

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
March 1, 2017

1. Call to Order.

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

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR GRANT asked for changes to the minutes of the February 1st meeting. There were none and the minutes were approved.

3. Invited Guests

GUESTS SANDRA KELLY (VICE-PROVOST AND DEAN OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES) AND DIRECTOR SHELLY DEMPSEY (ON YOUR TIME)

VICE PROVOST SANDRA KELLY - introduced the On Your Time Initiatives as an actual office that reports to the Office of the Provost, formalized in October 2016. The Director of the Office of On Your time Initiatives is Shelley Dempsey. She has two masters from USC: one in Higher Education Administration and the other in Business Administration. She has a lot of experience and background particularly in evening and non-degree programs and so is ideally suited to lead this initiative. She is also currently a member of USC Emerging Leaders program.

DIRECTOR SHELLEY DEMPSEY - reported that the idea has been around for a while. President Pastides spoke about the idea of On Your Time back in 2015 when he said, *“On Your Time is our commitment to timely graduation and reducing student debt. We have re-engineered the academic year so that we teach twelve months. Now, students don’t have to take an annual summer sabbatical. Instead they can accelerate their path to graduation, saving time and money.”*

The mission is to ensure that all students have the opportunity to graduate on time.

Involved in this mission are the ideas of both retention and graduation. USC has made steady progress since 2009 in the area of freshmen retention. They have instituted many programs, many services that have helped and there’s more that can be done and that’s where On Your Time plays a role. In terms of graduation rates there’s opportunity for continued improvement with 4-year rates.

So specifically, how does On Your Time relate to this?

For one thing, the summer semester was recently moved into their area. For summer of 2017 the office put in place a plan to promote the ease of scheduling a full-course load. It has less overlap of sessions than there would be for the fall 2017 semester, with the idea

that students can take the classes that they need and not have to choose between the ones that overlap and do one or the other.

They are intentionally scheduling the classes that students need during the summer. Whether it's for the ones on one end of the spectrum that need certain classes to be retained at the university or other students that are at the other end of the spectrum where they are ready to graduate and how they will get them finished up with their degree.

An important change to summer is that there was a lot of confusion in the past in terms of some Fridays were only for classes in a certain section, other Fridays you couldn't have class at all. Now Fridays will be held sacred for Student Support Services and that will allow staff to particularly help with students that need the extra support in the classes they are taking in a lot tighter of a time line.

She asked faculty to help spread the word and stop misinformation about financial aid for the summer. Summer tuition for a full load does match that of Fall and Spring.

The next phase of On Your Time, is ongoing: Supplemental Course Offerings. The staff works with a lot of the schools and colleges, a lot of the units to provide supplemental classes. That can be in the area of bottlenecks, classes that need to put a couple more sections on the schedule, hire an adjunct to teach a class and the budget may not allow for it, that's where On Your Time can be involved with these classes.

The Senior Citizen Tuition Waiver Program students also go to their office. These are any students who are South Carolina residents, 60 years or older. Important note here is their tuition is waived but they do have to pay fees. Another important piece is that these student register on the first day of class. The Legislation is written that they are allowed to take classes as space allows, and it isn't known if space allows until the first day of class.

The staff needs faculty help to get the word out about On Your Time, in several ways. They are looking for what undergraduate degrees are students already graduating from in less than 4 years. Beginning in the Fall of 2017, they will be gathering and marketing and promoting these programs and would like faculty to be a part of that.

Faculty can tell others about the services that are located in this office. The staff members are ready to help any of the students mentioned in the presentation. They can help them before they get frustrated. Often they get passed around and no one knows what On Your Time is.

She asked faculty to consider ways that they can partner with her office, things that will work to help with retention, help with degree profession.

CHAIR GRANT- asked if there were any plans for more faculty to be in the third semester as part of their full time duties or is the presumption that faculty will continue to have their full time duties during the regular 9 months?

GUEST DEMPSEY- That has not been mentioned as an option at this time.

