

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING OF FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Thursday, July 11, 2019 at 2:00 p.m.

KAREN J. WILLIAMS COURTROOM OF THE LAW SCHOOL

PRESIDING: Professor Marco Valtorta, Chair

Call to Order

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

He asked members of the press to identify themselves.

Only senators can make motions and only faculty members can address the assembly. Those are the bylaws of the Senate. Priority will be given to the Faculty Senators. Speakers need to line up at the microphones and identify themselves by stating name and department or unit, and each speaker will have one turn on the microphone and will then relinquish the microphone after addressing the assembly. Speakers can go back in line to speak again if they wish. He extended special thanks to Dean Robert Wilcox of the Law School for making this beautiful courtroom, the Karen J. William Courtroom available for the meeting and to all who have helped organize this meeting on very short notice, especially members of the Law School staff, the Senate Administrative Assistant, Yvonne Dudley, and Chair-elect Mark Cooper.

Discussion of the Assembly

Today's meeting is solely devoted to discuss the status of the presidential search and the appointment process and related issues. He imagines that most of the attendees have seen or heard his report at the General Faculty meeting in April about the search up to that point. That is up to the nomination of Chancellor Kelly as interim president. What has happened since then has been covered in the press and, in fact the press reports that came up earlier this week, and keep coming out are the reason why well over 10 senators, which is the minimum required, called for this special meeting.

PROFESSOR BETHANY BELL (College of Social Work) -made a motion for consideration of a resolution that was being passed out to attendees. She thanked everyone for coming.

Bell is a faculty senator and chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee and as a senator she made a motion for consideration of the resolution to restore the integrity of the presidential search.

“Whereas, the Governor of the State of South Carolina has taken the extraordinary step of calling a meeting of the Board of Trustees to select as president of the University of South Carolina a highly controversial candidate that he favors, and

Whereas, political interference in the selection of the university president conflicts with good

governance of the university, and

Whereas, the Governor's action has already transformed selection of our next president into a partisan conflict, defiant of deliberative process and destructive of trust, and

Whereas, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges has demonstrated concern over gubernatorial interference in governing boards, and

Whereas, deviating from good governance principles jeopardizes accreditation for the university as a whole and for individual programs and the aspiration to achieve AAU status, and,

Whereas, to succeed in its mission, the University must not only preserve its accreditation, but continue to attract and retain talented students, faculty, and administrators, and

Whereas, a properly conducted search might be expected to yield a highly qualified pool of candidates, and

Whereas, once damaged, a university's reputation is not easily repaired, and

Whereas, the Board of Trustees in its wisdom nominated an interim president who can lead the university in day-to-day operations, ensuring that additional time can be invested to rectify the problems in the search process, and

Whereas, the Faculty of the University of South Carolina resolved to continue to advise the Board of Trustees openly and honestly to the best of its ability regarding the presidential search,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate urges the Board of Trustees to cancel the current presidential search and begin an open and legitimate search process as described in its bylaws and as recommended by the American Association of University Professors.”

PROFESSOR BELL – moved that the resolution be adopted. There was a second and discussion was opened.

PROFESSOR JESSE KASS (Mathematics Department) -asked the Chair if since this is a summer meeting they automatically have quorum no matter how many people are present.

CHAIR VALTORTA – corrected him that it's because this is a special meeting.

PROFESSOR KASS – asked about the rules governing whether or not they can pass the motion.

CHAIR VALTORTA – replied that they can if his sense is that there is a quorum.

PROFESSOR DENISE McGill (School of Journalism and Mass Communications) – identified herself as a faculty senator and asked if there was a parliamentarian present. She stated that her understanding from Augie Grant is that they only need a quorum if somebody calls for quorum.

Did anybody just call for a quorum?

(Unidentified person calls for quorum)

CHAIR VALTORTA – responded that since he is not a senator he can't call for a quorum.

PARLIAMENTARIAN BILL SUDDUTH (University Libraries) - It is the determination first of the chair. If the Chair feels there's a quorum, you may proceed.

