's no referent for that. ACAF 1.06 exists in a revised form dated March 24, 2016 but the committee has a copy of a revision which includes things that are not in the standing policy and so the Senate is being asked to vote on something which, to my way of thinking has no referent. Senators don't know what they are voting on.

CHAIR GRANT – The one option for the Faculty Advisory Committee is to insert the titles into the policy itself, rather than referring to ACAF 1.06.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER – That would be a possibility but at this point they don't have a solid referent.

PROFESSOR JOHN GERDES (INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGY) asked what the number of senators that would be non-tenured track generated vs. tenured track generated, if the proposal passed.

CHAIR GRANT – If it passes and current apportionment is kept at 1 senator for every 10 faculty, there are approximately 550 non-tenure track faculty who would be extended voting rights that would be 55 members to the Faculty Senate to the existing 140.

PROFESSOR GERDES – The one exception to this policy is that the non-tenured track senators would be able to do everything else except for T&P. What about promotion of the non-tenure track faculty? If there is now a promotion path for non-tenure track, are they allowed to be on that? Because of the exclusion, it would seem not.

CHAIR GRANT – It depends upon how the department is configured. The issue is whether promotion of non-tenure track faculty is an administrative function or whether it is a faculty function. And there within each unit there are different procedures by which that is handled.

PROFESSOR GERDES – Stated he was not going down to the department level. He doesn't know what T&P or what promotion elements that senators would be dealing with.

CHAIR GRANT was not aware of anything in the Faculty Manual that deals with promotion outside of the Tenure and Promotions Guidelines.

PROFESSOR THOMAS NATHANIEL (MEDICINE – GREENVILE VIA ADOBE CONNECT) – stated his colleagues would like to know if the promotion criteria for

tenure and non-tenure are the same or different? For example promotion to Associate or Full Professor.

CHAIR GRANT – Again, tenure and promotion criteria for both are determined by the unit. Faculty Senate does not control those, so this change would not affect those guidelines

PROFESSOR ANDREW LEIER (SCHOOL OF THE EARTH, OCEAN AND ENVIRONMENT) –Are similar measures under discussion in the Senates in the comprehensive campuses and Palmetto College?

CHAIR GRANT – Not at this point.

PROFESSOR LEIER shared a comment from a colleague that it may not be prudent to refer to a definition of non-tenure track faculty under voting in a separate university policy in ACAF 1.06. As it currently operates, these policies can be modified without the advice and the consent of the faculty.

CHAIR GRANT- There was an extended debate in the Faculty Advisory Committee on whether to include the specific faculty titles or just include the general words “full-time faculty”. And it was considered that the more specific the definition the better off it would be. But that means if the faculty titles are being changed this requires continual revision of the Faculty Manual and the Faculty Advisory Committee as one solution chose to refer to an external document that’s more easily changed.

As a point of information, changes in university policies, the ACAF policies, are set up to get advice from the faculty. The policies are published with widespread notification to the faculty. It is true that consent of the faculty is not required for changes to that policy. So that is a concern and again the Faculty Advisory Committee is going to meet again and look at this to see if this is the best way to specify. But again, as a point of information the goal is to be as precise as possible in defining so there’s no question if the policy passes on who can be represented and who can choose to be a representative and do service to the university in this fashion.

PROFESSOR MARK COOPER (ENGLISH) stated that he has read the AAUP statement on fairness and finds it persuasive. He seconds the advice for everybody to have a look there. He asked how this would work practically though, if units are not required to change how they elect or appoint senators.

CHAIR GRANT – The internal governance of the unit doesn’t change. But in the election of Senators, all faculty in the unit, all full-time faculty will be eligible to serve and representation in the senate will be a function of the size of the tenure-track and non-tenured track combined.

PROFESSOR COOPER – So, but there’s nothing that says that a unit has to elect non-tenured track faculty in proportion to their presence in its unit?

CHAIR GRANT – That is correct.

PROFESSOR COOPER – So this could end up not increasing the number of non-tenure track faculty who are represented in the Senate. Is that right?

CHAIR GRANT – That is correct. The same as by rank there are Faculty Senators who are Assistant, Associate and Full Professors now and there's nothing that constrains representation. Some units have all Assistant Professors representing the unit. Some are all Full Professors. Many have Associate Professors.

PROFESSOR COOPER – All that is known for sure is units that have a lot of non-tenure track faculty will be getting more Senators.

CHAIR GRANT – Yes.