PROFESSOR JOHN GERDES (Integrated Information and Technology) - asked how is this going to really impact the faculty. In the past, a lot of the classes during the summer were a lot shorter which gave faculty teaching during the summer time to do their research but now a lot of the dead time has been eliminated, which is great for the students but it creates some problems for the faculty and the ability to staff all of these initiatives. If we are really committed to getting students out in a certain amount of time and giving them the same level of education and support and classes that they get during the regular school year, we would probably need to have full time faculty during the summer. So again, all of this plays into the issues of how this initiative is going to impact the faculty itself.

GUEST DEMPSEY- It does, and this is a culture shift for the University of South Carolina. They are studying how other schools are doing similar things; it's happening all over the country. At this time in terms of how they are building the summer, it seems to be more of the classes that are some of the lower level courses, cross over many disciplines, and so as they go forward those will be discussions that the Deans will be brought into with Dr. Kelly and discuss how that will affect their full time faculty.

PROFESSOR GERDES - Since it does impact all of the faculty, is the Faculty Senate going to be voting on whether to support these changes?

VICE PROVOST KELLY- Do remember, that the office has only been in place since October but if there are going to be changes on how faculty are compensated and what their workload is, that will definitely be a discussion that goes across many units. The summer schedule itself, the way it's instituted, that was really very much driven in part by faculty complaints about overlap between the summer sessions. Some of the summer sessions in fact are quite short, Maymester being an obvious one that didn't really exist 10 years ago. As for suggestions of how that should go forward, Shelly would like to hear them but at this point teaching in the summer is not required of 9 month faculty.

GUEST DEMPSEY- All of the Deans did support that schedule and have the chance to see it and provide feedback to it in advance before it was adopted. It's a work in progress; it may look different next time.

PROFESSOR DENISE MCGILL (Journalism)- liked the theory and the ideas behind this but has a couple of concerns. One is that students who expect that they are going to graduate and they need to graduate in 4 years even if they've changed their major, but they've failed a class. She gets a lot of pressure to give overrides to her class so that they can graduate on time. How will this be addressed?

VICE PROVOST KELLY- Part of this is across different units as well managing student expectations. The staff has looked at courses that students do fail, looked at courses that students really need to get graduating and that's data driven, so in a data driven way,

they're trying to help the facilitate what gets offered in the summer. They are contemplating some other initiatives that might help that. For example, specific online courses offered so that students who fail, who fall behind, who change majors, have a chance to catch up. However, on the advising piece, there also is using Pathfinder and Degree Works. If you change to this major, these tools help determine what can you do, and how quickly you can graduate. And so there's an advising piece of this that is very important in managing student expectations because there are some times when students change to a particular major and have fallen behind, particularly if there is a lot of sequential stuff so it's very hard for them to catch up so that has to be managed. They are well aware that there has to be a balance and they can't promise every student, that no matter what they do, they will graduate in four years.

PROFESSOR MCGILL- Are you trying to steer them to majors where they will graduate in four years?

VICE PROVOST KELLY- The staff is telling them point blank what's possible and what's not possible and it's their choice of which major they choose. So that can go in the advising notes.

PROFESSOR SOPHYA GARASCHUK (Chemistry) - If students are taking full loads of course work in the summer who is going to advise them for that semester. Right now faculty are advising for the fall semester. If her students are going to take whatever 4-5 courses over the summer, they have to be advised again before they go into the fall semester. Are they supposed to advise for the summer semesters?

VICE PROVOST KELLY- Usually when faculty advise for the fall, they are also advising for the summer.

PROFESSOR GARASCHUK - But normally its one class, and now there are students who will have the chance to take a full load of classes over the summer.

VICE PROVOST KELLY- But they still would be advised in the spring for both the summer and the fall so it's not increasing the advising level.

PROFESSOR GARASCHUK - Is it an extra advising responsibility for faculty?

VICE PROVOST KELLY- Faculty advise twice – they advise in the fall for the spring and in the spring advise for the summer and the fall.

PROFESSOR GARASCHUK – Faculty will have to advise for more courses?

