

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

February 6, 2019

1. Call to Order

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

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes

CHAIR VALTORTA – called for corrections to the minutes of Dec. 5. There were none and the minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Invited Guests

GUEST DR. DAVID SNYDER (Chair of the Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Committee) - For the past year he has served as Chair of the University Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Committee. DIAC was established in 2011 by presidential directive to serve as an advisory body to President Pastides. That remains its function today. It is solely an advisory body and it does not possess policymaking authority such as the faculty senate possesses.

Among DIAC's key recommendations in the past have been the establishment of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion and the hiring of a Chief Diversity Officer, Dr John Dozier. More recently they advocated for the installation of the markers that commemorate the labor of enslaved persons that now grace the Horseshoe.

DIAC's membership seeks to be broadly representative and includes faculty, staff and students. Most of the 36 members represent key units involved in D and I advocacy including the Directors of Student Disability Services, African-American Studies, the Office of Multicultural Student Affairs, Jewish Faculty and Staff Council, athletics and so forth. Snyder's own inclusion derives from his role at the International House. They've also included a representation for many of the colleges often by seating the assistant deans for diversity and inclusion. In this way they maintain a deep interface with CADO (the Council of Academic Diversity Officers). They are one of the most representative bodies on campus.

In addition to DIAC's role as advisor to President Pastides, they also consult with and advise Dr. Dozier who sits as an ex officio member on the DIAC. They would welcome deeper ties with the Faculty Senate and he thinks it advisable to seat a senator on the DIAC if the Senate would

welcome that. They've already done some profitable work with the Faculty Senate for example in connection with the presidential search.

DIAC's work is pursued through 6 subcommittees, called "action teams": Engagement Action Team, Campus Climate Action Team, a Composition Action Team, Communications Action Team, A Bylaws and Membership Action Team and a Standing Research Action Team. These categories map loosely on to Dr. Dozier's strategic plan and provide the primary means by which they engage with his work

Snyder has been seeking ways to formalize and regularize DIAC's structures and procedures as well as filling out a broad and energetic agenda. Among key items this year has been a review of the University Strategic Communications Plan especially in relation to future bias incidents, ongoing review of existing curricular and co-curricular programs on campus with an eye to diversity and initial steps to addressing an emergent concern over the racial makeup of USC's top administration.

One key initiative answers an ongoing demand of some years from students that the university find a way to rename Sims College. They are constrained by state law for renaming buildings. But discussions on DIAC and elsewhere about the Sims College controversy has given rise to the broad conviction that the name of Sims might be the least of our concerns on that score. It's not too early to announce that DIAC will be making a recommendation to the President that he convene a special presidential commission on the history of USC with an eye toward making recommendations about how to recontextualize buildings and other installations with historically problematic names. They will see if the President accepts their recommendation. Beyond that DIAC's agenda flows from the concerns brought to Snyder's attention or to DIAC members from the campus community.

PROFESSOR KIRSTIN DOW (Geography) – asked if there were other issues faculty should be aware of and sharing with colleagues besides Sims.

GUEST SNYDER - A conservative estimate places the names of buildings associated with Confederate era white supremacy at least a dozen. He would be happy to more information on Sims. But there are a number of those installations. There are a number of areas on campus that deserve some form of recognition or commemoration as well. Dr. Bobby Donaldson has done a great deal of historic work mapping out for example the extension of campus into historically African-American neighborhoods. This is something else that DIAC may look at. The DIAC is going to make a recommendation for a commission of experts to produce a report that will produce further recommendations.

The next invited speaker in this invited guest is Professor Mark Blackwell. Dr. Blackwell is a Professor of Philosophy and Religious Studies and Director of International Programs at Francis

Marion University in Florence, SC. He is the President of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Sate Conference of South Carolina.

GUEST DR. MARK BLACKWELL (President of the South Carolina Conference of the American Association of University Professors) – spoke on the presidential search process.

“I bid you greetings from your colleagues in the AAUP and particularly those members of the South Carolina State conference from 20 public and private universities and over 200 members. Also many thanks to my good friend, Dr. Marco Valtorta, the Faculty Senate, President Pastides, Provost Gabel, your administration and your staff who kindly invited me and assisted me for this visit.

In the time I have I'll speak briefly. I'd like to share thoughts from the AAUP on one of the most significant instances of shared governance in the life of USC, the selection of its 29th president in its nearly 220 years of service to the state. This election will deeply touch the lives and futures of tens of thousands of students, faculty, staff and administration over your 8 campuses just as it did in 2008. The last decade has shown how carefully and wisely the previous search committee performed its duties and now this crucial task is again at hand for the current search committee, and I'm certain you all will do well.

Having studied your presidential search website, I commend you and encourage you on your search process with regard to selecting your search committee, designing your search process, establishing sources of potential candidates, constructing your screening process for candidates and recommending the best candidate to the Board of Trustees. Most importantly, the inclusion of faculty, students and the community at all phases of the search process is imperative to ensuring that USC will continue to fulfill its mission of providing teaching, research, creative activity and service to all of the citizens of South Carolina. Your Board of Trustees has done well following its bylaws and facilitating the elections of 11 members whose diverse constituencies include trustees from your various judicial districts around the state, faculty members representing different schools as well as the university system in general, a student government representative, an alumni representative and a representative from your foundation. Among these members are a trustee designated with affirmative action oversight and the chair of the faculty who represents the AAUP at your university and at the state level. This committee's composition and representation certainly fulfills AAUP standards and best practices and your committee should be prepared to fully undertake their weighty duties.