PROFESSOR BRANDON BOOKSTAVER (COLLEGE OF PHARMACY) – stated he is an Associate Professor here. He was actually was hired in to the Clinical non-tenured track and still maintained a clinical practice site at Palmetto Health Richland. Four years ago, he applied and took a new position on the tenure-track, so he's been with the university for 10 years. Six years as a non-tenure track faculty and now 4 years on the tenure track side. He has a very unique view of both sides of this and now serving as a Faculty Senator.

They have two departments in the College of Pharmacy. About 50 faculty, 25 of which are non-tenure track and to the point that was made earlier, 22 different titles. He can understand why across the board here there's a very different perception of what non-tenure track faculty actually do. From the view from Pharmacy these folks are engaged in service, teaching and research. They are averaging over 3½ -4 publications a year while still maintaining 30-40 percent of their time at a clinical practice site off campus, at a teaching hospital for an example. They teach about 2/3 of the curriculum, some of that includes undergraduate curriculum as well. So even though Pharmacy is a professional program, it does extend down to the undergraduate side. The Department Chair is a non-tenure track full professor who has been at the university for 16-17 years. So they have administrative roles who have been maintained from the non-tenure track.

He wanted to impress a little bit and echo some of the results from the non-tenure track survey. If someone comes in a non-tenure track and they are really a full-time member engaged in the university to the max and there are one or two awards that are available for them but they're not allowed to serve on committees right now.

They have the voting members and 25, half of their colleagues have zero say when it comes to electing a Senator. They know they may or may not be represented and even in his department before he switched, they had 4 tenure track members in the entire department, so they would really recycle every time to see who would be Faculty Senator.

He wants to really impress upon the senators that there is a huge pool of non-tenure track faculty who have a significant amount of involvement in grants, extramural funding, a significant amount of involvement in scholarship service and teaching and really do appreciate what the tenure track folks do and part of that would be their job to help educate as well. They can teach their students but teaching the non-tenure track faculty to appreciate that is also a valuable service that can be offered.

He stated he would be happy to answer questions about how that is viewed from the non-tenured track side. Units that don't have a large non tenure track contingency anyway may not see a change the number of senators to an appreciable value.

PROFESSOR JANET HUDSON (EXTENDED UNIVERSITY) has been working on this for three years and was co-chairing Faculty Welfare when they did the original survey and just wanted to speak to the broad issue of fairness. Often times faculty live in a unit and see the university through a very narrow scope. But things change and often times when those who have been here a long time may not notice change occurring around them. A third of the univeristy's faculty are non-tenure track and that's growing.

Faculty are not narrow. Non-tenure track faculty are not narrow. Many do the very same responsibilities. They don't make as much money and they definitely don't have as much respect. As an historian she stated that at some point it is just tremendously an issue of fairness. And the way voting rights have ever changed is that the people in power have to be willing to make that change and it's all in a resistance to giving up our power. She doesn't see this as giving up power but recognizing and coming to see how things have changed in the academy and recognizing that and extending the respect and since 1/3 of the faculty are affected by this, it seems only fair that they are included, they're enfranchised in some ways to participate in the governance of the university.

PROFESSOR HEATHER HECKMAN (UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES) stated she is not a Senator at the moment but was on the Non-tenure Track Ad hoc Committee. That committee also did a smaller survey of peer institutions just to see what kind of governance rules they had regarding non-tenure track faculty. Of the eight institutions looked at (University of Tennessee, Rutgers, University of Georgia, University of Kentucky, University of Missouri, IU Indiana, University of Virginia and University of North Carolina) six already had non-tenure track faculty representation in the Faculty Senate. One was considering a proposal very seriously. One did not have representation, but considered it a known problem from around the university and UNC at the time, that was a year ago had a Senate Chair that was non-tenure track.

PROFESSOR MVS CHANDRASHEKHAR (ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING) relayed some of the concerns from his college in general. One of the concerns was that representation from non-tenure track faculty is undermining the institution of tenure. That was the big concern. There are non-tenure track faculty that do a lot of service and do the same responsibilities but then, why not give them tenure?

PROFESSOR DOXTADER thought the point about fairness was important. There's an important distinction to be drawn between the fairness that is related to the issue in general and the fairness that may or may not result from the proposals that are at hand.

To oppose the proposals is not necessarily to oppose the fairness. In fact, to make the argument that 1/3 of the faculty would be somehow enfranchised by this proposal is not necessarily true given that it's not actually known what they are talking about in terms of who the faculty is.

