

**FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**November 6, 2019**

**1. Call to Order**

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR MARK COOPER - called the meeting to order.

**2 Corrections to and Approval of Minutes**

There were no corrections to the minutes of October 2, 2019. The minutes were approved as submitted.

CHAIR COOPER introduced the invited guests from AGB. Dr. Roderick McDavis, PhD in Counselor Education from the University of Toledo, spent 13 years as the President of the Ohio University and is currently the managing principal of AGB Executive Search. Dr. Sally Mason, PhD is in Cellular, Molecular and Developmental Biology from the University of Arizona, is President Emerita of the University of Iowa. Dr. Garry Owens, Masters of Music and a PhD in Curriculum and Instruction from the University of Wisconsin, Madison, was the founding Dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts at Texas Tech.

**3. Invited Guests**

Guest McDavis (AGB Executive Search) - Thank you, Mr. Chair. We are delighted to have the opportunity to be with you this afternoon. I will keep my comments brief so that we can entertain questions from you. This search is underway. The search committee is formed. We already have the leadership profile that has been sent all over the United States. The ads are out in the usual publications, the *Chronicle*, *Inside Higher Ed* and others. We are already beginning to receive a lot of inquiry from folks from all over the country. You and your colleagues here at the University of South Carolina have done a great job. This is a very attractive provost position. There are a lot of people we believe across the country who are going to become candidates for this position with very, very strong academic backgrounds.

We met with the search committee earlier today. We had a good exchange with them. We have set the timeline over these next four to five months, in terms of getting this work completed. You will have an opportunity, when the finalists come to campus, to engage with them in conversations and discussions. We feel that the search is off to a very, very productive and positive start. And we certainly believe that you're going to do a great job of attracting candidates from all over the United States. If you know of people that you feel would be an extremely good Provost, we certainly would welcome your nominations. We encourage that in every search that we do. We think people on the campus know the institution best and you know what you need in

terms of a provost. So, with that, I think I'll stop and all three of us are certainly available to answer questions that you might have. Yes sir.

PROFESSOR MARCO VALTORTA (Computer Science and Engineering) - Do you have a timeline for the search?

GUEST McDAVIS - We do, as I say, it's already started. It would probably take the next four to five months to get completed. There's a process that we're going through right now, which is the recruiting process. As we go through that recruiting process, that'll take us into the early part of next year. There will be an opportunity for Search Committee to begin to identify those candidates that they would like to bring for what we call airport interviews. That will occur sometime in the early part of the year and then after that, the Search Committee will determine those individuals that it believes should be the finalists for this opportunity and those interviews will probably occur in February. And then from there, the candidates will come to campus. You have a chance to engage and talk with them. And so the decision should come about March, April, certainly we think no later than May.

PROFESSOR VALTORTA - Thank you.

GUEST McDAVIS - You're welcome. Other Questions?

PROFESSOR BETHANY BELL (College of Social Work) - How many legally, can you remind me, if we have to have three or four candidates for this position and also, can you ensure that the campus visits will not be four days back-to-back with minimal interaction like previous searches?

GUEST McDAVIS - We will engage the Search Committee in terms of scheduling. We know how difficult it is to free people up so they can come into the forums until the other meetings and those kinds of things. So, we'll take that into consideration. Sally, you want to comment on that first part of the question?

GUEST MASON (AGB Executive Search) - I'll comment on both. Let me go back to the second part of the question because I think this is important to the process. Once candidates are invited to come to campus, the search becomes very open and it really is going to be up to the Search Committee. Obviously, we want the candidates to spend some time with the President, so they will be on campus when the president's available. We've got his availability for the month of February so we know when those possibilities are. We expect a series of open forums, lots of opportunity for people from all different parts of the campus to be exposed to the finalists. And while we don't directly supervise that, that really is run by the Search Committee, we can help collect input via surveys that you might be filling out after you've had an interaction with one of the finalists.

With respect to the first part of the question, President Caslen has indicated three finalists.

PROFESSOR BELL – (inaudible) in our state, there is always a minimum of three, sometimes four.

GUEST MASON - Three is a very good number. We like three in terms of finalists, but we've also seen searches where the president's been persuaded to look at four and in rare cases, five. That's a lot. We don't necessarily advise that, but we certainly understand when you get a very talented pool of candidates, how difficult it can be sometimes to narrow it down.

