

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
April 4, 2018

1. Call to order.

CHAIR MARCO VALTORTA (Computer Science & Engineering) called the meeting to order.

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes

CHAIR VALTORTA- asked for corrections to the minutes of March 7, 2018. There were none and the minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Special Items

CHAIR VALTORTA- introduced the first candidate for Senate Chair Elect, Mark Cooper (English)

PROFESSOR MARK COOPER (English)- Since accepting this nomination he's been asked frequently why he would do this. One of his colleagues responded by sending him a proposal to abolish the Faculty Senate, so he chose to interpret that as a version of the question why would you want to do this. There are about 2,000 faculty in the University of South Carolina system and he wonders what it would mean for them to act in concert.

He wonders what issue would galvanize faculty. Would it be something like trying to change taxpayers' minds about who should pay for higher education? Would it be something grander, like advancing the cause of racial and economic justice for all people? Would it be something more prosaic, like parking, perennial favorite of this august body, and if they could agree on an issue, could they agree on what to do about it? And if they could agree on what to do about it could they act effectively together to make decisive change? This is what he would like to spend his time thinking about if he were elected Chair Elect and then Chair of the Faculty Senate. So that's why he accepted the nomination. He's optimistic about this; he's not naive about it as he knows that agreeing with one another is not what faculty do best. But these are unusual times and so maybe times when it might be easier to find common cause.

PROFESSOR STEVE RODNEY (Physics & Astronomy)- asked Cooper to say something about how he would go about determining what would be the galvanizing issue that he might lead the Faculty Senate on.

PROFESSOR COOPER- He would spend this wonderful year as a Faculty Senate Chair Elect, figuring out what the process is for developing agendas at the Faculty Senate and try to build some opportunities in the Faculty Senate meetings for developing consensus around an issue. So the Faculty Senate process would be the instrument whereby they try to figure out and Faculty Senators then would be called upon to do that work in their own units to try and filter information about that.

CHAIR VALTORTA- introduced the second candidate for Senate Chair Elect, Tom Regan (Sport Management)

PROFESSOR TOM REGAN (Sport Management)- He's been here, in the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management and been in the Department of Sport and Entertainment for a long time, since 1991. He's been the Chair of the Faculty Budget committee twice, Athletic Advisory committee, on multiple Steering committees and he's been able to look at Marco, Augie, Jim Knapp before that during this period of time. He wants to do this because it's time in his career to give back and to serve the faculty. And one of the things that he wants to do is that he's at that point in his career where he can add value to the faculty. What he wants to do is initiate a culture in the faculty where they become much more involved in some of the issues in that faculty seem to be somewhat non-involved in all the time. He will go to every college and make sure that he talks to everybody during this first year if he's elected and he's going to talk to some of the leaders in those areas - not the Deans but to the faculty and some of the issues that are going to be needed in order to move USC forward.

There are multiple things that he thinks this whole culture, the faculty at South Carolina, has been somewhat, not as active as they could be and on top saying they're going to need to be but faculty need to be proactive in some areas. The administration, they listen and they do care but they said they have to have good guidance from the faculty and involvement. There's not one time he's ever heard the administrators say it doesn't matter what faculty say; they want to hear what faculty say and they want to be involved and during this period of time and this next four years if he's in this role, he's going to be involved in the culture in order to enhance what the faculty should do. He has plenty of experience in governance and he's been a Faculty Senator multiple times, on Steering Committees, and he worked on the compression issue with Provost Amiridis and now with Provost Gabel to get it done over that period. And that 5.9 million was initiated out of the Budget Committee a long time ago. He's also involved in the USC budget model right now with the Budget Committee. He's the faculty representative. Any faculty can come and talk to him. The best part of this is that during this period of time he's been here the diversity of our faculty across the university is excellent and he learns something every day when he has an opportunity to talk with faculty. He pledged 100% of his service during this period of time.

PROFESSOR SETH STOUGHTEN (Law)- What issues are you referring to?

PROFESSOR REGAN- Issues as far as making the faculty get involved. One of the things that he'd like to see is that the children of the University of South Carolina have the opportunity to go here if they want to and in turn be able to promote that through an enhancement to the faculty when they are recruited to come in with their young families. It's a budget issue and it's a university issue across that but those young faculty members being able to bring their students to the University of South Carolina with tuition reduction other than the Hope Scholarship and Life scholarship in addition to that in order to keep that talent in the university.

CHAIR VALTORTA- instructed the senators to fill out the ballot and turn it in just before the report of officers. Votes will be counted in time for the secretary to report the results of the election after the Report of Officers.

Valtorta introduced parliamentarian Bill Sudduth for a special item on the agenda re: an analysis of attendance data for Faculty Senate.

PROFESSOR BILL SUDDUTH (Parliamentarian)- has been parliamentarian for five years and part of what started to concern him a few years ago was the attendance of the Faculty Senate. There have been cases in the last couple years where there were concerns about quorum and attendance and the ability to get the Senate's work done. The information presented is taken from the sign in sheets from this year and the two previous years.