Your committee recently announced the selection of a national executive search firm from 7 candidates ultimately to help identify a fit successor to President Pastides. I'm certain Parker Executive Search experience and expertise is of great instruction and aid to the search committee concerning search processes in general and USC's in particular. And I'm hopeful that they will excel in affording a broad pool of qualified and sufficiently vetted candidates. However, for the

integrity of your shared governance and academic freedom, it is of great importance that your search firm's role in influence not extend into educational or institutional policies but remain focused on this task at hand. I expect your search committee realized this advice in selecting Parker Executive Search, but it is the committee's ongoing duty to be self-aware at all times during the process in order to save this, and all aspects of USC's autonomy, integrity, and its mission.

It is of note that a description of the position and qualifications have been constructed and published already at your presidential search website and that your search firm is soliciting applications and nominations to a deadline of March 8, 2019. The qualifications listed certainly require applicants of the highest leadership abilities, and they describe in many ways an ideal AAUP concept of President. However, I would suggest in the strongest terms an edit to bullet number 7 which currently reads "a strong appreciation for shared governance." I adjure you as a colleague to appoint a president with a strong *commitment* to the principles and practices of shared governance and academic freedom for faculty and students. My advice is that your next president should denote her or his commitment to these AAUP principles rather than implying recognition on them in the service of some faculty members.

As you move into the next phase of examining the applicants in your process, it is essential that you establish and maintain a transparency of process paired with the utmost confidentiality for your candidates. While it is a classic and legally governed conflict between the right of individual privacy and the public's right to know, especially at public institutions, the search committee must balance very carefully its duties for candidates and its constituents. Establishing transparency of the process in communication with all constituents must be accomplished early in the search process and maintained throughout until an appointment is confirmed. I notice from your website that the search firm has provided a questionnaire and received over 900 responses. The questionnaire is a start toward reaching out to the USC community and envisioning together what and who the next president may be. Let me speak a bit later with respect to finalists and how I hope the committee will further allow transparency and will encourage its constituents to realize a stake in the process.

To insure applications of the very best candidates, confidentiality must be maintained in the early phases and interviews and meetings may be conducted in concert with the search firm to avoid disclosure of candidates prior to announcing a shortlist. If leaks were to occur this would likely result in the loss of the best candidates and the potential best leadership for USC. Leaks are to be avoided. Further, on confidentiality in the vetting of candidates, it is crucial that the search committee and the search firm work in concert to solicit, collect and vet information on candidates particularly as the process moves toward and establishes a shortlist. Thorough background and reference checks are vital to the best information and assessment of a candidate strengths and weaknesses and interviews are essential and may be on or off campus toward preserving the utmost confidentiality. It should be enough to say that inadequately conducted background checks have led to recent resignations of public officials after elections and appointments to public service. Obviously, I refer to politicians and educators. Damage to these institutions and their constituents is unfathomable if not incalculable or irreparable so many real

and potential benefits can be lost or taken from people's lives if confidences are violated and proper vetting breaks down.

And now just a little more on transparency and communication. Upon selecting the finalists, it is imperative that campus visits and public forums be scheduled and implemented with adequate public notice such that each candidate can and will meet with the various constituencies to engage in dialogue. And it is most important that finalists have dialogues open to all faculty members and students. Forums for university community apart from faculty and students are essential as well. The AAUP strongly supports judicious and open communication with participation because it builds confidence in your university leadership and ensures accountability for all community members at every level.

In the final phase the best candidate(s) should be recommended to the Board of Trustees who will then appoint the next president effective of a date to be determined by those parties. When a search process is in vision designed, constructed and implemented according to these principles (cf. <https://www.aaup.org/issues/governance-colleges-universities/presidential-search>), a new president can assume her or his duties with their colleagues in the hope of a meaningful future to undertake the university's mission and without lingering questions or doubts about its processes and administration. Thank you.

GUEST VICE PROVOST ALLEN MILLER (International Accelerator Program) – spoke about Shorelight. USC has a partnership with Shorelight Education and what Shorelight does primarily is recruit students from all over the world, and they come here and participate in the International Accelerator Program, which is a program that allows them to come up to USC standards in English for admission while at the same time taking academic credit. USC is getting ready to renew the contract, so it seemed to be an appropriate time to report to Faculty Senate on what the results are so far. Three hundred fifty-three students have completed the program. It started with a very small cohort in the Fall of 2015, and of the students who have entered the program 92 percent have completed that 1st year program. And once they completed that program their average GPA has been 3.23 which is basically the average GPA of domestic students, maybe a 100th of a point superior but they're completely comparable to the domestic students.

Many of these students have excelled. There have been 144 on the Dean's list, 18 on the President's list, 6 accepted in the Honors College and 4 into International Business.

The left side of the graph is particularly important because one of the questions they often get is, “are they doing so well because you're putting them in the easy classes?” These are 3 classes that are traditionally relatively difficult classes and they are compared against mainstream students. They are comparable in each of these classes. In CHEM 105 and 122, they perform slightly better than the domestic students and in ECON 221 just below, so Miller’s staff is pretty happy with their performance overall.

The students have a wide variety of majors. Many of them are in Business and Engineering and HRSM but very many majors are represented in the group.

Lastly people ask, if USC is successful in increasing international student recruitment. For many years the average was about 75 students a year and about 300 international undergraduate students. As of 2017 there were more than twice that number. That trend continues this year.

CHAIR VALTORTA – introduced the final speakers from Parker Executive Search, Laurie C. Wilder, President of Parker Executive Search and Porsha L. Williams, Vice President.

Laurie Wilder has successfully conducted over 1000 leadership searches, both in higher education and the corporate work. Porsha Williams is Vice President of Higher Education for Parker Executive Search, where she leads business, client and candidate development for the firm's higher education practice. She joined the firm in 2005. Ms. Wilder and Ms. Williams worked on several searches for academic leaders in the USC system.