GUEST McDAVIS – I would add to what Sally has said in that in most of our searches, especially for President or Provost, three to four tends to be the number that's desired either by the Board or by the President. So, three to four, is kind of what we try to suggest.

GUEST MASON - If I could just say a couple words about our process. One of the things that we like to do as an executive search firm is to really understand the campus and understand the needs of the campus before we start a search like this. The work that I've done on behalf of the President as part of an advisory team to him through AGB Consulting, has really complimented what we're going to be doing now for the provost because we've had an opportunity to really see what's happening on this campus, what the strong selling points are. And I can tell you that it's kind of a joy to be able to talk to people about the real opportunity here at the University of South Carolina. Having been a president and a provost myself, I see this as a for the right person a really very special kind of opportunity.

GUEST McDAVIS -- I just want to echo what Sally said and underscore that as a former president and provost myself, this is a wonderful, wonderful opportunity. You have helped shaped this search through your good work. That's what's attracting people, at least in the early stages, to the University of South Carolina. You have a great academic reputation. There are some wonderful, wonderful initiatives going on here on the academic side. That's what people want to be a part of. So, we think you're well positioned to attract some outstanding candidates from all over the country. Other questions please? Thank you.

CHAIR COOPER - Very good. The Provost Search Committee did meet today, and we did discuss the timetable and the schedule for onsite interviews, just a preliminary discussion. I think we'll come up with a schedule that will workable and hopefully satisfying.

#### **4. Report of Faculty Committees**

##### **a. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Elizabeth West, Secretary**

SECRETARY ELIZABETH WEST (University Libraries) - The Steering Committee has several appointments and nominations for vacancies as well as ongoing vacancies. There are two terms on two committees that are less than a year that we need to fill. And because they are less than a year, the Steering Committee can appoint faculty members to those positions. Steering has approved the appointment of Robert Dawson, School of Medicine to the Instructional

Development Committee and Andrea Henderson of Sociology to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

We also have vacancies on the UCTP. These are filling slots where other members have had to vacate. One is for 2021, and the nomination for that is Varsha Kulkarni from Physics and Astronomy. We also have Jiajia Zheng from Public Health for a 2022 vacancy. And those will be voted on at the end of the meeting during Unfinished Business.

Continuing vacancies. We have one on Grievance ending in 2021. Grievance is something where we really need to have that committee filled. You must be tenured at full professor or librarian to serve on that committee. We still have two vacancies on the committee for Professional Conduct. You must be tenured, but of any rank or librarian and one of them ends in 2021 and the other in 2022. Finally, we are still searching for my replacement as Secretary of Faculty Senate. I will not run for a third term. You must be tenured, but of any rank or librarian.

**a. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Marianne Bickle, Chair**

PROFESSOR MARIANNE BICKLE (Interdisciplinary Studies) - A total of 33 proposals were approved by the Faculty Senate Committee on Curriculum and Courses during the month of October. The proposals are divided among colleges in the following manner: Arts and Sciences - 15 proposals; the College of Business - 9 proposals; Education – 1; Engineering and Computing – 4; Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management – 1; College of Nursing – 2 proposals; and Public Health - 1 proposal.

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

**b. Faculty Senate IT Committee, Professors Heather Heckman/Neset Hikmet, Co-Chairs**

PROFESSOR HEATHER HECKMAN (University Libraries) - Hopefully this is entirely redundant with what you have already read twice now. And hopefully you've already taken action based upon what you have read twice now about reaching out to Lindsay Anastasio about grant accounting. Raise your hand if you're a PI. Are there issues with your grants? Have there been, for example, people paid on your grants that should not have been? Was that difficult for you to troubleshoot? Email Lindsay Anastasio. So far they've gotten 12 emails. I want to make sure that they hear from a broad and diverse range of faculty. If you did not raise your hand and you have peers who might've had issues, please encourage them to reach out to the controller's office.

There are consultants working on the finance intranet. Raise your hand if you have used the finance intranet. Okay, fair number. They have heard from our committee that it is vital that people be able to click through and see the drill down for names who are actually being paid on salary lines. Hopefully that change, which is not, which can be implemented, although it will

take some modifications to two systems, will be extremely helpful for all of you in your work as PIs.

But, if there are other things that you need or want from the finance intranet, it would also be great to give them feedback about that now while they are working on it. Email Lindsey Anastasio. Questions for me. Thank you.

CHAIR COOPER – Is it helpful if they cc'd you or cc'd me? Some people have been doing that. I think that's fine and I can filter them back to you.