Relative to his colleague's question about department's standards for promotion and how those would not change, there's no guarantee that a department will impose, perhaps unfairly, promotion standards which include doing an enormous amount of service to people who are paid less than tenure track faculty. They are all ambiguities in this and simply to pronounce that this is a question of fairness is not necessarily the most productive way to go.

It seems that the devil is in the details here and so is the virtue. Given that senators don't have a document to look over ACAF 1.06 in terms of who is eligible under the terms of this proposal and how this will change in the apportionment of senate seats; given that they do not have a document that indicates that; and given the fact is likely to revise the proposal in front of the Senate in the next month; and given that the departments want to weigh in and read the final language that would be voted on, he would move that the vote be deferred until at least April or until such a time as they have ACAF 1.06 or a list of positions that are eligible under the terms of this position.

CHAIR GRANT –As a parliamentary rule, senators cannot move to change a motion that has not yet been made. The Faculty Advisory Committee is going to present a motion at the meeting March 1st. As with any Parliamentary procedure, a motion to table is always in order. A motion to adjourn is always in order.

PROFESSOR CARRIE QUEENAN (MANAGEMENT SCIENCE) – There's this talk about fairness, not fairness and yes rules of who is going to be senator or can't be determined by the department but I think even with the possibility of things going to one extreme or the other should not stop us from giving people the opportunity to be a part of this, to have a voice.

If this was 100 years ago half of the people in here wouldn't be able to vote for all kinds of different reasons. What are we saying? In her department the clinicals do so much work, they wouldn't be the department they are without them. They should have a voice.

CHAIR GRANT addressed the number of emails he received although most of the issues have been covered. Professor Knapp's concerns have been voiced by colleagues. One that has not is a concern by Professor Binev who is concerned about the committees charged with implementing, monitoring and/or adjusting academic regulations and this concern is being referred to the Faculty Advisory Committee as they look at other, how this change

impacts other things in the Faculty Manual. So the proposal that will come in March will be more complete looking at any specific place where the wording is affected.

PROFESSOR NATHANIEL BELL (NURSING) –If it is up to the own units in colleges to vote on who is a member of Faculty Senate, but it is being proposed that they are going to have proportional representation of some sort, that non-tenure faculty have a voice in the Senate, how are they to ensure that they elect non-tenure faculty to the Faculty Senate.

CHAIR GRANT – There is no such current provision for the three ranks who are allowed to serve on Faculty Senate and there is always a chance that representation will be disproportionate just as there is today.

PROFESSOR AMIT ALMOR (PSYCHOLOGY) stated that in his department they actually dealt with that issue and actually have guidelines that are very similar to the guidelines that are proposed for the entire university. So they basically granted voting rights for all of their non-tenure track faculty in the department recognizing that fairness and inclusion trumps the many other concerns that they had, recognizing there are serious concerns.

One of the concerns that they did discuss was an issue of protection for non-tenure track faculty from being opened to other pressures and influences that could be exploitation.

Service roles are not necessarily the roles that a lot of faculty actually compete for and want to take on. Allowing without clear description of roles, duties and so forth might create the opposite situation than the concerns that other people voiced here. And that is that most service positions that are not prestigious and not considered very desirable will kind of be pushed on people who will not be able to say no because they are much more dependent for the next year contract on kind of positive compliance with the expectations of the group.

He also was a research faculty professor at a different institute and he is fully supporting the inclusion and extension of voting rights for reasons of fairness but there has to be also consideration of fairness in the duties that come with that privilege of voting. There is a risk for people whose contract is more tangible and that kind of plays into the AAUP concern about the increase in number of non-tenure track folks. He would like to encourage the committee to kind of consider the protection side of things as well.

PROFESSOR BOOKSTAVER – stated he was intentional in not using the “F” word of “fairness” because he sees it much more as a respect and recognition piece than of fairness. Non-tenure track colleagues teach an awful lot of the curriculum and are responsible for a lot of the growth and development of the life-blood of this institution, which is the students, and the representation for something like Faculty Senate and/or committees and/or the other four things that were mentioned prior to this discussion is really that. It really is a representation of the respect and recognition that is shared amongst colleagues.

He asked for a point of clarification on how the proposal would impact university committee rights as far as abilities to serve on those as a non-tenure track faculty.

CHAIR GRANT – The intent is to extend the ability to serve on committees. Not all committees, for example, not the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

PROFESSOR GERDES asked how much lead time they will receive before the next meeting so that they can meet with their faculty and discuss it with them with the revised document.