Valtorta welcomed viewers from University of South Carolina System Universities and colleges and staff members who may be watching this part of the proceedings via Adobe Connect. Professor Augie Grant, Past Chair of the Faculty Senate will monitor comments and questions received from USC System faculty and read them as time allows at the proper time.

GUESTS LAURIE WILDER AND PORSHA WILLIAMS (Parker Executive Search) -

Parker Executive Search is based in Atlanta, Georgia. They have four core practice areas: a higher education practice where they typically conduct Dean level and above search assignments; an academic health sciences practice where they represent science institutes and universities in their searches, typically chair level and above leadership; a sports practice where they focus on intercollegiate athletics; a corporate practice that's generalist in nature. About 80 percent of what they do on a given day is done on a college campus.

One of the most important things is that they are not here to select USC's next president. That is not their role in this process or in any search process. Their job is to aggressively recruit, facilitate and advise, but they have no vote and no decision-making power. All they can bring to the table is a dedicated effort to recruit the most qualified and diverse pool of candidates for the committee, the university, as well as for the board's decision, ultimately. They have been working with the search committee since the early part of the year, late part of last year. The presidential website was put together by individuals from the university and it's done very, very well. They are actively engaged in the search and recruiting of wonderful candidates. There are a lot of presidential searches that are critically important going on right now.

Timing - their objective is that the search committee will have invited candidates to campus in mid to late April. Typically, there are 4 candidates, more or less, after the first initial rounds of

confidential interviews. Their process from that standpoint is that this search committee will have access to all candidate materials. They do not whittle candidates out so if they apply to be a candidate the search committee will have access to that and will make all decisions as to who they will interview initially and then who will be brought to campus to meet with all the various constituency groups. Candidates will have a day and a half or so on campus to publicly meet all the different constituency groups. There will be ample opportunities for all the groups to provide feedback to the committee as well as to the board.

What they can assure faculty is that it is an open national/international search. They are aggressively in the market looking for and trying to recruit the greatest number of potential candidates for USC. There have been questions as to how to go about engaging in the process during this recruitment piece. That is so vitally important to the success of this search and that is as simple as sending an e-mail to Wilder and Williams and saying, “call this individual.” They will always acknowledge receipt of those nominations and then they will go and try to recruit those individuals into the process. There are portals on the website for faculty to provide information and feedback and that information is collected and then ultimately provided to the search committee for their review as well. So please engage in this process. If there someone a faculty member thinks is important for them to talk to, it’s as simple as sending an e-mail and saying reach out to that person. The committee will have access to that information.

(UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER) – noted the Senate had just heard a presentation discussing the importance of transparency and participation and that in light of Wilder’s comments a day to a day and a half seems rather short. It’s shorter than a typical job interview for many faculty members. What sort of flexibility might there be around the length of that or is that something that is just so institutionally ingrained that there isn’t an opportunity to increase that involvement or participation?

GUEST WILDER –The schedule for university presidential searches across the country is typically somewhere from a day to 2 days. So that is a relative standard for presidential searches. That has not been fully developed yet and so that schedule for when they come to campus and how that goes forward can still be discussed. But typically, candidates don’t really want to commit more than a couple of days on campus because of that piece of public exposure.

PROFESSOR BETHANY BELL (College of Social Work) – has been on a search committee with the Parker firm and wanted to know if this process is as in others where the ability to get references is broad, it isn't limited to the people that are listed on application. What is Parker’s role in that process and how is the decision made to go beyond the ones that are submitted by the applicant and how is that conveyed back to the search committee?

GUEST WILDER - The integrity of the individuals that are presented is one of the pieces of an open process that is so critically important, as well as an opportunity for a public vetting and that

will occur here. There are various stages of background checks and they take place in various stages of the process. There's obviously very extensive background work from confirming degrees, into looking for criminal reports and those types of media reviews. If they go online and look up someone they can see a lot of things. It's not always something that would be judged but it's information that would be provided directly to the search committee. As are articles associated with something that either happened in this person's life or on their campus that they would be involved in.

And then there's the piece of referencing. Because Parker is a national firm, they work in many levels. They have a lot of contact points in which they can talk to individuals, to people before they are candidates, and searches to really get a feel for who they are, what type of leadership they bring and that's information that will be provided to the search committee as they make their initial decisions as it relates to who they want to initially interview. Once those candidates become public candidates, they would have signed a statement that allows for anyone to call anyone and everyone that they want to call. So, there will be an extreme vetting of those final candidates. Again, as they go through the process they start to ramp up the level of background checks because that early stage of this is confidential. So, they're talking to anybody and everybody from that perspective and that's provided back in a written report to the board.

PROFESSOR HEATHER BRANDT (Health Promotion, Education and Behavior) - asked how realistic that timeline is that's been put forward for this process in terms of when candidates may be brought to campus for consideration and then considering the start date for the fall semester?

GUEST WILDER – It is realistic and what they have found especially over the last probably 5 to 6 years is that candidates want the search process to move about in an expeditious way. Because of the public exposure. USC is looking for someone who is happy where they are today. Their campus would hate to lose them. They've got strong relationships with their faculty, staff and students and external constituency groups. The longer the process goes, the more those relationships are jeopardized on their campus, and so this is a process of the timing that they feel comfortable with. They are a search firm that will push back if the timeline will not work, but this is one that they think is very important not only for them to be able to go out into the market but for the campus as well.