PROFESSOR HECKMAN - I'm happy to be cc'd on emails, but you don't have to do that. They are taking them directly as well and in some cases they're setting up one-on-one meetings to work with people. In other cases, it's a little bit more straightforward and they can say, okay, this is somebody else who really thinks it's important to get the drill down on salaries or what have you. If you have a preference?

CHAIR COOPER - I don't. I just want to make sure insofar as we can, we're all singing from the same sheet of music when we're giving advice about what we want this to look like. IT has been the committee that's been coordinating that, so it may make sense if you think you have something that's a little off the roadmap to make sure that one of us gets it so we can make sure it's on the radar.

## **5. Report of Officers**

PRESIDENT ROBERT CASLEN – Thank you very much Mark. So, there are about four or five things I'd like to update you on, and I'll be glad to take your questions. First of all, you probably knew that we had an offsite Strategic Planning Retreat just recently. The attendees were all the senior leadership to include all of the deans and the deans from the entire system, not just here in Columbia. We started off by talking about the landscape of higher education with a presentation by ABG and then Dr. Mason, who was just up here, also gave a presentation based on her assessment. We then had some sessions on development of a mission, a vision, and five to eight strategic objectives. So, we're in the process where we're close to settling on both a vision and a mission statement. I'm going back out one more time for additional feedback. I'll share with you what we're looking at for a vision statement and a mission statement and then the strategic objectives.

The vision statement would be in the form of the following: University of South Carolina is the preeminent public research flagship university in America.

Mission statement: As South Carolina's flagship university, the University of South Carolina transforms the lives of the people of South Carolina, the nation and the world through empowering education, innovative research, impactful economic development and selfless service within an inclusive and diverse environment.

And strategic objectives will most likely have one that will address the following: students and student success; faculty; research; diversity and inclusion; infrastructure and sustainment; the University of South Carolina system; and one on campus climate. The way ahead is once we settle on what a final draft is for vision, mission, and the strategic objectives, we're going to post them on a website. We then we'll open it up to the entire university for feedback over a period of time.

I'll take the five to eight strategic objectives and assign them to units and to the senior staff. They'll receive feedback, and they will further develop these principal objectives with subordinate objectives and goals and then with metrics. And later on in the academic year, we'll all come back together again to finalize what that strategic plan looks like. So that's the way ahead.

Second thing I want update you on is where we are with SACS. The bottom line is that we gave them the final feedback based on the letter from Dr. Wheelan, the president of SACS. It was in the public forum. So, I assume that most of you had the opportunity to read it. That will go to the Ethics and Compliance Committee, which will meet during their retreat in the first week in December. On or about the 9th of December, I'll be notified, personally, what the results of that Committee are. Those results will be made public in January, in the new year.

The issue that Dr. Wheelan is raising is the issue of undue political influence. And that's principally what we addressed. We addressed that, not so much on what occurred because what occurred is very factual, but we had to address how to mitigate political influence not only as a board but by individuals, as well as individual board members.

And then we also address other things like integrity and the integrity of a process. The integrity of rules and regulations and in any search, the integrity of following those assigned procedures, rules and regulations. So ,we'll see what happens on the first week in December.

I was asked to give an update on where we are with some of the senior leadership and you just got the update on the provost search. I'm very proud to have Dr. Susan Bon as the President Faculty Fellow. She comes from the faculty herself. She's incredible. She's a not only a great Presidential Faculty Fellow, but she's also very wise and understanding and giving me some great advice, and I'm very grateful.

You know about the provost search, as I said. We have a national search going on right now for the Director of Communications and the Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion.

A couple things on the organizational structure related to ethics and compliance. We expanded Audit and put an ethics and compliance element in there. We will conduct a search for the Director of Ethics and Compliance. We also split the Chief Operating Officer and the Chief Finance Officer positions. Right now, the Chief Finance Officer is set and the Chief Operating Officer is an interim. We'll be doing a search for that as well.

And we also have a Vice President of Advancement, who has oversight of anything that has to do with advancement, whether it's government relations or whether it's the alumni and anything

else that has to do with investment to include communications. That will also be a search in the future.

I've also had the privilege of keeping track of some outstanding work that the faculty has done, particularly in research and other achievements. And I've had the opportunity to recognize Dr. Li for receiving the 2019 SCC Faculty Advancement Award as well as Dr. Mitzi Nagarkatti and Dr. Michael Beets for their recent grants from the National Institutes of Health.