CHAIR GRANT – The next meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee is Monday, February 13th and so anticipate that sometime on the 14th. The next Faculty Senate meeting is Wednesday, March 1st. That's two weeks before the next meeting.

CHAIR GRANT - Once a motion is made there is an opportunity for discussion but senators don't have to wait until that. They can discuss through Blackboard and send questions to members of the Faculty Advisory Committee, The Faculty Welfare Committee, The Ad-hoc Committee on Non-tenure Track Faculty or to Chair Grant. The members of those committees are eager to make sure this is as open of process as possible and that there's not any chance that there is the appearance that something is trying to be pushed through. Rather they want maximum opportunity for discussion and when the vote comes, senators will have received as much notice as they can provide.

PROFESSOR SASKIA COENEN SNYDER (HISTORY) asked for a point of clarification on whether the vote in March is just to include non-tenure track faculty members on the Senate, in the Faculty Senate or does that also include other university-wide committees?

CHAIR GRANT – It will include non-tenure track faculty in the Senate and we will give them a vote at the General Faculty meeting after this passes the Board of Trustees. It will then give an opportunity beginning in academic year 2017-2018 for non-tenure track faculty to have additional representation on committees.

PROFESSOR SNYDER – The first vote is only for the Faculty Senate, correct?

CHAIR GRANT – No, that one vote is for Faculty Senate and for voting privileges in General Faculty meetings of the university.

PROFESSOR SNYDER –Second question - is the vote only on the voting rights or also on the other proposed changes about promotions and awards and

CHAIR GRANT – Only on voting rights because the Faculty Senate does not have jurisdiction over the other areas. The other areas are under the jurisdiction of the Provost Office but in her report the Provost may want to address many of the outstanding

advancements that have been made in the last year to recognize the work of non-tenure track faculty.

PROFESSOR SNYDER –History certainly welcomes these kinds of changes. Non-tenure track people do a lot of the work, not only in teaching service but also in research and so they're very appreciative of what has been done here.

5. Reports of Faculty Committees.

a. Senate Steering Committee, Elizabeth West, Secretary:

PROFESSOR ELIZABETH WEST (South Caroliniana Library) announced today was the deadline for submitting committee volunteer forms.

b. Committee on Academic Responsibility, Professor Dick Kawooya

PROFESSOR DICK KAWOoya (Information and Communications) brought forward a change to the Faculty Manual regarding the structure of the committee. The committee has been working with the Office of Integrity which is making changes to the honor code.

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

c. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Kathleen Kirasic, Chair:

PROFESSOR KATHLEEN KIRASIC (Psychology) brought forward 24 proposals. 14 from the College of Arts and Sciences, 1 from the Darla Moore School of Business, 3 from the College of Education, 2 from the College of Engineering and Computing, 1 from the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management and 3 from the College of Nursing, totaling 24.

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

c. Committee on Instructional Development, Professor Don Jordan, Chair:

PROFESSOR DON JORDAN (Science Education) brought forward 3 proposals: one from the College of Arts and Sciences (Department of Media Arts), 1 from the College of Education (Department of Elementary Education), 1 from College of HRSM (Department of Sports and Entertainment Management).

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

6. Reports of Officers.

PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES thanked Professor Pae for speaking on USC Upstate.

Pastides addressed President Trump's directive relative to immigration. University administrators and faculty are meeting regularly with affected students, staff, and faculty. Pastides signed a national petition from the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities working with elected officials in Washington. They continue to wait for additional information, clarification, and directives from the Justice Department and from the courts. They are working as hard as they can to communicate the importance of the security, the safety and the well-being of all of USC's internationals. The two most affected groups on campus are students, faculty, and staff from Iran and Iraq.

The short term recommendation is for those individuals not to leave the country. There is also momentum and activity on the part of academic colleagues around the world to potentially not come to academic conferences in the United States until these policies are further thought out.

He thanked both Professor Grant and others who turned out for Carolina Day at the State House. This is the day each year when University staff and alumni wear the school colors and go to the House office building, the Senate office building and the executive branch to talk about the need for better funding and other kinds of support for the University of South Carolina and public higher education.

The University has multiple funding requests this year, the majority of which are for additional investment in the faculty and in support of student success. Additionally we are requesting a bond bill, as are many other southeastern states, for one-time capital needs. A capital need is a building, whether it's a new building, a renovation, or an expansion or an addition; then the state pays the interest on the loan.

The new governor, Henry Darden McMaster, is a double alumnus of the University of South Carolina as a history major and graduate of the School of Law. Hopefully that will mean opportunity for dialogue and communication.