PROFESSOR STEPHANIE MITCHUM (Women in Gender Studies and Department of Religious Studies) - has looked over the description and asked if it is a trend to advertise for presidents who are not necessarily academics. The current president is an academic and has a background in more than an appreciation for higher education.

GUEST WILDER - Trend is a strong word there. It's not necessarily a trend on a national basis. Job descriptions are really there to put a framework for the search committee to make decisions as to what is critically important. This is a position description that ultimately was vetted by the search committee. It is not a document that Parker finalized for them and what they were looking for is to create the pool as broad as possible. There is a strong understanding of the need for someone who really has an understanding and a demonstrated success in working within and leading within an academic setting. The job description has a lot of things that are just preferred from that perspective but that really is just to look at the broadest pool of candidates.

PROFESSOR MITCHUM – It just opens it up to candidates like the President of the Southern Baptist Convention.

GUEST WILDER – If there are people that USC faculty would like Parker to reach out to, someone that they want to recommend and nominate please do that. There will be periods of time they're having conference calls with the search committee and they will talk about how many nominations and recommendations have come from the internal constituency groups, so please engage in that.

PROFESSOR AUGIE GRANT (Past Chair Faculty Senate) – When will the on-campus interviews likely take place?

GUEST WILDER – Mid to late April.

PROFESSOR BELL – referred back to the job description. She personally found the one bullet that says “must have an appreciation of diversity” or something pretty generic. What is the search firm doing to make sure that's there, because that's not a preferred, that's a required qualification? So how is that being operationalized?

GUEST WILDER - In a couple of ways. There are 900 plus individuals who have sent comments to them and there were obviously themes in those types of things and one of those was a real understanding and appreciation for diversity. And one of the reasons that Parker was retained in the first place, is they have a national reputation, a real understanding and appreciation but also demonstrated success in really recruiting the most diverse pool of candidates they can, ensuring the pool of candidates absolutely understands it is wedded to that. The committee is looking at those themes and ultimately there will be these questions that are asked of potential candidates to really get into, that aren't as broad as what is in that position description, that are very detailed in nature about what is your success?, what have you done?, what do you believe?, those types of things. Then through the vetting process they also engage in that process to see if these people are saying something and doing something else or are they absolutely living what they're saying.

PROFESSOR BELL – Are the questions that are asked of the candidates going to be on that website so faculty will know what they were asked when it comes to the public interviews?

GUEST WILDER - Typically that is not provided directly to the university. It's something they can work with the search committee about after the fact. She doesn't like to provide search group list of questions online ahead of time. After the fact she's not opposed to that. Sometimes people want to put it before the fact and that gives candidates a chance to study for them and she wants to know what they really think when they see that for the first time. So, she doesn't think that's a problem after the fact, but she'll talk to the search committee. She again emphasized that those decisions are ultimately made by the search committee.

PROFESSOR BELL – For faculty to interact within a public setting and not knowing what sorts of questions they have already been asked that we may not know the answers to, but faculty may want to ask it again.

GUEST WILDER – She is not opposed to that.

PROFESSOR GRANT - C.S. asks, Will staff be invited to participate in the on-campus presentations?

GUEST WILDER – Absolutely. The search committee will work to put the most comprehensive on-campus schedule on the plate. It's going to be staff, students, community. It's going to be faculty. It's going to be different parts and/or parts of the organization from athletics, to the arts to a little bit of everyone because that's what is going to get the right feedback from all the different constituency groups.

UNIDENTIFIED PROFESSOR – Back to the discussion about time. If all there were done comprehensively in the course of 2 days and allow the search committee to have some time with that person and allow them to sleep briefly, would people have a meaningful period of time for an interaction that's truly telling? There are norms that are going to be pushed to really reach this ideal of transparency and have a meaningful participatory process because frankly it's needed right now. There's a great deal of reason and motivation for faculty to be able to participate fully.

GUEST WILDER – Looking at searches going on across this country it's very typical for the candidates to come spend day and a half, two days to do that. They will work with the candidates to ensure that that's the right visit as well. There has to be a balance. These are individuals who are very, very successful where they are as well. In a lot of cases they may be actively engaged in fund- and friend-raising. And there's only one person that's going to ultimately get this job and everyone else has to go back to their campus and tell them that they didn't really mean that they wanted to go somewhere else and so it's a position where Parker is having to balance a lot of things in order to provide the strongest pool of candidates. They are 100 percent transparent with the search committee. The use of the word transparent means there is nothing that they do as a search consultant that they do not share with this search committee. The committee knows every person that they talk to. They know the conversations. They know the market feedback. So that is absolute. They are representing faculty in those regards as well. So what Parker tries to do is to create a process that allows faculty to see the strongest pool of candidates.

A lot of searches on a national basis are completely confidential. There are no on campus interviews and there's pros and cons to that. For USC it's an active approach that says they're going to conduct a search that's going to ensure the committee sees great candidates but it's also going to ensure that faculty and staff and students are going to see those final candidates. There will be an opportunity to show and to tell the powers that will ultimately make this decision what the university communities think of those individuals. Because the timing is going to be one that is not long and drawn out, you won't lose many great candidates. There is competition currently in the market for presidential searches, so they are working to do what's in the best interest to ensure the broadest and diverse pool of candidates and also understanding the importance for transparency.

4. Report of Faculty Committees

a. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Elizabeth West, Secretary

SECRETARY ELIZABETH WEST (University Libraries) – thanked all of the faculty members who volunteered for committees. There are still have some vacancies: 4 volunteers for the Committee on Professional Conduct; 1 on Faculty Grievance; and more volunteers are needed for the UCTP. For Grievance and Professional Conduct, volunteers must hold the rank of tenured professor or librarian and for UCTP they must hold the rank of tenured professor.