The determination of a quorum is first a determination by the chair. If the chair feels that there are enough senators to constitute a quorum, then he may proceed with the business. If a faculty senator wants to call the quorum to see if there actually is one that is their right to do so. At which point the officers will determine if there is one. Valtorta asked for a show of hand of senators who had not signed up on the sign-up sheet when entering the room; many indicated that they had not, and Valtorta took this as evidence of a quorum.

There was no further discussion and the motion was adopted unanimously.

CHAIR VALTORTA - asked if there are any more questions or comments from the senators.

PROFESSOR ABBAS TAVAKOLI (College of Nursing) – directed a comment toward media reports on a student forum that Tavakoli attended yesterday that there were about 150 students attending in that forum and only one student was for General Caslen. But during evening media reports, they were showing for and against, these sort of candidates, which there is no both sides. To him, a majority of university body, student, faculty or staff are against this candidate. So there is not two sides and their media coverage should be proportionally correct and that was not correct. Just want to make sure that comment goes through the media here today and as you see there is no “for” General Caslen in our faculty body too.

PROFESSOR MEGAN OLIVER (University Libraries) – stated she voted for the resolution and now would like to know what it accomplishes in terms of the future of this kind of thing. What does a violation of this resolution incur and is there anything further that the faculty senate can do as a voting body?

CHAIR VALTORTA - The resolution will be delivered to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees has the authority to select the university president. Of course, the Board is bound by its own rules, the bylaws of the Board. He expects that tomorrow he will be allowed to make a report of what happened today in this assembly and possibly of commenting on the resolution.

PROFESSOR SETH STOUGHTON (Law School) - reminded this body that there were at least two and possibly three separate issues that they should be discussing and thinking about. One of which is the relative qualifications or lack thereof of General Caslen. That's a separate and distinct issue in his mind from the process that the Board of Trustees used to get to this point in the process. And that is separate and distinct from the governor's pressure on the Board of Trustees as publicly reported.

PROFESSOR DENISE MCGILL- asked if Valtorta could share anything he could re: his perspective from the search committee. How did he find out about this? Was he contacted by anyone and is it even legal for the trustees to take the search power away from Valtorta and explain how this works from his perspective.

CHAIR VALTORTA -It is a difficult question for him. First of all, he would like to make sure that this body doesn't take any punches back from the search committee just because he was on it. The senate's duty is of course, to seek the truth, do the right thing and ignore who was on the committee. So, as far as the last few days, he was told of the Friday meeting of the Board, via confidential email just minutes before the State newspaper broke the news. Valtorta was actually driving to work and started getting phone calls that quickly led to a request to have this meeting. The search committee as a whole has not met since April. However, they did have a meeting organized by the chair of the committee where several members of the search committee were invited just a couple of days ago. This was a another time to exchange views on various issues, most specifically, what would happen, what could happen or would happen on Friday.

So there was also the question at that meeting as to the future of the search committee and the answer was, if a president is selected on Friday, the search committees is disbanded. If not, it is up to the Board to decide what to do. They may decide to maintain the committee. Maintain the committee with some changes possibly. He thinks this would be very odd given the clarity of the bylaws on this point or disband the committee and having a new committee set up for a new search.

PROFESSOR SIMON TARR (School of Visual Art and Design) - made a motion because of the potential damage to the university's accreditation and because of potential serious damage to its reputation. And largely due to the lack of good university governance procedures in this search process. He called for a vote of "No confidence in General Caslen as a candidate for president of the university."

There was a second and discussion was opened.

PROFESSOR TRACI TESTERMAN (School of Medicine) thought it might be useful to hear from some people who were able to meet him in person and listen to him about those impressions because not everybody was able to attend that day. It might be useful to get some other perspectives on, not only his qualifications on paper, but in terms of interpersonal and other interactions because in order to be effective, a president has to be able to be respected by the students, the faculty, the administration. The various groups at the university need be able to communicate well, show respect and receive respect in return.