VICE PROVOST KELLY- If a faculty member has a student who is planning on graduating in 3 years, an accelerated degree or something like that the faculty need to take that into account when they advise them for the summer.

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR AMANDA CASTLES (GAMECOCKS LIVEWELL) highlighted some of the main programs and services that are available to faculty here on the main campus through Gamecocks LiveWell. The office is located currently in the Blatt PE Center, immediately through that front door, on the right.

This is probably the biggest benefit that a lot of people are not aware of and that's their State Health Plan Worksite Screening. It doesn't matter if it's the Standard Plan or the Savings Plan, either option covers a completely free comprehensive blood work panel once a year, at the Thomson Student Health Center, Monday through Friday mornings. There are additional tests that can be added on for a fee if they are outside of that standard order that the State Health Plan has.

Wellness Coaching is new, and it lets the employee be in the driver seat of any health and wellness goals that they might want to set. They can cover nutrition and healthy eating and physical activity plans. The first step is to go through a very general appointment to figure out where their baseline is now and what types of goals they might be considering and then the office staff will work with them to create an action plan. After that they are there for accountability.

The office also has a walk in service for a blood pressure check, body fat percentage checks, using a hand held device, and also some more appointment based services for a caliper measurement for body fat percentage, a fitness assessment, and an exercise plan. They are also available for departmental presentations.

The pharmacy is available to employees so if they have any prescriptions to fill there is the convenience of being here on campus. They can also use the lab, and then the allergy immunization and travel clinic.

Wind Down Wednesdays happens every Wednesday at the Russell House; they are brief guided meditations for a stress break during the week.

The Wellness Ambassadors Program lets them have a link to individual areas related to that. They will send information directly to whoever is a wellness ambassador and then work with that person in order to get any specific programs to areas.

They utilize social media to promote their programs and events on campus. You can search Gamecocks LiveWell on Twitter and Facebook to find their pages.

PROFESSOR JOE STATON (USC Beaufort) – provided information on USC Beaufort, with the historic Beaufort north campus and the Hilton head gateway campus which is the south campus. They have 2,000 students as of last fall and several new residence halls. They broke ground a couple of weeks ago for a building for the new hospitality program on Hilton Head Island as part of the joint effort with Hilton Head.

They have 18 degree programs and 20 minors and concentrations. The top programs, Business and Biology, are the top 2 in terms of numbers. They have Psychology, Hospitality Management, Human Services, Computational Sciences, Education and Nursing.

They've been giving degrees since 2004 and are up to about 2,200 graduates in the last 13 years. They are pretty good at getting scholarships and other internships for their students as well.

The Hilton Head Gateway is the new campus; they broke ground on that in 2005. The Historic Beaufort campus has been there a lot longer. They have students from 33 states, 11 countries, and SAT and ACT scores are rising. They have low student/faculty ratio and a fairly high diversity of students on campus. The main groups they serve is the 4-county area of Beaufort, Jasper, Colleton, and Hampton counties.

Beaufort campus was actually started in 1795. They have been part of the USC system since 1959. They are a two-year degree school. The sand shark is the mascot; they have a number of sports teams. The colors are navy and sand and they keep the garnet and black as secondary colors because of ties to the main campus. They have an active baseball program, softball team, golf, cross country, track and field.

CHAIR GRANT - announced he has appointed as Parliamentarian pro tem Professor Mark Thompkins who is a former parliamentarian in case any parliamentary issues come up we actually have an expert to address those issues during the reports of committees.

4. Reports of Faculty Committees

a. Senate Steering Committee, Elizabeth West, Secretary:

PROFESSOR ELIZABETH WEST (South Caroliniana Library) - brought forward the slate of nominees for the senate committees. There were no nominations from the floor. The slate was approved by acclamation.