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

PROFESSOR JOHN GERDES (Integrated Information Technology) – brought forth 14 proposals. The report that went out to the faculty said 15. There was one course in Arts that was inadvertently included on there and that one was the BFA in Studio Art. That is not being brought forward so that drops the total to 14.

There are 8 in Arts and Sciences, 1 in Business; 1 in Education, 2 in Engineering and Computing, 1 in Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management and 1 in Music.

PROFESSOR MATTHIAS SCHINDLER (Physics and Astronomy) – asked for clarification over the tabling over an EMCH course at the last Senate meeting.

CHAIR VALTORTA - The tabled motions may be un-tabled during the section on the continuing business.

PROFESSOR GERDES – The two Engineering courses were CSCE Major Degree Program in Computer Science and the ZZEN Major Degree Program, again in the College of Engineering and Computing. Those are the two that are in this proposal for today.

There was no further discussion and the proposal was approved.

c. Committee on Instructional Development, Professor Michael Weisenburg, Chair

PROFESSOR CHRISTY FRIEND (English Language and Literature) – brought forward 4 existing courses to be offered via Distributed Education Delivery: from the College of Arts and Sciences: SPAN 122 Basic Proficiency in Spanish, from the Department of Languages Literatures and Cultures; from the Department of Sociology, SOCY 540 The Sociology of Law; in the College of Education, Department of Physical Education, PEDU 197 Fit Carolina; in the College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management, Department of Retailing RETL 351 Small Business Organization and Operation.

There was no discussion and the proposal was approved.

d. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Andrew Graciano, Chair

PROFESSOR ANDREW GRACIANO (School of Visual Art) – brought forward a motion for changes in the Faculty Manual related to Academic Grievance Procedures.

In the manual, there are 3 spots where it discusses Academic Grievance Procedures: on page 22, on page 37 and on page 45. This change brings them all together under one heading, Academic Grievance Procedures, on page 37. The four separate kinds of Academic Grievance Procedures are now numerically specified in a list followed by the remainder of the text of the section.

CHAIR VALTORTA -If passed the modifications of the Faculty Manual will be presented for approval at the Spring 2019 General Faculty meeting on April 30th.

UNIDENTIFIED PROFESSOR –Regarding the link for this particular committee report is there a difference in what was just presented?

CHAIR VALTORTA – Yes. The email received with the agenda has the link to this proposal but unfortunately it was left out from the website.

UNIDENTIFIED PROFESSOR – ...has a change to the Library Committee

CHAIR-ELECT MARK COOPER (English Language and Literature) – On the Faculty Senate web page, the page describing the meeting, the meeting for today, under Faculty Advisory Committee they're both links to the Academic Grievance Procedures change and to the Committee on Libraries change, which is not being brought forward this time. So, it's discoverable.

PROFESSOR JIM BURCH (Epidemiology & Biostatistics) - There's no changes to the wording, just a reorganization of the text. Is that correct?

PROFESSOR GRACIANO – Right. That's right. There is no real contents change. It's just moving the text around.

CHAIR VALTORTA – There would probably be additional changes to the Library Committee description that the committee will introduce for the next meeting.

There was no further discussion and the motion was passed.

5. Report of Officers

PROVOST JOAN GABEL – had two announcements on behalf of Dr. Kelly and Dr. Addy. The winter session had 14 sections fully subscribed online courses - 457 students. So, this pilot appears to have been very successful. Students love it. She hoped faculty who have participated found it to be a fulfilling way to engage with students and deliver content. This process is continuing in ways that will be discussed as the ideas progress.

USC will pilot another Living Learning Community next fall on Entrepreneurship and Innovation. Dirk Brown who is the director of the McNair Institute for Entrepreneurship is going to be leading the pilot. It's a test because entrepreneurship and innovation is not an academic program in the way that most of USC's living learning communities are. So, this is running as a trial and it is in the ideation phase, so she is bringing it to the Senate's attention for input and consultation, which can be directed to either Dr. Brown or Dr. Kelly or to Provost Gabel. There is a committee that is stewarding this in the way that is always done with living learning communities that has faculty and staff from Student Affairs because housing is directly involved.

The first-year reading book for the fall is called *Factfulness*. She has been flying a lot lately and has seen it in the hand of lots of people for airplane reading. It is also on President Obama's and Bill Gates' "must read lists." This is a book that she very much encourages faculty to consider using above and beyond what they do with the students in the first-year experience, and to that end they are able to make it available to anyone who would like a copy for free this year, which is broader than they're normally able to do. It will be available in April and faculty can let Dr. Kelly know of their interest and they'll get a copy.

The COACHE survey is going to come out soon into faculty email and she strongly encourages them to participate in this, particularly as members of the Faculty Senate, and to encourage their colleagues to participate. This is the instrument for measuring faculty satisfaction in engagement with campus processes. Now more than ever on campus those results are extremely important and it is also a way to measure that satisfaction and that allows the administration to benchmark.

Gabel expressed appreciation to faculty for their strong participation in the applications for this year's Provost Office Internal Grants and Faculty Awards. She expects to announce outcomes of the grant review process and the awards in April.

CHAIR VALTORTA - reminded the senators that the Provost has extended her invitation to all of them to her retreat which will be Friday, February 22nd.

PROVOST GABEL – commented that the agenda this time will not have the rotating piece that senators participated in before. The people who are presenting thought it would be of interest to everyone so out of respect for everyone's time there will be no shuffling around.

The Parker Executive Search consultants will be back. So, if in the interim senators have questions, things that percolate or feedback from colleagues, they will be back again for that event and questions can be brought back to them at that time.