PROFESSOR BELL -shared some of her experiences and thoughts on him. First, of all the candidates, he had done no research on USC's strategic plan or mission, and he showed no understanding of what is entailed for faculty in a research institution. He didn't have answers that map onto the reality of this university. Second, when he was the superintendent of West Point,

only 25% of his faculty were civilians. So that means only 25% would ever speak up against him because they're not military. You don't speak up against people of higher rank. So that's not showing any evidence that he understands governance that's not military governance, if that's even a word.

Third. The interpersonal. She thinks his comment that the students got very upset about was him showing poor communication. She doesn't think he intended to say how it came out about sexual assault and drinking. But that's a perfect example of poor communication. And the president cannot communicate that poorly when you're talking to students or donors.

Lastly, there's promotion of his ability to secure federal funding while he was superintendent of West Point to redo the dorms. Getting the people who appointed him as the superintendent to give him money is nothing like the billions of dollars that Pastides has raised for this university or any other president. Those are areas besides paper that lead her to not think he's qualified.

(UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER) – gave a comment related to the motion on General Caslen.

CHAIR VALTORTA - Very good. Let's go back to that then.

(UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER) - Respectfully requested the senator to revise the motion. The motion was premised on the idea that the senate is discussing the effect of accreditation reputation. That's perfectly appropriate. That is a motion about the process by which the Board moved towards General Caslen, the Board's consideration of him. That's a separate and distinct issue from General Caslen's qualifications. If that is the issue and the senate is being asked to vote about his qualifications, then it should be separated from the framing of accreditation reputation because if he was selected through a normal standard and legitimate process, the faculty wouldn't have the same objection.

CHAIR VALTORTA -Thank you.

PROFESSOR TARR – retracted his motion and restated it simply. He moves for a vote of no confidence in General Caslen as a candidate for president of the university.

The motion was seconded and discussion opened.

PROFESSOR ANNE GULICK (English Department) - wondered about the potential risks or benefits of voting on the candidate versus the process at this point.

PROFESSOR SCOTT SMITH (College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management) - asked Valtorta what was the specific recommendation of the search committee for the four candidates. What was the specific recommendation to the board from the search committee? What is the faculty representation.

CHAIR VALTORTA - The faculty has three representatives - Julius Fridriksson and Valtorta from Columbia and Araceli Hernandez-Laroche from the other campuses. The committee gave the board a list of four names, not a specific ranking or a specific recommendation on the four.

There have been, again, many comments in the press as to candidates dropping out at various stages in the process. Of course today's meeting is being held because of reports in the press of political interference. So those are issues that are relevant, but for which Valtorta cannot divulge at this time, at least in more details.

PROFESSOR BELL - addressed the former senator's question. It's very relevant and the senators are doing a double prong approach by passing the resolution on the process and a vote of no confidence. If faculty only put their eggs in one basket, then the Board of Trustees will not understand that they do have multiple concerns as the senator from the Law School mentioned. Bell considers this a balanced approach by making two different motions.

CHAIR VALTORTA - To continue addressing the previous senator's point and to some extent it is indeed paramount to consider the process issues. As candidates are concerned, the board has a more complete leeway. That is a clarification from his point of view.

Valtorta opened comments to faculty who are not senators and invited Dr. Wells to comment.

PROFESSOR CARL WELLS (Darla Moore School of Business) – introduced himself as the President of Black Faculty Staff Association at the University of South Carolina. The Black Faculty Staff Association recently launched a petition survey electronically out of its concern for Governor McMaster, pressuring the Board of Trustees to cast a vote in support of former West Point Superintendent Robert L. Caslen as the next president of the University of South Carolina. They are disheartened that the presidential search process, which generated strong student, faculty and staff concerns and opposition towards Mr. Caslen and a black finalist that received overwhelming support from a diversity of faculty, staff and students, ended in controversy. Nevertheless, they were prepared and respected the Board of Trustees decision to move forward with an initial and a new process. He added, however, that they are again saddened to hear that in a time when faculty and staff are away from campus, the board is reintroducing a process wherein students and faculty and staff provided some pushback.