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

PROFESSOR KATHLEEN KIRASIC (Psychology) - brought forward 5 proposals, 2 from the College of Arts and Sciences, 2 from the College of Engineering and Computing and 1 from University Studies. There was no discussion and the proposals were approved.

c. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Professor Kathy Snediker, Chair

PROFESSOR KATHY SNEDIKER (Libraries) - Very briefly, last fall Faculty Senate passed changes regarding the process for withdrawal for the semester due to extenuating circumstances. So this has necessitated some very brief changes in the Faculty Manual as

well. Basically, a few grammatical cleanups but also taking medical withdrawals out of this section in the Faculty Manual because they no longer follow this process but the process that was in fact approved last fall. There was no discussion and the proposal was approved.

d. Faculty Advisory Committee, Ev Monsma/Marco Valtorta, Co-Chairs

PROFESSOR MARCO VALTORTA (Engineering) – The committee moved to approve a proposal to modify the Faculty Manual so that voting rights are extended to non-tenure track faculty members. The proposal was sent as an email attachment to all senators and has been available as the FAC committee report on the Faculty Senate webpage for this meeting. Therefore and in the interest of time, he summarized the proposal and the co-chair will later give a brief history of how the proposal was developed, if needed. The proposal consists of 6 pages with recommended changes to different parts to the Faculty Manual, referring to the latest revision of the Faculty Manual of June 10th, 2016.

On page 1 of the proposal, the committee proposes to modify a section called “voting” which is on page 4 of the Faculty Manual by redefining which members of the faculty have the right to present motions and vote at meetings of the university faculty. As a special case they propose that the clinical teaching faculty of each School of Medicine will have 3 elected representatives only. On page 2 they propose to modify a section called “voting” on page 30 of the Faculty Manual by clarifying that the voting procedure applies to members of the tenure track faculty. On page 3 they propose to modify a section called “Faculties of the Colleges, Schools or Departments” which is on pages 13 and 14 of the Faculty Manual by expanding the definition of faculty of colleges schools and departments to include all full time faculty, by restricting votes on tenure and promotion matters to tenure track faculty only and by encouraging units to extend voting privileges to faculty who are not fulltime.

On pages 4 and 5 of the motion, they propose to modify a section called “members” which is on page 88 of the Faculty Manual by extending eligibility to serve as a senator to all voting members of the university faculty as defined in the revised voting section on page 4 of the Faculty Manual and by specifying a new formula for representation of clinical teaching faculty of the School of Medicine. Each of the two schools will have only 3 senators representing the clinical teaching faculty. They also propose to modify the heading on pages 88-89 of the Faculty Manual to reflect the new definition of voting faculty form page 4 of the Faculty Manual. One page 6 of the motion they propose to modify a section called “officers” which is on page 89-90 on the Faculty Manual by allowing any voting member of the faculty with 5 or more years of service at USC to run for Chair of the senate.

This concludes the presentation of the motion by the Faculty Advisory Committee. There are questions. Prepare to present the history of this motion.

CHAIR GRANT - As a motion of the committee the motion requires no second. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee discussed the procedure because they heard that some

amendments may be proposed, therefore they would like to propose before they discuss the motion in general, that any amendments be considered and following the discussions and vote on amendments, then they will consider the motion as a whole.

Are there any amendments that anyone would like to make?

PROFESSOR SIMON TARR (Visual Design) - brought concerns with page 13 “Faculties of the Colleges, Schools and Departments” the line “units are encouraged to extend voting privileges to faculty who are not full time”. A concern being that this is an overreach on the part of the Senate and without regards to dictating to units that they should restructure their bylaws and governance structures for temporary faculty without regards to those units’ conflicts of interest or other considerations. It is improper and somewhat presumptuous for this body to use the Faculty Manual to make such a proclamation. If a unit feels strongly about such unit governance structures they could already amend their unit bylaws and adopt them as they wish and indeed some units have already tried to do this, some to some success, some without and some have rejected it. So, I would propose that that line be stricken.

CHAIR GRANT- It is proposed the sentence under consideration is “units are encouraged to extend voting privileges to faculty who are not full time”, the motion has been made to strike that sentence. Is there a second? There is a second. Grant reminded senators that came in late that senators must sit in the two center sections. He asked for discussion on the amendment.