The Board of Trustees retreat last weekend was a long but very productive, and the Provost did a good job about asking them to focus on the academic equality of this university and how it will achieve the next level of success by replenishing the faculty, investing in academic facilities, both instructional and research and ultimately making this the kind of university that great faculty want to stay at or come to. The board was extremely receptive to that message and they have asked the President, the Provost, and others to come back with a plan that would both potentially benefit from new money if the university receives new money from the state and if not, where would they find the money. That of course always conjures up the cloud of redistribution, but the administration is not ready for that by any means. The board is in concert with the administration and hopefully with the academic leadership of the university to not let that goal lay fallow while other things continue to move forward.

Yesterday, the maquette for a new statue that will be on the walkway between the Russell House, the new health center and the Thomas Cooper Library was revealed. The statue

portrays the University's first African American professor, one of the first African American graduates of our School of Law, and the first African American graduate of Harvard College, Richard T. Greener. During Reconstruction, from 1873 to 1877, he taught a variety of topics, including Philosophy and Religion. Then when the librarian left suddenly, Greener took over duties as librarian temporarily, without any incremental adjustment to his salary.

He advocated for funding for African American students to enter into the University of South Carolina and he succeeded in securing 124 full scholarships for African American students. When these students came to Carolina, if they were not fully equipped and ready to pursue their studies, he served as their tutor and their mentor. When Reconstruction ended and the University was closed and reopened as an all-white institution again, Greener left and had an outstanding career as the Dean of the Howard Law School, and later was an envoy representing the United States in Russia. In the fall, there will be a ribbon cutting for the beautiful statue to Richard T. Greener, the University of South Carolina's first African American professor.

Last night Pastides was at the State of the City Address where the Mayor and former USC Student Body President Steve Benjamin talked about many things including town and gown relations. Pastides was touched in that Ed Madden, director of Women's and Gender Studies at the University and poet-laureate of the City of Columbia, had written and recited a beautiful new poem, about the strength of a city and its neighborhoods.

The President thanked the Faculty Advisory committee for its work on non-tenure track faculty. He added that when he was the Dean of the Arnold School of Public Health, it was growing rapidly, but could not grow rapidly in tenure track appointments because they didn't have the slots. They did have money to invest and they had seen peer schools of public health around the country, AAU, R1 universities like USC grow quickly in the research track and eventually he could see that retaining them was difficult.

Young colleagues were doing a great job in scholarship, in service, and in teaching, but when he asked them what USC could do to keep them, they cited difficulties with one-year contracts and the feeling of being second class because they could not vote. So the Arnold School granted them the right to vote, and some of the departments gave them to right to vote.

PROVOST JOAN GABEL began by describing how the University is in the midst of Leadership Week. This is a new effort in conjunction with Student Affairs that's been running a Leadership Week Conference for 30 years. Last year the conference was jointly hosted with the SEC and had representatives of students from all of the SEC schools. There's activities going on in every college and in most of the administrative units in support of leadership efforts for the students, some for the community, faculty and staff. They're open; the students earn progress towards their graduation with leadership distinction, if they are so inclined. Representative James Smith coming on Thursday, the Mayor, also on Thursday, so the community is becoming involved too.

The Provost addressed the health sciences initiative. The main component to emerge out of that initiative area is a living learning community. The participants, the potential student participants in this program, Galen Fellows. Galen was one of the first physicians in ancient Greece and was also a pharmacist, so it refers to the inter-professional nature of the health sciences initiative. The Galen Fellows are the students who will participate in the living/learning community. The brochure and other materials came off the presses last Thursday. Last weekend was the first admitted student's weekend since the announcing the initiative. Information sessions for the Galen Fellows were all standing room only.

The First Year Reading Experience book has been selected. The book is entitled *Callings: the Purpose and Passion of Work* by David Isay. The students are competing now to win the representative poster design. University Advising is almost done with their project to do all of the major maps. They expect to be done by May, a very robust project, but very helpful on a variety of levels to be able to provide good advice to students.

The Center for Teaching Excellence Director search is underway.

The Pipeline for Academy Leaders (PAL program) was cited in the recent addition of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* as an example of how a university can effectively invest in the development of its faculty. Anyone interested in the program can talk to Cheryl Addy about that and other faculty development efforts.

Applications are now in for Provost grants. Two new attributes were added to the internal grants. One was a category for pedagogy and another was that non tenure track faculty can apply for the grants. They had applicants in the pedagogy category and non tenure track faculty applicants across the board in all of the categories.