Within 48 hours of launching their survey, they collected 650 responses. The initial responses of the survey have been shared and forwarded to individual members of the Board of Trustees. It's been forwarded to the staff who are employed in the office that supports the Board of Trustees and it's been shared with leadership at the University of South Carolina. Time would not permit him to list 650 individual responses. He did provide a categorized summary of those responses, however.

1. There's concern about the lack of due process, the failure to follow South Carolina Law, the Board of Trustees' own bylaws, state regulations and hiring best practices.
2. There is a great deal of concern about the lack of qualification that Mr. Caslen possesses.
3. The blatant misuse of power and the lack of transparency and official university process disregard for the opinions of faculty, staff and students was stated over and over. The reintroduction of a process that was challenged by students at a time where they're away from the university and the infusion of unethical political agendas into a process as important as electing the next president of the University of South

Carolina.

Again, the initial survey has already been shared with the Board of Trustees. It is still being launched and a final number and other comments will be added and that will be forwarded to them again early tomorrow morning. Thank you for the opportunity to provide a statement on behalf of the Black Faculty Staff Association and in support of the current agenda. Thank you very much.

CHAIR VALTORTA - Thank you Professor Wells. The search process does not include direct representation from the staff. Following the good example of his predecessor, Professor Robert Best, 12 years ago, Valtorta reached out to staff representatives, not to Professor Wells, however, to get some input which was useful, input early in the search process. Certainly something that he hopes the Board will consider is to add staff representation directly to the search committee in the future. That of course would require a change in bylaws or the appointment of a special advisor, which the Board also can do.

There was no further discussion.

Valtorta asked Professor Tarr to restate the motion.

PROFESSOR TARR - moved for a vote of no confidence in General Caslen as a candidate for president of this university.

The motion carried and the vote was unanimous.

PROFESSOR BELL – had an additional process question. In April Valtorta as well as the student body government presidents were not in the room during executive session when the Board was discussing the four applicants or candidates. She assumed that will happen as well at tomorrow's board meeting at 10:00 AM. If that is the case, will they allow Valtorta time to speak before they go into executive session? Will he truly have the opportunity to address the Board of Trustees?

CHAIR VALTORTA – responded that was correct. The student body president, it was the student representative, Taylor Wright at the time and Valtorta were sent off during the executive session. And that's normal. Sometimes they are allowed to stay in executive session and sometimes not depending on what is discussed. So for tomorrow, he is in receipt of an email from the chair of the Board, the honorable John von Lehe, in answer to Valtorta's invitation for him to attend this meeting, consistent with the bylaws of the Senate. The bylaws of the Senate explicitly state that the chairman of the Board of Trustees is always invited to the meeting or can designate someone to do it in his stead. The Honorable von Lehe chair politely declined and wrote back asking him to make an accurate and eloquent report. So, based on that email, Valtorta expects that he will indeed be allowed to report on what happened today and make possibly other considerations.

PROFESSOR TRACEY WELDON (English Department Linguistics Program) – in the

College of Arts and Sciences. Dean's office, had a question about what's happening tomorrow. Is the Board of Trustees being asked to vote up or down on Caslen only or will the other four candidates also be voted on tomorrow?

CHAIR VALTORTA – can only talk about what is out in public and what is out in public is the agenda of the board which does not limit the discussion to one candidate. However, press reports have been overwhelming in the direction of that, an up or down vote on one candidate. So that is a pretty safe assumption that other candidates will not be discussed. Faculty may have read in the press that two of the candidates, Applegate and Walsh, have made it clear that they do not want to be considered again. Again, these are press reports and candidate Tate has not commented on the possibility of accepting a reconsideration.

PROFESSOR KEN ROTH (Moore School of Business) asked the issue about the quorum just because he thinks their strength as a faculty group and the Faculty Senate is actually increased by numeric attribution's of that quorum. So that was his motivation. He is not Caslen.