6. Report of the Chair

CHAIR VALTORTA - President Pastides is continuing a well-received practice started 2 years ago, inviting Senators to his skybox at the Colonial Life Area for a basketball game. The chosen game is the Women's Basketball game against Georgia on Valentine's Day, February 14, 2019. Space is limited. Please contact Yvonne Dudley, the Administrative Coordinator of the Faculty Senate Office. Only one guest please. As a reminder high school students and college student athletes are not allowed as guests.

As the Senate Chair, Valtorta participated in a conference call with chairs from other Faculty Senates and a couple of national AAUP representatives related to the emerging nascent National Council of Faculty Senate Chairs organized by the Texas Council of Faculty Senates. This is a nationwide initiative that is taking place, and he will report as things progress.

Valtorta reported on activities of the President Candidate Search Committee. The committee met on December 7th. The search firm was hired at that meeting. On December 13th the committee met with the search firm to discuss the process and on January 11th by phone they discussed the position description that had been circulated before. The website has details such as the position description itself and forms to provide nominations and other input.

Valtorta had conversations with members of the USC Columbia staff on November 24th and 25th following the precedent set by then Chair Professor Bob Best in the occasion of the previous presidential search. The main purpose of those meetings was to receive input from the staff, which could help in the selection and interview of candidates. The staff doesn't have a representative on the search committee, and Professor Best 10 years ago decided to take over this role at least in small part.

On the 25th he also attended, together with the faculty representative from USC Upstate, a meeting on the Palmetto College Executive Committee in which the faculty and some administrators of the college emphasized the importance of the USC system as a whole.

7. Unfinished Business

PROFESSOR RAMY HARIK (College of Engineering and Computing) – proposed a motion to un-table the vote on the new curriculum in Mechanical Engineering.

The motion was seconded.

PROFESSOR HARIK - To shed the light on the un-tabling, the College of Engineering and Computing met with the College of Arts and Sciences and have discussed this element and reached a concurrence on it.

There was no further discussion and the motion to un-table the proposal was passed.

PROFESSOR HARIK – proposed a second motion to discuss or present a friendly amendment that was discussed between the College of Engineering and Computing and Arts and Sciences that was agreed on, which is a change in the new Mechanical Engineering curriculum. A minor change on the Math and Science elective. The change used to read any Biology, Chemistry, Math, Physics or Stat course and right now it reads the Math Science elective can be BIOL 110 or 300 and above, CHEM 112 or higher, MATH 300 or higher, PHYS 212 or higher, STAT 506 or higher

CHAIR VALTORTA - We have a second, is there any discussion? The amendment was called friendly. I guess technically we don't have friendly amendments, but it is friendly I guess in the sense that it was agreed by both colleges involved.

PROFESSOR HARIK – Absolutely.

CHAIR VALTORTA - Very good. So, if there is no discussion, I would like to have a vote on the amendment. Everyone in favor, please say yes. Opposed say no. Okay, so the amendment passes.

Now let's vote on the amended proposal and see if it passes. Any discussion? None, so everybody in favor of, yes there is. I'm sorry. Professor Geidel.

PROFESSOR GWEN GEIDEL (School of the Earth, Ocean and Environment) – With just a point of question. When you say it was approved within the College of Arts and Sciences, were you in deliberations with Dean Moore and Knapp? (inaudible) or Who was it you were actually in with?

PROFESSOR HARIK – There were several meetings that took place.

ASSOCIATE DEAN JED LYONS (Academic Program Liaison, College of Engineering and Computing) - We received a request from my counterpart, the Academic Program Liaison in the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's office, with the specific restrictions on the course, so that

came by writing from Ginger Nickles-Osborne. Lauren was at the meeting; other people were too.

PROFESSOR GEIDEL - Thank you, I appreciate that.

CHAIR VALTORTA - Any further questions and comments? Yes?

(UNIDENTIFIED PROFESSOR) - So just for clarification, we're not, this is not a decision on specific courses it's the overall program. Is that a correct statement? Thank you.

PROFESSOR JOHN LAVIGNE (Chemistry and Biochemistry) – This is not the 361/371 question I asked about at summers' meeting, it's the overall curriculum changes which removes certain Chemistry, Physics and Stat classes being required to being now optional or elective. Okay, for clarification, yes.

CHAIR VALTORTA - Thank you. All right. Then let us call the question. Everybody in favor of the motion to approve this amended program change, amended program change yes, please say yes. Opposed say no. Okay, the motion passes. Congratulations!

So, okay. So now the, just as a point of observation, since there was no un-tabling of the course proposals that were mentioned in the discussion they disappear from the Senate agenda and I imagine that eventually they will reappear in the course approval system in some other fashion.

Next, we have a new business and again I expect some new business, yes. Professor Almor.

8. New Business

PROFESSOR AMIT ALMOR (Psychology) - Thank you. Yes, I have a motion that I would like to bring forward to amend the Attendance Policy in the Academic Bulletin. A procedure that according to what I was able to gather requires both the agreement of the Faculty Senate as well as the Provost Office but the first step is for the faculty, in some cases, for the Faculty Senate actually to move it forward.

The specific issue that maybe you can bring the proposed changes screen there, is to strike down a part of the attendance policy that says that.

Only 10 percent of scheduled class sessions can be missed by students regardless of whether they're justified, excused or unexcused and making it clear that this 10 percent does not apply to a specific least which is already in the policy of excused absences.

A few words about the impetus for this proposal. This proposal came out of the discussions in the Council of Jewish Faculty and staff due to increased incidence of issues related to students wishing to observe the holidays and being unable to do so or at least having to suffer the consequences in terms of attendance because some instructors, not the majority of instructors, actually interpret this guideline as is currently stated as kind of applying to absences due to observance of religious holidays.