PROFESSOR ERIK DOXTADER (English) - proposed a motion to supersede the amendment because this particular motion captures the spirit of the amendment, particularly the comments that were made with respect to it. Whereas the motion on the floor continues the missions and ambiguities that make and found its spirit and purpose. He moves to recommit the motion to the Faculty Advisory Committee for further development and clarification.

CHAIR GRANT- The motion to recommit the entire motion to the Faculty Advisory Committee does supersede the motion for amendment. Do we have a second? Any discussion please?

PROFESSOR DOXTADER - appreciates the efforts of the Faculty Advisory Committee in their work with this. This is incredibly complicated, which is now a terrible thing to say because they’ve discovered that other things are terribly complicated. There are some problems and they need to be thought through.

First, this is inconsistent with some tenure and promotion documents that have been approved for departments. Second, regarding that item number which now lists the various position and the various non-tenure track positions which would be eligible for membership, the list does not have a referent to the degree that (ACAF 1.06) is under revision. He shares Professor Tarr’s concerns about the language of encouragement and whom is doing the encouraging. He would like to hear advice from council on that

question and believes a debate is needed about this body relative to the amendment and the purpose of this body today in light of what's going on in higher education, and that debate is needed in conjunction with this proposal.

PROFESSOR JESS KASS (Math) – shared a comment from a colleague: “immediately before the voting section is membership, in that paragraph faculty is defined to consist of the president, provost, deans, professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, full time academic instructors and full time lecturers who are not degree candidates at the units of their appointment.” With no change to this paragraph, doesn't that mean that all future references to university faculty exclude the clinical, research and other titles mentioned in the long list added to the voting section? In fact with this definition of faculty, the changes in the voting paragraph are meaningless, there are no “members of the faculty” holding the tile of clinic professor etc. This is a relatively complicated issue that should be resolved or put back into the FAC.

PROFESSOR VALTORTA - The section of membership seems to have a catch-all clause at the end. At the end of the list of members of the faculty, what the faculty consists of there is the following clause “or such other person that the faculty chooses to elect to its ranks.” So that list isn't supposed to be exhaustive and he doesn't see a conflict between the membership paragraph and the voting paragraph because of the existence of that last clause.

PROFESSOR JOHN GERDES (Integrated Technology) - In the sentence that was referenced there, it does indicate that units are encouraged to extend voting privileges to faculty who are not full time. So any person that is teaching any course, they would have voting rights? Is it encouraging to have adjuncts and absolutely anybody that taught any classes would be encouraged to have full voting rights in the departments. Is that what that is saying?

CHAIR GRANT- No. The concern as the proposed changes were being drafted was whether the representation should be on the basis of full time faculty or FTE faculty. Because many units have a large number of adjuncts who teach a significant number of courses, and it may not be appropriate for them to have representation on the faculty senate but it might be appropriate for them to have a voice within the units. And the compromised wording created by the committee was this sentence that has an effect only on unit voting. It has no affect upon the Faculty Senate and representation on the Faculty Senate. The goal is only to ensure that there is representation in matters involving curricula by people who are teaching courses. But, again we have a motion that has been put aside superseded by another motion that would strike that one sentence, so if the current motion is not successful we will then vote on the motion of whether to strike the sentence.

PROFESSOR GERDES - wanted to get to a definition of that one phrase.

CHAIR GRANT - As a matter of procedure, the Faculty Manual is a general guiding document. It is backed up by a series of academic policies. Someone mentioned ACAF 1.06 earlier, which had been referenced in an earlier version. It is not referenced anymore in this proposal. But specific definitions like how is full-time defined, that's a matter for a separate HR policy. That doesn't need to go into the Faculty Manual. Rather the Faculty Manual, the goal of that is to provide an overall set of guidelines and then we have policies which also can be proposed and deliberated in this body.