His concern is it was raised formerly by a faculty senator regarding the individuals versus the process. He thinks it's pretty clear and they're used to as faculty delegating searches to subcommittees and honoring the recommendation of that subcommittee. He thinks given his 30 plus years of being here actually caring deeply about the university, caring deeply about the mission of the university, and as a white old male, he actually has probably the most diverse department in terms of nationality, sexual orientation, disciplinary, etc. .

So just because someone is an old white male doesn't necessarily mean they don't care about other missions beyond simply what may be attributed to them. That being said, it's really clear that the decision of who to offer the job to is the Board of Trustees. It's not the faculty's. Faculty can give input, but the decision rests with the Board of Trustees. What does rest with the faculty is the process by which that communication and the way in which that decision is made is very much part of faculty governance. He'd be a little disappointed if the faculty simply take a vote on a particular candidate as opposed to actually addressing the bigger issue is how are decisions made around this university and how are decisions made with respect to the state and the university relationship. The real issue is the process that has occurred. He would hate for them to not have a message to their shareholders with respect to what they value with regard to that process.

PROFESSOR JIM BURCH – (Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics). Stated he is infuriated that this process has been undermined. And Dr. Wells mentioned that bylaws had been violated and potentially other rules and regulations of the university had been violated. He asked where is the outrage, and what are the options about moving forward if there have been regulations or bylaws that had been violated. What are the ramifications of this and what are the consequences and what can we do to rectify this situation?

CHAIR VALTORTA – replied that the university has had many years of a good relationship between the faculty and the administration, and he would say the Board as well. It is his hope as chair of the Faculty Senate and faculty representative to the Board that this kind of a good climate will be maintained or if it has been somewhat damaged because of process issues that have been highlighted not just by faculty, but frankly by some of the trustees themselves. This damage has taken place. His hope is that it can be repaired for the good of the whole university, its community of scholars and educators. He sees a call for more advocacy in Burch’s comment. Valtorta has made some comments to trustees about the risk of losing the harmonious nature of the relationships or at least the comfortable nature of the relationship over the past many years, at least the past three presidencies.

PROFESSOR BRAD COLLINS (School of Visual Art and Design) - There are indeed two separate issues. One of them is process and one of them is the candidate. The two motions that were passed deal very effectively with both of them. In terms of the process, however, it seems that if the governor is allowed to have his way on this, it sets a very, very dangerous precedent and the Board of Trustees needs to understand that that's what's at stake here. A very, very dangerous precedent that, that in the future any governor will be able to run the university.

In terms of the candidate, it's important that the faculty indicate to the Board that it's not only unfair to the faculty and the students, but in many ways unfair to Mr. Caslen to be dropped into a very, very hostile situation. And he needs to understand that he would be forced to be faced with a very, very hostile work environment.

CHAIR VALTORTA - assured that the point has been made. Press reports indicate that General Caslen was quoted in the press as being unwilling to come to a university where he felt so unwelcome, but evidently things changed in that respect.

Valtorta addressed both Burch’s comment and the comment of the previous colleague by pointing to this room. The Senate rarely has such a turnout. The turnout today is greater than the turnout during the finalist forums.

PROFESSOR TODD SHAW (Political Science) -addressed the comment of a previous colleague, which he is in complete agreement with. Of course, the Board has the authority to make this decision, but as he was reading other comments from colleagues and he thinks they all in agreement that a dynamic research institution is only as good as its faculty. Clearly the Board can read the vote of no confidence as an advisory opinion, but an important advisory opinion. Shaw appreciates it being stated very plainly because it has been articulated in various ways already in that effect.

He voiced his concern as a citizen in the state, but also as a member of this faculty. Some concern over legislators in the press about how to couch General Caslen's leadership of this institution. And some of it is to bring the university under control. There are many roles the president of a research institution must serve. And one of course is to have a cooperative relationship with the faculty and the staff and the students and alumni and

donors to move the institution forward. He calls upon legislators to think of the broad view of what an institution does and what a university president must do in that. And certainly to keep things in the black and to be mindful of the bottom line. But the bottom line is only one bottom line.