As you might know Jewish holidays actually change on the Gregorian calendar every year and the High Holy Days are pretty much celebrated by or celebrated by Jewish people from many denominations and. A peculiar property is that in each given year 4 of those days fall on the same day of the week. So imagine you're a student, you want to observe those holidays and the class you're attending, you're at the class that you're registered to, happens to be on that day that this year happens to coincide with the Jewish holiday. You were right there and then either get to or exceed your 10 percent of allowed absences and will depend on current under the current guideline will depend on the instructor kind of reading or choices of doing that.

In recent years there has been a substantial increase in diversity on the campus. There has been a substantial increase of the number of Jewish students who choose to come here and over the past few years there have been an increased number of issues that came to the attention of the Council of Jewish Professors and Staff that were specifically related to these. So the representative of the council actually met with both President Pastides and Provost Gabel and discussed those changes. Both were highly sympathetic and encouraging and basically willing to support those specific changes but the Provost, who unfortunately had to leave requested that those changes are actually supported by Faculty Senate or initiated through the Faculty Senate. So, I don't know if any of the other members of the council are here and wish to make further comments but this is the background for the motion as for the motion itself I hope you can see on the screen there. Marco, do I need to change something or if you can scroll up to the beginning of the ...so...maybe you can turn on the under the review. I think we're not seeing the reviews because if you go to the top part there, go to review and the show all markup. Show all markup. No, the first you know the 1st one the 1st about yes. Show marking , show all mark up.

So now we can see what the proposed changes are. In the 2nd paragraph that previously said *absences from more than 10 percent of schedule class sessions whether excused or an unexcused is excessive* , instead we have **absence from more than 10 percent of the schedule class sessions unless specifically excused for one of the reasons listed below** and that is a list that exists in the current policy as it is. That's one change.

The second change is in the 2nd paragraph where from currently we have *it must be emphasized that the 10 percent rule stated above applies to both excused and an excused absence*. The motion is to remove that sentence altogether and then finally at the end of the same or not finally at the end of this same paragraph remove the word *excessive* so that we are, that sentence I'm trying to find where it starts, It is also recommended that the faculty include the policy statement in their syllabi requesting students to meet with the instructor early in the semester to discuss the

consequences of potential, here we are striking that, we're proposing to strike down *excessive* and leaving it as absences due to and instead of *participation in University sponsored events* say more generally **any of the reasons listed below**.

And in the next paragraph Faculty should consider the following events or set of circumstances as striking down *potentially* and leaving excusable absences that and then add to **that do not count towards the 10 percent of allowed absences unless the student failed to provide the instructor with advance notice within a reasonable period of time in which case the following excusable absences may be counted by the instructor towards the 10 percent**.

And the lease which is on the next page is actually the same as it always was including several things including observance of religious holidays. Thank you.

CHAIR VALTORTA - Thank you for the presentation this proposal proposed change. Is there any discussion? Oh, we need a second, that's right. Is there a second? Second from the Senate? Discussion, please. Any questions? Yes, Vice Provost Kelly.

VICE PROVOST SANDRA KELLY - I'm really sympathetic to what this is intended to do and I think it's important. I'm worried about, so in my role I sometimes deal with students who abuse this. So in other words we have a list of religious holidays and it's quite extensive. We have students who decide they're suddenly belonging to a religion because it kind of tax on the March break or something like that. So it becomes difficult to determine what religious holidays should be excused. What religious holidays are not typically excuse but still observed, etc.

So, I'm worried about the unintended consequences and so I'm not saying that we shouldn't do something like this but I guess I want to little more time to think about it. Just because, when you, when you don't have that little bit of flexibility unfortunately out of our 28,000 undergrads and 7,000 grad students some of them will take policies and use them in a way that is difficult. So I don't know quite what to do about it and what we didn't want to, I was part of, actually I was Faculty Senate Chair when we actually listed the religious holidays and we at that point decided we did not want to get into the business of deciding which religious holidays were okay to take off and which weren't okay to take off. So, in other words, because there are a lot of religious holidays and we certainly don't want to discriminate. So, I'm not quite sure what I'm saying here, but I'm like Whoa wait a minute here. Let's think about this a little bit more. I don't know how many of you have looked at the Interfaith calendar recently there's a lot of holidays on that.

CHAIR VALTORTA – We have Professor Testerman and then Augie Grant.

PROFESSOR TRACI TESTERMAN (School of Medicine) - So there's some things on this list like death or major illness that can't be planned ahead but religious holidays are known about in advance and there it does say above that you're supposed to let the professor know you know that these should be discussed early in the course. So presumably the student is going to choose one religion. I don't think you could reasonably expect that they would be participating in all religions and therefore expects, you know all of these various religious holidays. So, I mean maybe that could be something that you could argue back that okay this was known about and so

they can't, you know, at the last minute say oh I couldn't make it because it's such and such holiday.

CHAIR VALTORTA – Very good. Thank you. I think Professor Grant.

PROFESSOR GRANT - Point of inquiry, with I believe the Bulletin has been set for Academic Year 2019-2020. So the soonest it would be effective would be 2020-2021 and the deadline for that would be late this year, so time is definitely a factor in our favor. I don't know what the exact deadline is though– December.

CHAIR VALTORTA - So I think you're hinting at the possibility of maybe having this studied by Faculty Advisory Committee first or

PROFESSOR GRANT – Course and Curricula or the appropriate committee

CHAIR VALTORTA - More comments? Yes, please.