The departments are broken into three groups; small, medium and large. Small representation or departments or units that have one or two senators, medium three to five senators and large departments are units six or more senators. In the first two years the size of the Faculty Senate was stable; last year it increased by including non-tenure track faculty. Faculty Senate increased by 23 additional representatives for this year. Of those 23, thirteen units added one rep, two units added two senators and two units added three senators.

The slides were not meant to embarrass nor praise anybody but what they were compiled for each department size and each year and show what departments were high attending, what departments were low attending and the number listed next to their name is the number of senators that they have for their unit. The summary of this over the past three years is that of the small departments 19 departments which is about a six per year have had high attendance which is 70% or more, another 19 departments have low attendance. Medium departments, which again over the three years totaled 48, had 12 departments with high attendance, 12 departments with low attendance and then with the larger departments again 17 over the last three years. There were zero departments with 70% or better attendance and 7 departments with 30% or less attendance.

Regarding individual attendance, some folks may look at this as representing their department or they may look at being a senator as an individual duty. Individual attendance over the past three years have averaged anywhere between 26 and 27 faculty senators who have never attended a meeting during their terms.

The *Faculty Manual* states that a senator should attend a minimum of at least four or a majority of the meetings which would be four or more and that has been running at 36.5-41% and currently 43% of the faculty senators have attended at least four meetings.

CHAIR VALTORTA- introduced Professor Erik Doxtader (English) for a presentation of the attendance issues as he sees them.

PROFESSOR ERIK DOXTADER (English)- appreciated the chance to talk. In thinking about the question of attendance it seems to him that attendance is not just to show up, the term itself both means to turn ones ear and to speak simultaneously and to articulate and to listen and to do so in an active way and attendance is a problem. He thinks the Senate can stipulate that is a problem, the statistics that Bill has amassed indicate that it's a problem. It's been a discussion point for a number of years during his term in the Senate, it's a problem in terms of numbers, it

seems to him it's a problem in terms of passivity, it is not a problem of the Senate leadership in his view. The Senate leadership including Marco and others work tirelessly, and they deserve respect and applause and commendation.

The problem of attendance is a problem as senators. It's a problem of having quorum. It's a problem of being able to represent departments. It's a problem of faculty governance and all senators are all implicated in that problem and his suggestion to have this session was motivated by a sense that it is a problem and it's something that needs to be talked about honestly. It's not simply a matter of having an attendance policy. Faculty need to ask the larger question and the underlying question and the more difficult question which is why is attendance bad? Mark Cooper's colleague may have stumbled onto something in his email to dissolve the Senate. Why is attendance poor? Faculty need to ask that question out loud and there are a variety of replies and the Senate needs to hear and consider those different replies. He doesn't think people fail to attend Senate meetings out of bad faith or out of disinterest. He thinks they don't attend for good reasons potentially or what to them are good reasons. There may be a reasonable view that the Senate's work does not justify attendance or at least full attendance or attentive attendance.

There's a widespread perception that the Senate is not all that relevant and that its relevance is waning in the last several years. There's a perception that the Senate is perhaps unduly focused or too much focused on the transmission of information, where senators passively and listen to things that they are then charged to articulate back to their colleagues, at least some of which could be contained in e-mails. There is a perception that what happens in this body, in this room is oftentimes reduced to question and answer sessions that lack for depth and that are perhaps not addressed to the issues that faculty think are important, and there is a reluctance to do what would make this body a senate, which is to deliberate.

If senators are unable to deliberate, if they do not deliberate about matters of common concern then they need to change the name of this body because that's what makes it a Senate. Doxtader stated those are his views and there are other perspectives to be sure and this is a moment to begin to hear those. From his own point of view the question of attendance is partly a question of stepping back and asking the question, what does it need to serve in the Senate and that's a question that needs to be taken up in each and every department. There is a widespread perception that the Senate is a good place for junior faculty to do light service; that's reasonable and it also comes with some certain implications. Senators need to think more clearly about the ways and means of this body, its history, the relationship between this body and committees, the articulated power of this body in terms of its bylaws and the relationship or the comparative between what they can do as a senate and what happens in senates in peer aspirant institutions. There are some important differences as one begins to look and USC faculty need to take up the question that both of candidates for the future chair articulated which is what are the questions that concern them, what questions do faculty have in common, and how can they begin to deliberate and debate on those questions at the same time that they take up the question of how do they want to debate them. Debate does not just happen, deliberation does not just happen, particularly in a body where some members of the faculty, particularly untenured and faculty who are not on the tenure track, do not feel comfortable speaking in this body; those issues go together.

For Doxtader, attendance is a question of what can be done to the question of what good can the Senate do; that's an open question, and it's a question faculty should take up together. This is a moment not for answers but for the question itself. Thank you.

CHAIR VALTORTA- opened the floor for questions.

PROFESSOR FRANK THORNE (Mathematics)- His department is coping with budget cuts, and a lot of other departments are also, so he was complaining to one of his colleagues who admonished him to keep the big picture in mind. And upon thinking about it he decided his colleague was completely correct. So one thing he'd like to request to this body, what is the big picture? He'd be grateful if they'd discuss the budget in more detail, and what he'd really like to do is learn how he can best serve his unit, his college and the University as well.