CHAIR VALTORTA - Indeed the trustees have a share of obligation and most of them are elected by legislative delegations and on the same basis as circuit judges. One interesting parts of Valtorta's role is sometimes to educate trustees as to the nature of shared governance. The trustees who participated in the search as members of the search process got a quick lesson on this when the committee interviewed semifinalists. And everyone had a lot to say about shared governments. It was a good lesson.

A university is a very special place, and it is not just a business. It has a business side, but it is in essence a community of scholars and educators. They have a common purpose. A university is directed toward knowledge, truth, wisdom and of course the education of the citizens of the state.

PROFESSOR SUSAN COURTNEY (Department of English) – thanked Valtorta and everyone who has been working so hard for the faculty. If all of the faculty who are here in this room showed up tomorrow morning at nine o'clock in the Alumni Center, that would be a very powerful thing. For anybody who wasn't able to be there in the spring, it was very powerful. The students mobilized and there were a lot of bodies and you could feel all those bodies in that building. And when they took that vote, everyone got to hear it. And the students broke out in cheers. The Board walked out of the room, they walked through the crowd. So, if the faculty are there in person tomorrow, as well as with the resolutions, that will be a very powerful thing.

CHAIR VALTORTA -encouraged everybody who feels inclined to be there to not to resort to violence or intimidation. The students provided a lesson at the public forums when they brought up the issue of gender diversity in the pool of four finalists. Their message was very strong, very articulate and clear, but again, they did not resort to name calling, verbal abuse or worse. There is also the possibility that some of the people in the board room may react to pressure that goes over the top in a negative way.

PROFESSOR ANDY KRETSCHMAR (School of Law) - invited everyone in this room whether a senator or not to share what they do. The reason being is because one of the charges leveled against this body, this body being the faculty and it's a charge we're all familiar with, is that any dissent that is put forward by this body or by students is simply a bunch of overpaid members of the ivory tower complaining that they don't get their way. Each and every faculty member has connections with students that are meaningful to those students in this university and each faculty member does research and publishes and does work that is a value. So over the coming days no matter what happens, he encourages everybody here, be it Facebook, be it friends, whatever, to tell people what they do as faculty. Don't let anybody have to guess. Tell them what it is you do and how it brings value to this university and most importantly to the students because that's what's being dragged through the mud here, in some cases when faculty are accused of

being part of some Marxist plot. Please dispel any negative connotations. Shine a light on what you do, please.

IDENTIFIED SPEAKER - There's been a request that from the people on Adobe Connect, watching online streaming, if they can be allowed to ask a question.

CHAIR VALTORTA – Yes.

PROFESSOR JENNIFER POURNELLE (School of Earth, Ocean and Environment) – stated she was trying to wrap up some of the comments just heard about the difference between procedure and person and a couple of points she hopes the press will take away. She can't speak for the military, but she can speak as a veteran, a 13-year veteran, including of the first Gulf War, of a veteran of over 16 years of service in southern Iraq. Much of her career actually overlapped that of General Caslen, so she has a very intimate understanding of his history. Her opposition to him as a president is not because he was a general, but because of the track of his career.

He did not participate in common governance even as it exists within the army or across the military. He held straight line by line by line combat positions. That's commendable. It makes him a war hero. It does not make him someone who even understands the G5, J5 civil military process, let alone someone who understands the J3, J5 five inter-military processes, let alone someone who, for example, like retired General Powell has had experience in Washington with the kind of fundraising that goes beyond appealing to the alumni of a four-year military academy. He'd probably be an excellent president for the Citadel. But his lack of understanding of what this university is unfortunately coincides with exactly the lack of understanding held by some of the trustees, many of the public in this state who confuse perhaps college experience with what it really means to be the president of a light industrial park with a lot of argumentative tenants. USC is not a hierarchy.