PROFESSOR JOHN MUCKELBAUR (English) – Stated he is nervous in this political climate of circumstances that look to erode the value of tenure. He does not want to devalue the work of non-tenure track folks at all but one of his questions is simply why is the question of representation of non-tenure track faculty in the Faculty Senate in any way related to the question of their representation in the unit because these seem like totally different questions. Why are we dealing with them as if they are one question?

CHAIR GRANT - If the first motion has been made passes, it won't be of a concern. Any further discussion on the motion?

PROFESSOR KASS - Referred to page 4, regarding the last clause “and all such other persons” ... but then the... is “as the faculty chooses to elect into its ranks” the colleague who emailed Kass expressed concern he doesn't want to assume what that means. What are the provisions for the faculty to elect others to its rank? He'd like to see this clarified by FAC.

CHAIR GRANT - Suggested that that suggestion is out of order, simply because that is a separate issue. There is a motion before the Senate that is specifically addressing the issue of extending the vote to non-tenure track faculty. Making other changes, he's consulted with the Parliamentarian. There have been a host of suggestions on other changes to the Faculty Manual that could be added to this and they have not been considered by the Faculty Advisory Committee, so that change can be made by the Faculty Advisory Committee.

PROFESSOR KASS - Rephrased that he put that information out in support of the proposed amendment, the proposed motion to delay.

PROFESSOR FELIPE THOMAZ (Marketing) - Raised this question and brought it to his unit as well and the non-tenure track came back with one point of concern that was brought up in our previous meeting that he did not see addressed in this current iteration or not as far as the discussion, that kind of goes in support of this motion to reevaluate, restudy, and incorporate new suggestions into it. And that point was the fact how do you actually get that representation?. That there's no language that enforces or institutes a certain amount of that representation given a certain number and there were two opposing cases that were suggested in discussion during the last meeting which was, there is an opportunity to fill these new seats with all tenure track faculty and nothing change. They don't have guaranteed representation and working simultaneously or conversely assign all of their senate seats to non-tenure track and dance their way out of additional service.

Thomaz did not see any language actually guaranteeing them the things that the committee thinks they should have.

CHAIR GRANT - Again the Faculty Manual is currently silent on that other than establishing the ratio that there should be one senator for every 10 voting faculty but how a unit elects its senators is an issue for the unit. Is that a suggestion that there be a procedure to take the right from that unit?

PROFESSOR THOMAZ – No, if that’s already in place, then just by changing the language here enacts others changes that handles this issue then Thomaz no longer has an issue. He just did not understand if this was going to preclude them from being included.

PROFESSOR SOURAV BANERJEE (Engineering) - The same concern was raised by a couple of colleagues in his department. Any particular department has 30 faculty and they now have 2 representatives in the Senate so when the voting rights are extended and some department has say 50 faculty they will get 3 or 4 representatives in the senate. So this extra representation will come from the non-extended community or from the same tenure track and the faculties that already exist, so the concern is the Senate will dilute with the non-tenure track faculty at the time. So if one point of time with the tenure decisions will be coming up let’s say eliminate the (inaudible) then the voting for that process will dilute the vote actually.

CHAIR GRANT - The proposal explicitly does not include any involvement of non-tenure track faculty in any process involving the creation of tenure and promotion guidelines for the granting of tenure of tenure track faculty.

PROFESSOR BANERJEE - The concern that has been raised over time is that if the voting right has been extended, the representatives in the senate will also be extended to the non-tenure track faculty will soon be coming and representing the Senate.

CHAIR GRANT – Yes.

PROFESSOR BANERJEE - So the later time, some issues are in favor of tenure track faculties but not in favor of non-tenure track faculties will be diluted by the voting right of the non-tenure track faculties.

CHAIR GRANT - That is absolutely correct.

PROFESSOR BANERJEE - So that is a concern raised by some of the faculties in his department meeting.

CHAIR GRANT – Absolutely correct on any voting item. As you broaden the number of people voting, the power of those currently voting will be diluted.