CHAIR VALTORTA- responded that he has been just coming out of this process which is called the blueprint process. Every college in the university has to prepare every year a report, which is called the Blueprint for Excellence. This is a standardized report that contains a lot of data for example data on the composition of the faculty. So there is a lot of discussion about adjunct faculty, non-tenure track faculty, tenure track faculty, their progress and so on so this gives them all of the data they want on how the composition in the various colleges and it varies tremendously across colleges.

The provost organizes this effort, leads this effort and she invited a representative from the Faculty Budget Committee. This was a representative rotated over time so for Thorne's college, Subra Bulusu who is also chair of faculty welfare but is a member of the Faculty Budget Committee was present and Valtorta was present. The chair of the Faculty Senate was invited to be there the whole time so they had the opportunity to ask questions of Dean Ford together with some members of the administration and maybe they can talk later about what kind of questions they asked but the point is there is a mechanism for the faculty even now to participate in this budget discussions and through this blueprint revisions what that may mean is there isn't a way to exchange information through the budget committee, through the chair of the senate in both directions and so this is something certainly that should be improved.

The next step for the budget is at the president level meetings for the various units, these are shorter meetings again the representatives of the faculty are sitting at those meetings. So there has to be a better kind of communication and understanding of their concerns as faculty so that they can express them in the appropriate way.

PROFESSOR TRACI TESTERMAN (School of Medicine)- What the Senate has heard is that there's an attendance problem and some reasons why the Faculty Senate is important, but what she hasn't heard are what are some of the barriers to attendance because in many cases that's at the heart of why people aren't attending. Certainly there's going to be a subset of people who have teaching conflicts but she doesn't think that's the majority of what's going on now. Coming from the School of Medicine the major barrier for her is driving over here, finding a place to park, whether she has enough quarters for the meters, how far she's going to have to end up walking and all of that. There is a point to having as many people together in a room but for

those in remote locations, there is the technology to simulcast so people can have discussions in multiple rooms and maybe that would be one solution.

PROFESSOR SIMON TARR (Visual Arts & Design)- thinks they need more information. There's a paradox in that the people having the discussion are the people who are here and the problem is not with the people who are here. There are probably going to be some mechanical simple reasons why people don't attend but the big question is - to Professor Doxtader's point - is there something more? Is it a sense of futility? Is it a rebellion against how the structures are? The Senate don't know that until it asks but it has to ask everybody. Probably another survey is needed.

PROFESSOR SARA SCHWEBEL (English)- thanked her colleague for starting this conversation. She is reminded every time in the Faculty Senate that the conversation is being recorded. Senators hear that multiple times in a meeting and the very fact that they are asked to stand and introduce themselves and introduce their departments and that it's recorded is at times a hindrance to open honest discussion. This is something they also need to think through if this is truly to be a deliberative body where people can share thoughts and information. She starts every semester telling her students that the reason she has a classroom policy that no recording devices may be used is because she wants honest open conversation and that they're going to be discussing difficult issues during the course of the semester and so it's difficult for her to be in a space where she doesn't feel that that is granted to her.

PROFESSOR SUSAN YEARGIN (Exercise Science)- stated the Senate wants people to discuss and it's no fault of anybody in the room but waiting for a microphone is going to cut down on the number of people who can talk and she asked if somewhere else on campus, perhaps at the new Darla Moore school, there are places where microphones are built in. With technology today there should be a better way for senators to be able to voice concerns without having to wait for a microphone. She also stated that the reason that she didn't go the first time she was a senator from her old department was because she just felt like her voice didn't matter. Sitting there and saying aye, just feels like a joke, like so she brought those concerns before the Senate that it should be using modern technology and voting electronically with their phones if their vote really matters. If it doesn't then why are they voting. She doesn't feel like she has to come because her vote doesn't actually really matter.

CHAIR VALTORTA- thanked Susan Yeargin because she was involved from the beginning on this move to bring the discussion to the floor of the Senate on this topic.

Valtorta added a few more comments. He has had a long conversation with Nina Jackson who is Internal Communications Manager in the Office of Communications and Public Affairs on the possibility of creating in a Faculty Senate newsletter to open communication across the faculty, based in the Senate especially.

He is sometimes frustrated by the fact that he cannot reach all of the faculty directly; right now there is a filter to the messages that the Senate office can send out to the whole faculty. He was told to send messages to the senators and the senators can then broadcast them to their units and a related comment was that if the message comes from senators, colleagues in the same

department or unit it will be read, whereas if a message comes from the Faculty Senate office, it may be ignored. He asked senators to please keep that in mind when they receive a message from him that says please broadcast this information to their faculty, as appropriate.

A comment he received was to use videos and handouts more effectively to cut down time for presenting and meeting and therefore leave more time for discussion and deliberation; improve the Senate webpages; explain better the relation between the Senate and its committees; prepare an orientation meeting at the beginning of the academic year for new senators. Another suggestion, which did not have much to do with Senate itself, was to make the strategic plan more accessible; faculty hear about this strategic plan a lot and they really should all be familiar with it and sometimes it's there and it's hard to find.

The next thing the Senate needs to do is follow up. Some of the committees represented that are here probably have picked up some items that their committees may work on and Valtorta would try to coordinate response to all of these good points.