For the press she pointed out that the faculty objection here is primarily procedural and as a veteran she supports the procedure because it is specifically representative of rule of law in a representative democracy. There is a procedure precisely so that people who don't understand faculty or their view nevertheless have an opportunity to learn from it, participate in it and we from theirs. And that process should never be abrogated by any governor. Someone asked about next steps. She recommends the Faculty Senate form a subcommittee to specifically iterate what are the procedural guidelines, the legal guidelines, the next steps. The trustees should be made aware of those by tomorrow morning. They should know exactly what rules of governance they are part of because it's not just our participation that's been abrogated here. It's theirs.

CHAIR VALTORTA – read a question from Adobe Connect. MARY FOSTER COX, (College of Nursing) wrote, “I urge our faculty senators to put forth a motion regarding no confidence in the process.” Some of the senators here are commenting that the resolution to restore the integrity of the presidential search that was voted at the

beginning is indeed as a resolution on process issues, process and governance issues.

PROFESSOR ELIZABETH REGAN (Integrated Information Technology) - shared a similar concern to the previous speaker. Personally, she had a much more favorable impression of General Caslen than a lot of people did. However, she's been thoroughly impressed by the counter position of the rest of the university. She has a less traditional background in academics than a lot of people, so she brings a little bit different perspective. But her main concern now is what happens if the Board of Trustees tomorrow makes a decision to vote favorably for Caslen as president. She had the privilege when she was in industry for over 12 years to serve on the Board of Trustees of a college institution in the Boston area.

And during her tenure on that Board of Trustees, they hired, fired a president, appointed an interim president and hired a new president. She wanted to just share that little bit because it was a divisive precedent. The Board thought they were doing the right thing and thought they had the support of the faculty and the institution, however, that president failed to gain the support and respect as the leader of that institution and losing that support ended up with a vote of no confidence. And so, at that point, the Board had to make the hard decision of letting that president go, appointing an interim president and going back through the search process. It was a very tumultuous experience and a hard thing. So the important message to the Board of Trustees is that first and foremost, the president of a university is a leader, not a manager.

A lot of their experience like hers is from a management perspective background. So leadership means followship. What's the difference between a manager and a leader? A leader is dependent entirely upon a followship. That speaks to shared governance of course. She wanted to share that experience and hope that maybe that's something that Valtorta might be able to have an opportunity to express to the Board of Trustees. And that was her concern about Dr. Caslen first and foremost, above everything else. If he does not have the support of this institution, he will be set up for failure.

CHAIR VALTORTA – read a comment from the chat board by Hildy Teegen. She stated that the process concerns may carry the day for some trustees otherwise inclined to support voting in a new president at this point. Professor Teegen was the dean of our Darla Moore School of Business. How does the no confidence compare to what was just passed? The resolution about no confidence in a particular candidate as it was characterized.

PROFESSOR MARIA GIRARDI (Department of Mathematics) – It's already been indicated that the vast presence of professors here and faculty members indicates grave concern. He thanked Valtorta for sending a solid email telling faculty about this meeting occurring at two o'clock today. At the beginning of this meeting somebody else mentioned something going on at the State House. He asked for information on what's going on at the State House.

PROFESSOR CHRISTIAN ANDERSON (Education)-stated he just came straight from the State House. The students asked him to represent the faculty and make a statement at their press conference. Mayor Benjamin spoke, then State Senator Jackson spoke, Lyric Swinton who's the student organizer from the April event spoke. Then Anderson spoke and then Taylor Wright the previous Student Body President spoke. And the comments were all very well received.

There was a lot of media so it should be well covered in all of the print and TV. To answer one of the previous questions as to what happens if they do meet tomorrow. State Senator Jackson made it very clear that he would convene a special hearing, oversight hearing and call the trustees in and make them account for why they were holding this meeting, which he regards as illegal.

Mayor Benjamin's opinion and he's a graduate of this law school, said that his reading of the law was that the meeting was illegal by the way it was being convened because it didn't have enough notice. He's asked the attorney general to issue an attorney general's opinion. Every single speaker, including Anderson, urged the governor to cancel the meeting and the trustees to carry on with an open and transparent process.