I also spent some time down in the McNair center and also with the Greenville School of Medicine where I learned a lot about faculty research. And I've been traveling around the state visiting as many of the comprehensive universities of the system and the regional colleges. And, I think tomorrow's my last one. I'm going down to visit the University of South Carolina Beaufort.

This morning we had the opportunity to go to Fort Gordon and meet with the leadership of the three major cyber commands there: the Cyber Center of Excellence, which has a laboratory that feeds into it, the Army Cyber Command, and the National NSA, Cyber Command. Each has research requirements, and they all have educational requirements. They're seeking opportunities for their students and their faculty to participate in education for bachelors degrees, masters degrees, and doctorate degrees. So, there's some tremendous opportunity not only in expanding education and support of their programs, but also on the research side, tapping into the Department of Defense, which we hadn't been doing that much.

And finally, you know, this semester I've had the opportunity to meet with most all of the deans, to talk about for about an hour or so. And of course, I spent a lot of time with them over the last couple of days on the offsite. Starting in second semester, we're already scheduling the opportunity to meet with each dean in their school for at least four hours, a half a day. It's up to them whatever they want to show me, whether it's classroom, whether it's a sit down with the professors, whether it's a visit to their laboratories or research work. But I look forward to spending some time with the deans as well.

That concludes the prepared comments I wanted to present to you today. Let me know what questions you have please.

PROFESSOR BELL - I didn't catch who, what team has been working on the vision and the mission and the strategic initiatives.

PRESIDENT CASLEN - All of the senior leadership, directors, vice presidents and the deans and the provost.

PROFESSOR BELL - Great. Thank you.

PRESIDENT CASLEN - I'm sorry, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate was also included in that group.

PROFESSOR BELL - Thank you.

PRESIDENT CASLEN- You're welcome.

PROFESSOR HEATHER BRANDT ( Health Promotion, Education & Behavior) - I'm curious if you could share with us in terms of the development of the mission, vision and strategies therein, if this is for the Columbia campus or if this is a broader initiative to account for the system?

PRESIDENT CASLEN - It's for the Columbia campus, except for the one strategic objective that will be subordinate to the Columbia campus, that'll address the entire system. I'm the President of the University of South Carolina Columbia campus. And I'm also the President of the system. So, I wanted to be sure that we had the system identified and integrated, and we're a part of that system as well. That's how we're addressing it.

CHAIR COOPER - Very good. I just interject to say I thought they were very productive and candid and open meetings. The system question is a really good one. We have real opportunities to use the system, but we're not doing that great, so we need to think about that some more. Thank you. I'll call to the podium Provost Harding.

INTERIM PROVOST TAYLOE HARDING - Thank you, Mark. I'd like to just add a word about the offsite as well, I've been here 14 years. I don't think we've ever had an opportunity for all of the deans, all of the vice presidents, all of the senior administrative, and academic leaders of the campus and all of the academic leaders of system institutions to sit in a room at the same time and talk about the future of our institution. Was really quite inspiring to do that, to have that opportunity. I thank the President for envisioning that opportunity for us. I think you'd been very proud of how your deans and others that you work with in that group across the campus comported themselves and represented your interests and the interests of our students and our entire group of stakeholders at the meeting. It was really quite fantastic and I look forward to the results being ready for our observation and comment throughout this room, across the faculty as the president just mentioned. The opportunity will present itself over the course of the coming months.

That's not really a part of my report. I just wanted to add that. My report is actually rather short, but I'll be happy to take questions about any of the things in the report or anything else you might want to ask me at this particular time.

The budget that I have talked about several times and the two financial initiatives that have been a part of each of my reports to this group and other reports that have to do with mitigation to the efficiency initiative to colleges and faculty pay package structured in the way of a compression merit equity semi exercise and a merit retention, semi exercise, all of that remains in conversation as we get ready for the post-offsite conversations with the President and the financial leaders on the campus for how we approach the Board for approval of those two and other initiatives.

It's very important that I keep you updated on where we are with that. I suspect that we will, this will happen at the December or January Board meetings, but I'm not entirely sure when it would happen. There is the need for college mitigation to be done in fiscal 20, and as long as I'm in this



role, I'll be a bulldog about making sure that we get that mitigation done before the end of fiscal 20, which is the 30th of June, so that it affects the budget year that we're in where the some of the greatest blood is being let on the campus academically. And I also would like very much to try and make sure we get the faculty pay package engaged in fiscal 20 as well. I've made that clear each time. Nothing changes even though we are a couple of months later than I had hoped. Being able to do this, it made sense to wait and do it all at once after the strategic offsite and the objectives are done, and we know what kind of resources they will take, to go to the Board with one big request all at once. So that's where we are on that particular subject. And in a moment I'll be happy to take questions on it.