4. Report of the Committees

a. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Elizabeth West, Secretary

PROFESSOR ELIZABETH WEST (University Libraries) - The Steering Committee is bringing forth two names to be voted on to fill vacancies on two committees. There is a vacancy ending August 2019 on the Faculty Advisory Committee, the name put forward is Erik Doxtader (English.) On the Curricula and Courses Committee the vacancy also ends in August 2019 and the name brought forward is Claudia Benitez-Nelson from Earth, Ocean and Environment.

During Unfinished Business, nominations will be taken from the floor and the nominees will be voted on.

b. Committee of Curricula and Courses, Professor John Gerdes, Chair

PROFESSOR JOHN GERDES (Integrated Information Technology) - brought forward 27 proposals. One, the report that was sent out to the senators actually listed 28; the committee was requested by the math department to withdraw Math 122, so that has been now sent back to the proponent.

The 27 are: 8 from Arts and Sciences, 1 from Business, 8 from Education, 3 from Engineering and Computing, 2 from Information and Communications, and 5 from Social Work.

There was no discussion and the motion was approved.

Chair Valtorta commented that the committee does a lot of work behind the scenes. The proposals come to the Senate after a lot of deliberation, vetting and checking, controls. The operation of the committee has changed substantially over time, so the process now is very much automated using an information system that was developed for that purpose.

He encouraged faculty receiving the report to open it and click on the links, where they can see a lot of information behind the report, good information, good discussion. The process also has been improved recently so that Professor Gerdes, in fact gave feedback to the proponents of proposals that are seen through a preliminary view as being problematic. This is cutting down on the proposals that are returned to proponents too late to be added to the bulletin. He commended Professor Gerdes for being responsive and active in improving the process.

b. Committee on Instructional Development, Professor Michael Weisenberg, Chair

PROFESSOR MICHAEL WEISENBURG (University Libraries) – brought forward 6 courses requesting approval for Distributive Education Delivery. This is also different from the one that went out; there were originally 7, but Math 122 was withdrawn by the math department so there's only 6. There are 2 from the College of Arts and Sciences, 1 from the College of Education, 1 from the School of Information and Communications, and 2 from the School of Business.

There was no discussion and the motion was approved.

**c. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Bill Sudduth, Co-Chair
Professor Camelia Knapp, Co-Chair**

PROFESSOR BILL SUDDUTH (South Carolina Libraries)- The first item is summer teaching compensation; this is a joint resolution from the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Faculty Advisory Committee. It has been sent to senators for review, this does not set policy or guidelines however it is being set forth as a communication of principles.

PROFESSOR ANNE BEZUIDENHOUT (Philosophy)- So part of the rationale for this is that a policy is needed because there are all these graduate students who are required to pay three credit hours of tuition during the summer that they are teaching and they are chomping at the bit for classes that there are low faculty to teach these so USC needs to incentivize this faculty thing and one of the ways is by not putting any caps on the compensation that faculty get. She asked if the committee did any kind of background research to find out exactly how widespread this alleged problem is and wouldn't it actually be a better solution to this alleged problem to actually not require graduate students to pay for three credit hours of tuition and go back either to only paying for one or perhaps considering hiring these people as adjuncts since certainly fringe benefits would probably be cheaper than having to pay three credit hours of tuition.

Then secondly with this issue about with the senior faculty should not have to have any cap imposed on their summer compensation, as far as she knows this might actually have changed in the last couple of years but summer revenues are one stream of revenue that actually goes back to colleges which doesn't normally go to during the regular academic year. So colleges use this as one revenue that comes from summer to help enrich the graduate stipends and graduate tuition support; if a professor who earns one hundred thousand dollars is going to get thirty three thousand dollars summer support that takes on a big chunk of the college's profits and actually hurts graduate students in the long run. All this rhetoric about helping graduate students seems to actually be just that, rhetoric, and she'd like to know whether somebody has actually looked into

the long term effects of this policy and how it might negatively impact, first of all, the junior faculty who need to teach because their salaries are genuinely compressed compared to these people who are earning over one hundred thousand, and the graduate students who right now do the bulk of teaching in the summer.

PROFESSOR TESTERMAN- Her understanding with the three credit rule is that it has to do with FICA compliance and so it's not really an option to switch it back to one credit; it was certainly not meant to be punitive to the students in any way. There really isn't the option of not charging them for three credits. With regard to senior faculty and capping salaries, certainly, no one's being forced to teach and so if certain faculty, senior faculty, don't want to teach, they don't have to. However there may be situations where it would be really beneficial to have a very experienced faculty member teach and they should not be paid a lower wage than what they normally get for teaching; they should not be penalized for teaching. So that's the rationale, and maybe there could be an option for them to voluntarily give up some salary. Definitely one of the things they wanted to address is that some faculty, particularly junior faculty and in some departments where the pay is not so good, they feel like they have a real need to teach and so they want to make sure that pay is adequate, that they're not being paid less than an adjunct and not getting McDonald's type wages for teaching during the summer. So yes departments need revenue and this revenue can be used in many ways but it shouldn't be on the backs of the faculty. They deserve to be paid for their work. She asked if there were anything else she could clarify.