Mayor Benjamin spoke with the governor this morning and he reported in his remarks today that the governor has never met Robert Caslen and he doesn't know him. He has no relationship with him. And so reporters asked, why is he so hell bent on getting him in? And Mayor Benjamin and Senator Jackson, didn't know.

The event went very well. The students did a remarkable job. It's unfortunate that it was at the same time as this, but there was a lot of moving parts, getting the mayor and the senator and everyone else there. So, you know, please no fault to the students for having it coincide with this. There were a lot of students there and he expressed to them how supportive the faculty and there are this many faculty showing up to show support, not just for them but for the university, in the middle of the summer. The students were energized and optimistic, but realistic too about everything.

CHAIR VALTORTA – There was a request on the chat board to post the resolution.

The bylaws allow the Chair to invite guests to speak unless the senators object. He invited Professor Blackwell to speak. Professor Blackwell is the President of the South Carolina chapter of the AAUP the American Association of University Professors. There was no objection.

GUEST PROFESSOR MARK BLACKWELL (South Carolina Chapter of the AAUP) - thanked Valtorta for the opportunity and the invitation and Christian Anderson for emailing him and asking him to come down. Shawn Smolen-Morton, their treasurer is here also. They are from Francis Marion University.

Senator Bell went over 90% of his points and rightly pointed to the interference with

good governance and directly at the ex-officio chair who would be the governor and that interference. It was good to hear the senator from the Law School talk about process and person or process and qualifications. There are ideological, ethical and process questions that have to be addressed. The AAUP is primarily in this kind of a situation about process and it does appear that process was directly interrupted after the last meeting in April and possibly within the last two weeks, and that has been said as well.

The legitimacy of the Board of Trustees actions were never questioned until after April. Blackwell spoke to the Faculty Senate on February 6th, when he was asked to look at the process and how it was going. The AAUP agreed it was going fairly well and he laid out about 10 points for what he thought the committee should do. And they followed all of them. The chapter was pleased when the process said it didn't want any of these candidates. That meant that it was working okay. After that it seemed for about two months things broke down and he seriously doubts that things didn't happen at all. He thinks many, many things probably went on and they brought everyone to the situation.

Senator Bell diagnosed the problem extremely well. And the AAUP's involvement started Wednesday night when they informed their entire membership on the webpage, on Facebook, and through email that this was going on. They started fielding questions and then sent out directives or suggestions that everyone considered to come to the silent protest on Friday. To come and stay, just silent protest in the sense that silence is a little bit more deafening than a lot of noise sometimes and it would be less expected.

They've been conferring with USC Columbia members and faculty on moving forward from this with Valtorta and from other people. And even retired professors have asked about a month ago, what can they do to start an AAUP chapter? The letters that they write to the Board of Trustees, the governor and the national chapter will have the Senator Bell's points in them, particularly the points about accreditation and quoting the AAUP presidential process. Those were exceptional and the Alabama case that's going on with the AAUP right now and accreditation and their governor in their university process.

Now comes the pitch. USC doesn't have a chapter but it takes just seven faculty to make a chapter. USC faculty should make a chapter because today and Friday aren't the crisis. How do you do shared governance? How do you advocate for shared governance for academic freedom or academic security for higher education and how higher education for the entire community can be done in a professional manner? How can they be professionals and do it pro bono as in not paid? That's what the AAUP has been doing for over a hundred years.

He encouraged faculty to work with Valtorta who's a member and anyone who's called for a chapter to be formed to get in touch with Blackwell. They'd like to help form a chapter at USC.

CHAIR VALTORTA -underscored the importance of what Blackwell said. In Valtorta's June address to the Senate concluded with an exhortation to join the AAUP and he

repeated it today.

PROFESSOR BELL – stated that she and Valtorta have an email waiting in which the Associate Secretary for the Department of Academic Freedom Tenure and Governance from the National AAUP in D.C. has reached out. She appreciates the South Carolina chapter of support, and now it is starting to go upstream.

CHAIR VALTORTA -The meeting is adjourned.