There are two other grants that are to be released momentarily. One is the SEC travel grant and the other is the internally supported visiting scholars program.

Two Dean searches are well under way. The College of Social Work has had its finalists on campus and is now in the process of concluding the research portion of the search and determining the process of making an offer.

CIC is well underway, position description is posted. The committee has met and will meet again to do airport interviews and determine which candidates come to campus over the next few weeks. Candidates should be on campus late March to mid-April.

The Provost gave an overview of the strategic plan update and board retreat. The Focus Carolina plan had seven goals. They're still up on the website as the functioning strategic plan. Because it's been a few years they deserve a purposeful refresh with conversations with the Deans, a town hall, and other conversations. They have been presented to the Provost Retreat group multiple times and will again on Friday during the next Provost

retreat. They've been running it by the board on a regular basis as well as with the Presidents' executive committee and leadership from that point of view. So a lot of people have been involved in the conversation.

The Provost provided some context about how this fits together operationally. The process is like a three-legged stool and the process of thinking about strategic planning and how to operationalize it which sets the guide post for what we want the university to be. They then also have to do things and see whether they are being done, measure them, and assess them. Most of that is captured in the blueprint process and that's an annual reporting process that will focus on metrics. Then there is conversation about how to align resources so that they can get done as many of the things that they aspire to get done.

The way in which the goals have been reframed under this purposeful refresh is taking the seven goals to five. The first refers to programs, the second is supporting the faculty, the third is research, innovation, creative expression, community engagement, being inclusive, and then institutional excellence.

Under educating the thinkers and leaders of tomorrow, the University of South Carolina will provide a superior education to students through a foundation in the liberal arts along with innovative disciplinary study to equip workforce-ready, creative, and innovative leaders for the 21st Century; for Graduate and Professional students, it provides preparation to be scholars and professionals. And this is aligned with what the President said in the State of the University on what it means to be a 21st century university. What the objectives are is how they would start to take that verbiage and put it into an operational set of goals and then look under each objective for action items.

Under assembling and supporting a world class faculty, the University of South Carolina will be a university of choice that leads the way. Goal three is innovation, creative expression, and community engagement; this is more on the scholarship and teaching side, the work actually done by faculty.

Under the idea of building inclusive and inspiring communities, this captures actually two related topics that aren't normally lumped together but is done here for the purposes of measurement and assessment, which is the learning/living communities signature and also campus climate and university culture. So one is more pedagogical and the other is more cultural but they fit together as an aspiration.

Finally, under institution excellence, this is where they look at rankings, the alumni association, gifts, and how they are allocating resources.

7. Report of the Secretary.

No report.

8. Report of Chair.

CHAIR GRANT stated the highlight of the week for him was representing Faculty Senate at the Board of Trustees Retreat and having the opportunity to see what the thinking is behind decisions that are made; to see what the opportunities are and the degree to which these Trustees are engaged in this university. There was a presentation made by David Seaton, CEO of Fluor who was a graduation speaker and he was talking about what employers are looking for and as he finished, the Board of Trustees started talking about it and the murmur that went through was more critical thinking, more writing, more communication.

Grant encouraged the faculty to take that back to their classrooms and encourage their students. The world is looking for people who have the type of training, liberal arts training that USC is providing and the faculty should be commended that they are so well aligned with where the world is going and what the outside demands are.

9. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

10. New Business.

There was no new business.

11. Good of the Order.

PROFESSOR CHRISTIAN ANDERSON (EDUCATION) Co-Chair of the committee that has established the Greener Memorial, thanked President Pastides for outlining why Richard T. Greener is so important to this campus. On Monday at the event President Pastides mentioned this portrait of Richard T. Greener and how he noticed it at the McKissick Museum when he became President, and he chose it to display in the President's Office. That says a lot. Representation matters and that's the first thing visitors see as they walk in the President's office and this statute will be one of the first things people see as they walk around that part of campus.

The picture on the other side is him as an older gentleman. This is what the statute will look like and that's where it will be placed next to the Library. For more information, there are brochures out on the table and this is a faculty initiated event or program; wouldn't it be wonderful if faculty donated whatever they could.

CHAIR GRANT thanked Professor Anderson and stated he hopes the memorial will serve as a further inspiration to students and faculty. One person can make a difference and each person has an opportunity to impact this campus in a very long-term way.

12. Adjournment

CHAIR GRANT – And with that I have one more motion to entertain. Would anyone like to make the motion to adjourn? I hear so moved, and a second? All in favor? We'll see you in March.