PROFESSOR TARR- stated there were a lot of questions last meeting about the practical effect of the resolution and its lack of binding this on anybody, one, and two if it were to influence policy in different units because different areas deal with this in different ways, this is a blanket resolution that may or may not be pertinent to different units but there has never in the history of anything involving money been a situation where there aren't unintended consequences. That was a big issue that came up last time and he has not heard yet any response from who anyone who would receive this as a resolution as to why things are the way they are.

PROFESSOR TESTERMAN- replied that her understanding from those she's talked to is that the Deans are generally in favor of this policy and offering more pay. Another aspect of this has to do with planning for summer courses and making sure that planning is appropriate because if there isn't adequate enrollment to cover the costs of the faculty then the courses need to be canceled. By appropriate planning and offering some high enrollment courses to offset some that have lower enrollment, some of that can be prevented, where there isn't adequate revenue and courses end up being canceled.

PROFESSOR TARR- understands that as a principal but doesn't understand where the Senate gets off telling units how to budget and present courses. He assumes it's part of the normal budgeting process of any college or school to ask how they are going to pay for it. He's questioning the appropriateness of this body to dictate that.

PROFESSOR TESTERMAN- The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee's charge is to look after the welfare of the faculty. And why should a faculty member be paid less for teaching in the summer than they are paid during the rest of the year?

PROFESSOR TARR- That's a good question.

PROFESSOR SUDDUTH- responded to Professor Tarr's point. When Faculty Advisory asked this, there are no claims that this is a policy or guideline, it's really a document to continue discussion knowing that units vary differently in how they act, treat and behave towards their summer compensation and their summer teaching and again the unknowns of what the consequences of On Your Time has and will be and on top of that what the unknown consequences are of the new budget model that fits with this.

PROFESSOR PAULA VASQUEZ (Mathematics)- stated she strongly agreed. What she's seen here is a lot of differences on the priority that different units have of what is thought and who needs to teach during the summer and she does not believe everyone will agree on one single policy that is going to make everyone happy. So she again asks why does there have to be a blanket thing that is going to cover every faculty and university when it's obvious that it will have to be divided it or leave it up to the units. What is wrong to leave that to every department?

PROFESSOR TESTERMAN- Part of that was because some units were not treating the faculty fairly. And the way this was written the committee did not say that a faculty member should get X percent salary for this course or that course because that is something that the individual departments are going to have to decide. The amounts of teaching that are considered a full load that varies by departments, the amount of work that goes into teaching individual courses that varies widely. So the way it was written was to allow flexibility for the departments to determine basically the percent effort that is required for teaching an individual course. So they're not saying teaching one course is going to give a professor 33.85% of his or her salary, that's not what the policies say. It's saying that whatever percent effort is being put into teaching the faculty member should be paid at a rate that's similar to what they're paid during the school year.

Does that help? There's a lot of flexibility in it and how it's interpreted by each unit and how they decide the payment.

CHAIR VALTORTA- reminded the Senate that the *Faculty Manual* used to have a fixed percentage of salary indicated in the manual itself as payment for each course, so when this was taken off the justification that was given was by the Associate Provost at the time was that - and this is you can read it in that in the minutes of the Faculty Senate - the justification was that units have to pay for effort. That's as it was put at the time the state guidelines or state law even so if someone puts a certain percentage of their time to teach a course they should be paid according to their daily rate the right amount. So the faculty voted to take out that fixed percentage of the salary per course in the summer with the understanding that they would be paid fairly.

PROFESSOR BETHANY BELL (Social Work)- offered two observations. First for those that are questioning it is about equity and it's a guideline and just like there's a guideline when faculty go from assistant to associate they have to get \$6,000, but some units get more than that. It's the same thing, it's a guideline that units can't go under this; it's not restricting saying what they have to do.

Second she pointed out an earlier comment about how this isn't a policy and it can't be enforced, that speaks to the issue that was said earlier about why are we Faculty Senators then if we don't have the power to make these things happen? What is the charge of Faculty Welfare if what they come up with isn't a guarantee that it will even become anything other than a written document as a suggested resolution?

PROFESSOR SUBRA BULUSU(SEOE)- -*This one started as a policy but the problem is the candor of this whole document can't go in one policy because there are several items that have to be separated out. Some will go under HR, which are related with the budget, and some have to go into the internal document. So that will take a longer time because it has to go through several channels. So at this point what the committee is saying is these are the internal principles every unit should follow, every college should follow. Then the next step is to see how these documents will be going into the policy.

There are three reasons why the committee started this document and to answer a question the committee did a survey in 2015 and asked all the colleges what they're paying during summer. They did an extensive survey for two years; some colleges don't have any policy on how they want to pay for the summer and in some situations what happened is the anger of faculty who were asked to teach the classes and the classes were suspended after two weeks in the middle of the semester, and that is not acceptable. So right now there is no protecting document for the faculty. In some units what happened was they agreed to pay 7.5 hundred but after that there was low enrollment; they gave options to the faculty able to teach the course for three thousand or less than that or canceled the course. Faculty who are not tenured don't do that because they are worried about tenure, so they are obeying what the chair or the unit head is saying, and continuing teaching the course even for the low pay. Even someone who works at McDonald's for \$10 an hour gets \$10 an hour. Why should a faculty member who agreed to \$7,500 teach for \$3,000? Right now this document at least helps and protects some of the faculty in this university.