PROFESSOR TANVIR FAROUK (MECHANICAL ENGINEERING) - Non-tenure track faculty will not have any say in the tenure and promotion but they will have a say in

the Faculty Manual. So they will vote on the Faculty Manual and whatever changes will be made in the Faculty Manual, the vote will come from the non-tenure track as well.

CHAIR GRANT – That’s correct, but it is my understanding....

PROFESSOR FAROUK – So that is the concern from...

CHAIR GRANT – Let me ask, the guiding document for tenure and promotion is the Golden Rod. Is the Golden Rod voted on by only tenured?

CHAIR-ELECT VALTORTA – The concern is legitimate. That is, right now, the Faculty Manual is written in such a way that even after the modification, if it is accepted; only tenure track faculty will be involved in the tenure and promotion process. The Faculty Manual delegates to the UCTP the definition of the processes for tenure and promotion which results in what is often known as the Golden Rod and only professors, full-ranked tenured faculty can serve on UCTP.

The concern is that by having representation of non-tenure track faculty in the Senate there may be potentially a change in the Faculty Manual. For example, the Golden Rod will be written by a different committee or something like that.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER – Just a couple of clarifications very quickly. First with respect to ACAF 1.06 which the Chair mentioned again. The question of full-time is a question potentially for HR but ACAF 1.06 currently does specify full vs. non-full time or full time vs temporary and its under revision. So he would simply reiterate that he doesn’t think the senators know what they are voting on.

The second thing is..

CHAIR GRANT – I’m sorry.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER – Senators don’t know what they are voting on. There’s no referent for the list of positions. There’s no stable definition relative to voting membership, page four which is the second piece of paper on our agenda. There isn’t a stable referent for that list.

The second thing is with respect to tenured faculty can vote and this is the third piece of paper on our list: FACULTIES OF THE COLLEGES, SCHOOLS, OR DEPARTMENTS, there are two questions: unless otherwise provided within the academic unit, except that only tenured faculty can vote on matters concerning tenure and promotion guidelines and advancement of tenure-track faculty, alright. Setting aside the question of non-tenure track faculty, this sentence is inconsistent with existing tenure and promotion policies at the level of departments that insofar as it says that only tenured faculty can vote on tenure and promotion guidelines. Okay, that’s inconsistent with the existing policy that has been approved

The second issue is the beginning of that clause “unless otherwise provided”. Does this mean, and people who are good readers can’t answer this question for themselves, does this mean that departments have to reconstitute their existing policy or does existing policy continue if this is passed? Unless, in that clause after that comma, is ambiguous in terms of what can exist after this and what has to be re-constituted after this motion is passed.

CHAIR GRANT – The answer to the question on a policy basis is in the clause it says “unless otherwise in the unit faculty”, that is then gives the right to the unit to indicate for those matters. But on all other matters than the Faculty Manual supersedes any unit guidelines”. So for example, there was a question from someone who said, we allow our non-tenure track faculty to vote on tenure and promotion guidelines and this would prohibit that practice because in this case the Faculty Manual would be the superseding document.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER – Stated he had exhausted his right to speak and asked if he could reply.

CHAIR GRANT – Absolutely.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER - Agreed and disagreed because it’s ambiguous. What Chair Grant says could be true. It could also be true given the way this sentence is written that all departments have to go back and reconstitute their policies and do so by including all non-tenure track faculty and then they have a policy that is theirs. People are raising this question and it’s a legitimate ambiguity in terms of whether existing policy can remain or whether they have to create new policy.

CHAIR GRANT – The intention of the three different committees that have vetted the policy and discussed the policy over the last two years, is that units not have to re-constitute policies. The goal is as Professor Valtorta explained broadening voting rights.

Grant asked if there were any further discussion on the motion to refer back to committee or would someone like to call the question?

There being no further discussion, the question is automatically called. The Senate voted to refer it back to the Faculty Advisory Committee.

CHAIR GRANT – Introduced Doug Foster, the new Chief Information Officer of the University, who gave a report in lieu of the President and Provost.