PROFESSOR MICHAEL GAVIN (English) - Just the way this is written though, it seems like you're saying that someone has to notify ahead of time about an illness and that's just seems really bizarre. I mean it doesn't seem like the way this is written is can really work. Because you're trying to, you really focus on the question of religious holidays but there's a lot of things in this list that what you've written just seems applicable to. And the way it's written now, it almost seems as if well you can skip a class 3 times but then if you get sick then then you have to have an excused absence and that just seems strange. It seemed the value to me for having the policy not to distinguish between excuse and unexcused absences Is to say, you know, at least what I tell my students is that if you get sick like once or twice you don't have... that's fine you missed, it doesn't it doesn't hurt anything. If you have something major that's going to cause you to miss lots or several classes, I tell them to get in touch with me. That was my interpretation of what was meant by this was that you know that we know you're going to miss class up to 3 times you, don't have to worry about documenting every little thing but if there's something serious that's going to happen that could prevent you from attending 3 times or make you miss 3 or more times then you should get in touch with us. And that's how I always interpreted it but the way this is written just yeah I mean something about it seems off.

CHAIR VALTORTA – We have a question here, Elizabeth.

PROFESSOR KAREN EDWARDS (College of Hospitality, Retail & Sport Management) - I would recommend that we table this discussion until a later date where the senators can look at this a little bit more closely and perhaps confer with the faculty that we represent.

CHAIR VALTORTA - Would you consider making a motion to, okay. Thank you. Our parliamentarian is going to make a recommendation.

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH - In the best interest of having the question continue and have it discussed by the proper committee, your best bet is to refer this to a committee and not table it. Table it puts it in a specific time frame that it would have to be taken back up at the next meeting and decided then. So, once you put something on the table and you do not bring it back

up at the next meeting it is gone and must be brought back. So as parliamentarian, I would recommend that you that someone possibly make a referral.

PROFESSOR BELL - I would like to recommend that it goes to Scholastic Committee, as long as the understanding is that the Scholastic Committee would come back so we would then be able to share it with our faculty

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH - We need a second.

CHAIR VALTORTA - Then I think this pre-amps the other. Any discussion on this motion to refer to the Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee? Yes, there is some discussion here.

PROFESSOR BURCH - So does that mean if it goes to a committee, does that mean that the individuals who are interested in the original motion get to have input on the committee? How does that work?

CHAIR VALTORTA - That's often how it happens they're invited to participate. yes.

PROFESSOR MARK MINETT (ENGLISH) - So just so I can understand the concerns seems to be that faculty are in the position where they decide what counts as a religious holiday or not a religious holiday for on a case- by- case basis for their students. Is that correct you? No?

PROFESSOR ALMOR – (INAUDIBLE) they shouldn't do that, but they should decide a religious holiday and they haven't which is why we chose to bring it up. That they don't come and it's just excessive and so on.

PROFESSOR MINETT – So the faculty is deciding whether it is a non-religious holiday or religious holiday?

PROFESSOR ALMOR - Also note that one other side effect that even if you miss only 2 days due to a religious holiday that means that you have 2 less times you can miss class. You're at a disadvantage now because you chose to observe.

(UNIDENTIFIED PROFESSOR) - It seems like that puts faculty in a poor position and there should be a uniform standard. If we refer this to a committee is there any way to put that point across? I guess that part of what we're interested in. I mean you're talking about taking away faculty choice. It seems like the Vice Provost suggested that there, they come across problems right and making those decisions themselves. I feel like we want to eliminate arbitrariness and decision making. And I don't know what that procedure is, but I'd like that to be a part of the record maybe for when we send it to committee, that's like seems an important goal to share that with faculty. That we should think about is an important goal.

CHAIR VALTORTA - I don't understand which arbitrariness you're referring to here.

(UNIDENTIFIED PROFESSOR) - I think the notion that students are put in a position where on a case-by- case basis, faculty, individual faculty might have no special knowledge or experience

in these issues can decide what religious holidays are excused or unexcused. It needs to be taken seriously right by the University.

(UNIDENTIFIED PROFESSOR)I'm not saying it's not important, but this isn't required. We have the right to deduct grades if they miss 10 percent. We're not going to fire ..so of course it policies.

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH – I guess Mark I want to find out whether it's a question, you have a question about procedure or content? Because procedure, well content that's what the referral to the committee. The committee will worry about the content that usually something that this order will also go through Faculty Advisory committee and it also will be passing through Steering Committee. So, I don't think the question is going to be taken unseriously. It's not going to, it's going to be taken seriously. Any committee takes their work seriously. So that's the procedural I mean I think that would cover both of maybe your questions at the moment.

CHAIR VALTORTA - So let us vote on this motion to refer the question to the Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee. Everybody in favor of that please say aye. Oppose no. So, the ayes have it. The proposal will be sent to the Scholastic Standards and Petitions committee. Thank you.

Is there anything else under New Business that anybody would like to bring up? I guess not.

Anything for the good of the order in the announcements?

9. For the Good of the Order

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH - I actually have 2 tickets to the Women's basketball game tomorrow night. Now you have to think about whether taking this is a good thing, well it is a good thing and the reason is I'm unable to attend because tomorrow night is that we are opening the Civil Rights exhibit at the library. So, I'm getting a twofer but I'm not taking names but if anybody here would like to take it. Let's say we are Section 104 row 17 it's pretty darn good. You're behind the home bench.

CHAIR VALTORTA -Wow! Thank you. All right and no more announcements then.

10. Adjournment

Do I have a motion to adjourn? Second? Everybody agree, yes? The meeting is adjourned. We meet here on Wednesday, March 6th. Same time, same place.