Some units pay faculty at different rates, and in some units graduate students are earning more than faculty in the summer. It is a shame the faculty are getting less pay than a grad student; it can be argued that the grad students are getting \$8,000 for the full summer, but faculty who are teaching one course for two weeks, that is still their salary for the summer.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER- In response to those last comments which are appreciated, personally if it came down to his teaching in a summer course versus a graduate student, let the graduate student teach. Stipends in Arts and Sciences at least are not competitive nationally and if this is a way to recruit graduate students there's something to that that's not factored into this document. He doesn't know what this document is and as a result he can't vote for it because he doesn't know what he's voting for, particularly if this is going to be taken and inserted into different policy documents. Previous comments were quite unclear, he doesn't think Anne Bezuidenhot's questions have been answered. This document is predicated on the idea that there are a dearth of faculty and not enough faculty who want to teach when in fact at least in some colleges there are too many faculty who want to teach, so that has implications for instance on page three of this document in terms of the principles of summer teaching. A junior professor who is being subject to salary compression should have priority over a senior faculty member

who's not working under conditions of compression. To say that this document embodies principles that every unit should follow, first of all there needs to be answer to Anne's questions and then there has to be an answer to the question of what particular pieces of this resolution are going where and how is that going to happen. Until such a time he doesn't see how this can be voted on.

PROFESSOR THORNE- Just to echo the last comment there, a lot of things in this document, a lot of things that have been said, he's very sympathetic to arguments that have been raised on both sides. It seems like the Senate is going to be obliged to vote on either pass everything or nothing but he advocates voting on pieces of the proposal if possible.

PROFESSOR TESTERMAN- stated they are aware that there are some departments where there are too many people that want to teach and the last part that was added in as far as transparency in determining who gets to teach was meant for those types of situations because some felt that it was being doled out unfairly. The committee recognizes that in some departments there aren't enough people to teach and in some departments there are too many people and not enough teachers so that's the last section that was added to address that.

CHAIR VALTORTA- stated that if there was no further discussion, comments or questions, a vote could be held. He would call this a recommendation as it was explained in the discussion. There are principles in here, there are more specific suggestions that could be taken up in policy. There are principles for the various units.

PROFESSOR SUDDUTH- clarified that when Faculty Advisory committee was discussing and voted on it the other day the discussion was that it is a set of principles, it's a resolution on a set of principles that would be transmitted to the Provost but also the council and academic Deans with the hope that there be additional discussion based on these principles and that's how he would see a cover letter with these going to the Provost.

PROFESSOR BEZUIDENHOUT- asked if this was to be added to the Faculty Manual, as she thought that was in Valtorta's email.

CHAIR VALTORTA- That was just an example of what could happen on the basis of these principles.

PROFESSOR BEZUIDENHOUT- So it's not a vote to mend the Faculty Manual?

CHAIR VALTORTA- Absolutely not

PROFESSOR BEZUIDENHOUT- So can somebody then say, articulate exactly what senators are voting on then? To send a letter to the Provost with these recommendations attached. Is that what the Senate is voting on?

CHAIR VALTORTA-called for a vote. A voice vote was inconclusive and a hand vote was held. There was no quorum and the motion was withdrawn.

Since there was no quorum a vote could not be held on the *Faculty Manual* changes. They may be taken up at the June Faculty Senate meeting when a quorum is not required.

PROFESSOR SUDDUTH- The third item from the Faculty Advisory Committee is an item of information. The committee is still seeking input from the faculty regarding any issues having to do with ACAF 1.00, which is recruitment an appointment of tenure, tenure track, non-tenure track faculty ACAF 1.10 recruitment and appointment of academic administrators, ACAF 1.121 appointment and review of endowed chairs and named professorships and ACAF 1.24 selection and appointment of department chairs and school directors.

The committee has sent a preliminary list of questions to the Provost's office having to do with these policies, and they are working with the Provost's office to gather additional information. Also the Faculty Advisory committee is going to be working with the Faculty Budget Committee on any budget implications. The purpose of this information and the goals of this information is to work with the Provost Office and the Council of Deans to try to close any questions that may be in this policy and try to make an equitable and fair hiring process across all four of these types of positions. The Faculty Advisory Committee welcomes questions. Their next meeting will be Wednesday April 25th at 11 o'clock, in Osbourne 107C.

CHAIR VALTORTA- This is very similar to the last time he saw a motion fail at the general faculty assembly. It was a tight vote. Today the Senate was one short on quorum so these things happen and don't let anybody say that everything gets approved in Faculty Senate that is presented by committees. That is not the case.

5. Report of Officers

PROVOST JOAN GABEL - April 18th is the day of giving. It's a one-day very high energy campaign. Clemson did one. This is something that development is doing at different institutions of higher education around the country. There will be a significant amount of social media traffic to this event, immediately before, during and for a short period of time after.