6. Reports of Officers.

VICE PRESIDENT FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND CHIEF

INFORMATION DOUG FOSTER – Spoke on his experience and philosophies. His experience is mixed, with a number of years in corporate environments, which may not

seem relevant to this job. He spent the last eight years at Purdue University which is very relevant to this job and over that time what he figured out is to keep the first thing, the first thing.

And the first thing here is creation and dissemination of knowledge. What happens in many organizations and IT is not immune to this, is they become as navel gazers. They start looking inward and kind of forget why they're here. What's the purpose? Why do they exist in the first place? They exist for the creation and dissemination of knowledge, to support all faculty to do those things that further that mission. He has also heard comments regarding "the academic mission" and his question is what other mission is there? That would imply that there are other missions and his view is there are not. This is where all the energy needs to go.

The IT organization today needs a lot of realignment. His promise is that it will happen. USC is making strikes in spaces like research and teaching and learning, but not nearly the level that is needed. He is gathering input and welcomes feedback.

He encouraged faculty to think about how IT could line up with this mission. What are things they could be doing that maybe they are not doing or are not doing enough of? It has to be done as a partnership. Communication is going to be a cornerstone of that. There has been such a void that it needs to be filled with lots of conversations like this. They are starting a number of governance groups and will work very, very closely with the Faculty Senate IT committee. There is a research subcommittee that was formed off that, and they are talking about student governance.

PROFESSOR MICHY KELLY (MEDICINE) - Security has to be a very important thing especially being at the School of Medicine, with patient information, but some think that the security that has been put in place prevents Medicine faculty from being able to do their job. Which over the last year, she has found it is harder and harder especially to work remotely. A 37.50 workweek is not reality. Faculty have to be able to work from home on nights and weekends and she is not the only person growing very frustrated with the security getting in the way of them being productive.

VICE PRESIDENT FOSTER - That is one of the very tricky balancing acts that have to go on, especially in the space like this. As they are called in Information Security, they are attack factors and they are explosive in higher education just because all the different places that people can access important information here. That is where shared governance really comes in, because the trick of this is, everyone is taking risks. The University is taking a risk and everyone has a job to do. There must a common conversation about how to balance those precisely so that it is secure, the risk is mitigated to some extent and people are still as productive as they can possibly be.

CHAIR GRANT – Asked for an update on the status on the HPC cluster.

VICE PRESIDENT FOSTER – An HPC cluster has been ordered and it should arrive within the next 5 or so days. There should be lots more communication around this. The

research committee is working on a symposium that's coming up on campus in the April time frame. (CHAIR GRANT – Friday, April 14th) They will talk a lot about what that cluster is about, how this is going to work and about how to create a sustainable model. Where Foster came from at Purdue there was a pretty robust research high-performance computing environment there and he wants to try to bring those kinds of things here to really advance research.

7. Report of the Secretary.

There was nothing to report.

8. Report of Chair.

CHAIR GRANT – Stated that as just as representatives from other campuses have been visiting here, he has also been visiting them. They are eager to be part of the system and find ways to work with Columbia campus faculty.

There are only two more Faculty Senate Meetings of the year; April 5th and June 7th. The Senate does not meet in May. The June meeting is Hawaiian shirt day. The agenda now says as of June the Senate will be meeting in the Booker T. Washington Auditorium.

9. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

10. New Business.

There was no new business.

11. Good of the Order.

SECRETARY WEST –The South Caroliniana Library will undergo a shift in its user services in preparation for renovations to the historic building. It is the oldest free-standing academic library in the United States. Constructed in 1840 and this will be a major renovation. The Library has entered a new phase of preparations and that means that all user services will be moved out of the Caroliniana building and onto the top floor or mezzanine of the Thomas Cooper Library. The Caroliniana will close from May 15 through the 19th for the move and services will reopen on the mezzanine of Cooper on May 22nd. The renovation will take several years.

CHAIR GRANT – Provided a reminder of the High Performance Computing symposium on Friday, April the 14th.

12. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be April 5, 2017, at 3:00 p.m. in the Law School Auditorium.