Making the reports from the Vice Provosts: From John Dozier. He is asking that faculty complete their climate survey and encourage the members of their unit to do so. There is a link to the survey. The link is embedded every time the update reminder email comes out. There has been a pretty good response rate so far but the more response received, the better they are at responding accurately and effectively to the issues raised.

The latest Provost Finding Common Ground forum series was a couple of days ago. Denise McGill from Information and Communications hosted; this one was a series of films representing voice through culture. Her film in particular has received Provost internal grant support and related to the Gullah community on St. Helena Island. It's one of the last if not the last thriving Gullah Geechee community that is still actively engaged in agriculture in the way that the entire corridor was hundreds of years ago. It's a fascinating project. Two other films were shown and then they had a discussion. The Provost Finding Common Ground forums are not on a schedule; there's literally none by design, no construct around it. If there is a current

issue of how USC can leverage faculty's intellectual capacity and contributions to finding ways to create informed conversations around difficult issues with no particular description of what constitutes a difficult issue. It does not have to be verbally; they've done it through dance, poetry, now film, panel discussions, individual speakers, music and there's no restriction at all. They're scheduled when something they think is interesting to talk about that comes to their attention and the schedule as the circumstance inspires the creative moment so it's sort of an open call to all faculty.

The exam schedule rules are going to come out soon. Please follow them, please encourage colleagues to follow them. Very important to do the exams during the exam period.

Another update, USC has purchased *Blackboard Ally*, which is a tool offered through the Blackboard platform, very powerful actually that will take Blackboard content and make it accessible. They are working directly with CTE to do it, Student Disability Resource Center and UTS to provide training to make minimal pain with the process.

The blue print meetings were completed just a couple of days ago. The blueprint is the administration's internal term for the annual report that the Deans and their leadership teams prepare for the Provost's review but it's not the annual review of the Dean it's just an annual benchmark that is done by the Provost and by the fiscal office to look at. It's really more of a pulse check on where the college sits relative to a variety of benchmarks, largely reflected through the university dashboard and also how the college is doing fiscally and there are questions and conversations associated with it. The blueprint changed a lot two years ago and I've been debugging it ever since and the technology is now plugged in very directly to the Office of Institutional Research so that they can really look at things like the demographics of the faculty, the enrollment and other things that they would want to look at.

Those meetings are open meetings; there's always Faculty Senate representation and the blueprint document once they've all been reviewed and given one final edit, are all available online on the Provost website. It includes a lot of budget information, and faculty can see snapshot information about their unit's budget. There are reams of information that go into developing such a document but if faculty want to see budget information and a lot of other data about their college, including how their college's leadership team sees units aligning with the university strategic plan it's all synthesized in that document. The administration uses it for internal reporting and they can edit it to reflect and capture questions if the Faculty Senate would like different things reported; that's something that they can control and change.

Provost's office internal grants letters went out April 2nd, there were a couple of bugs mostly affecting dates in the letter. There is one example where a dollar amount was affected. Any faculty who applied for an internal grant should double check their letter and if anything just doesn't look right just send Cheryl or anyone in the Provost's office an email and they will verify with apologies for that extra step.

Excellence Initiative Committee has finished the round of phase one proposals and should have letters out in the next few days either indicating that the proposal isn't being invited to phase two or that it is. They received 130 proposals that had a great breadth of topics. It was wonderful to

see what the faculty consider to be their excellence individually or in teams interdisciplinary across colleges, and it gives great optimism for what the impact of the academy is and continues to be and will be in the future. Now on to phase two where the best of those proposals will make longer more substantive proposals and they will hopefully get to the funding phase very soon.

Update on the budget model redesign: the Board of Trustees recommended a review of how USC does resource allocation. This is not how they do annual reporting, this is not what they file, this is not what gets audited; this is the model for how they make decisions about revenue that comes in and where it goes within the university. And that process was changed during the economic downturn to an extremely centralized process in order to navigate through the financial crisis and now while USC remains incredibly resource constrained they wouldn't describe themselves as being in crisis. So the time has come to reinstitute and modernize that process so that they administration can align resource allocation with a strategic plan and with incentives and so that process has gone through each unit. Consultants have presented to the Faculty Budget Committee to hear the voice of the faculty. They have been with the deans individually and collectively, they will be with the deans collectively again on April 13th, and the goal would be to have a proposed algorithmic model in place in time to run what is called a parallel year for the next fiscal year, meaning USC would run next year in reality the way it ran last year with just the normal incremental changes made depending on what the utility bill is and how many students are paying tuition and what resources they have, but they would be tracking as if they were running the new budget model. This is also so that they can identify unintended consequences, unexpected potential outcomes, perverse incentives that they did not foresee and fix them before they go live so to speak with the idea being that they would go live the year after the fiscal year after. That is the intention.

6. Report of the Secretary

Secretary Elizabeth West (South Caroliniana Library)- reported that Mark Cooper was elected Faculty Senate Chair elect.

7. Report of the Chair

CHAIR VALTORTA- congratulated the chair elect and thanked both of the candidates.

There will be a Faculty Senate softball day Sunday April 29th at 1 pm. This is the game against Mississippi State. Every senator can bring up to three guests, there is no need to sign up. It will be announced at the game as being Faculty Senate softball day. He'll send an e-mail and try to get a place to meet so everyone can be photographed all together.

The Faculty Welfare committee faculty reported that lunch at Preston is now restarted; this is the opportunity for small groups of faculty to get a free lunch and this is to promote collegiality and encourage interdepartmental and interschool information exchanges.

Eighty-seven senators attended the March 7, 2018 meeting; seventy-five did not, but there was a quorum at the past meeting. Valtorta reported on activities he carried out as chair. He attended the USC system Faculty Leadership Conference in Beaufort on Friday, March 9th. This is a conference of the chairs of the Faculty Senate's faculty assemblies and faculty bodies or frankly organizations of all USC campuses. This time only representatives of the four year campuses, as well as USC- Columbia were there, for some reason the two year campuses did not attend. It was a good meeting; there was no real action that came out of it. This time it was more of a discussion time especially helping the new chairs answering questions about how the Board of Trustees works for example.

He attended a meeting of a committee of the Board of Trustees Friday, March 16th, 2017. This included the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison committee of the Board, chaired by trustee Leah Moody. The Board of Trustees Liaison committee is composed by Subra Bulusu, Augie Grant, Camilla Knapp, Ben Nelson, Bill Sudduth and Hennie Van Bulk. Ben Nelson is chair of Senate at Beaufort and Hennie Van Bulk is from the Palmetto College, the small campus is actually in Sumter.

Things that were discussed for example were honorary degrees for emeriti faculty, hiring faculty with tenure, these kind of things so it was fairly straightforward. These meetings do not have a lot of give and take. This particular committee of the board is not tremendously interested in discussing things with the faculty but they do make occasional comments and questions and some things happen as the previous chair would say a lot happens at the Board of Trustees outside the board room and there's a lot of good informal communication.

Other committees of the board he attended were the Audit and Compliance Committee, the Student Trustee Liaison, which included a panel discussion from student leaders of the Palmetto college campuses and Health Affairs. On March 21st, he had two activities of note; one was a meeting with the Internal Communications Manager of the Office of Communication and Public Affairs, Nina Jackson to try to improve internal communications. The Office of Communication and Public Affairs has a mission of really disseminating the official message of the university and so they think of communicating as how to communicate better to the faculty but he turned this around and Ms. Jackson understood well that the Senate needs to have communication across the faculty and possibly going also in different directions.

Student body president Ross Lordo gave the State of the Student Body address on March 21st in the late afternoon, and it was a goodbye address. The new student body president is Taylor Wright. Ross Lordo did a lot for the student body, and it is impressive how much he has done in his one year as student body president.

The last Saturday he attended the AAUP South Carolina spring meeting. This was at USC-Aiken. The theme was still *What does shared governance mean for my university and my state?* There were discussion on the use and in some cases abuse of adjunct faculty. There is a process led by two faculty members at the USC-Aiken to collect data. This is one place where the blueprints are very useful because they have an enormous amount of information about the composition of the college faculty bodies.

There may be information packets sent out to highlight the condition of these less fortunate colleagues who are not represented in this body because they're part timers so that's what is meant by adjunct. There was also the interesting discussion in creating a survey instrument on the state of shared governance in the various institutions of the state; three existing survey instruments were discussed, an idea was to create an emerged one, a simplified one and the other possibilities to adopt one which is endorsed also by an association of governing board, so that this could be less controversial.

There was also a discussion on the procedure for presidential searches at various universities, it turns out that at least three universities have presidents that are expected to either resign or end their term. The USC Board of Trustees bylaws have procedures in place that include good faculty representation in the search committee. So on the search committee there are three faculty representatives that is for a search committee for the president, there are three faculty representatives, five trustees, a student representative, a representative dealing with the association. This search committee sends four names to the board. There are large universities that recently had surprises where apparently unqualified presidents were installed without any faculty input and even in the state there are institutions, whose by laws do not include faculty in the presidential search.

There is an ad hoc committee on non-tenure track career progression. He will report back to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee very soon with names for the committee.

8. Unfinished Business

PROFESSOR ELIZABETH WEST- There were no nominations from the floor and Erik Doxtader was elected to the Faculty Advisory Committee and Claudia Benetiz-Nelson to Curricula and Courses.

9. New Business

PROFESSOR GWEN GEIDEL (Earth, Ocean and Environment)- asked what the next step was relative to the earlier presentations and discussions on attendance.

CHAIR VALTORTA- In discussing this with others in particular Professor Sudduth and Professor Doxtader, today's discussion would be a way to collect ideas and then there would be a follow up for the Senate as a whole, maybe the chair or some of the committees. Also the membership of the Senate can think about introducing motions, maybe sending them to an appropriate committee depending on the activity to be taken; it could be Welfare or Faculty Advisory, for example, so if one of the items that was discussed, one of the suggestions strikes someone as being particularly important they could follow up, talk to talk to him or to Erik or Bill.

10. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed. The next meeting is Wednesday, June 6, 2018 at 3pm in Gambrell 153. As per the tradition of Faculty Senate, it is Hawaiian shirt day.