The offsite will also inform the blueprint process, the academic blueprint process that each college does and that all of the nonacademic administrative units do annually. The academic blueprints that are not college-related were just turned in in recent weeks. And we formulated into what is called the Provost Office Blueprint, which goes forward to the President's office and to all of the others that are privy to Blueprint and Budget meetings in the spring. All of that has been done.

The academic blueprints are always due out of deans' offices to the provost's office mid-spring semester, usually before spring break. I think we're still very much on that timeline, but what I want to make the Faculty Senate aware of, and any of your colleagues in your colleges that have regular input processes to your college blueprints, is that the college blueprints are open all of the time now. It used to be that we only opened windows for input at one time. Because of the great work of our College of Engineering and Computing, those blueprints are open all the time now for individuals who have access to edit them, to edit and add information to them. Having said that, the blueprints will evolve over time to reflect the new strategic priorities and objectives that will come as a result of the offsite that we had earlier this week.

My suspicion is and, and hopefully by the time I talked to you, again, this won't be a suspicion any longer, but it'll be a reality, is that the fiscal 20 blueprints, the ones that are will be reviewed in April or May of this year will be based upon the Focus Carolina 2023 five strategic priorities and all of the metrics for those priorities that we've been dealing with the last couple of years. In other words, this year's blueprint is not going to go through a dramatic change. It will be next year's blueprint that would reflect what is born from the new strategic offsite and from the strategic offsite and new strategic plan. So I'll stop there and ask if there are any questions of me.

PROFESSOR BELL - So does this mean that all of the dashboards are going to eventually be changing as well?

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - Not necessarily. It will depend upon what the objectives are because those dashboard metrics emerged from the objectives. So, my sense is that some of those are so critical and so central to our function, they won't change, graduation rates, retention rates. There are variety of metrics that I don't believe will change. We might look at them differently depending upon how the objectives emerge.

## **6. Report of the Secretary**

Secretary Elizabeth West - I have two items. The first relates to the Resolution of No Confidence in the Board of Trustees, which was adopted at the October meeting. We had a scrivener's error that'll be corrected. The resolution references EOP 1.04, which is actually an outdated policy that appeared on the EOP website. The resolution will be corrected to reference EOP 1.03, the current policy which contains the same language that was quoted from the outdated one. The only change is from 1.04 to 1.03. This does not require a vote and is being presented for the information of the Faculty Senate.

The second item relates to the archive of minutes from the Faculty Senate. Our past internet archive is no longer being supported after the migration of all of the web pages. Some things were disappearing, and Mark and I have worked with Amy Freeman and the University Libraries to set up a collection in Scholar Commons, and I have that on the screen here. The web address is [scholarcommons.sc.edu/facsenate](http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/facsenate). And these are organized of course by year. The minutes and supporting documents are all going into each year. We do have some missing ones from early years that we are still pulling the electronic files and will eventually go back to the archive that I have in the University Archives with the paper only copies. So, at some point we will have a full run of all the Faculty Senate minutes here and keyword searchable on this collection website.

We are in discussions over what to do with the video recordings and that will develop into a policy and a university retention schedule related to both the official minutes and the video recordings.

CHAIR COOPER - So when this switch is over, it should be fairly transparent. Rather than having a link that takes you to a page on the university's website., the link will take you here to all the same information, but a better search. Should be an improvement.

## **7. Report of the Chair**

CHAIR COOPER - I have a few items. I wanted to report back on the Special Advisory Committee for Board Level Governance. You remember that two or so meetings ago when we knew that the AGB would be sending a team to look at the Board and would meet with faculty leaders, you asked that we constitute a small ad hoc committee to do that work of meeting with AGB. That committee ended up being myself, Christian Anderson, Carol Harrison and Deborah Hazzard. We met twice to develop recommendations before meeting with the AGB Consultants on October 9th. That was the morning before the October Board meeting.

We reviewed literature about Boards including the AGB's own literature. We came up with recommendations in three broad areas. One was a concern with a lack of collaboration between the Board and the faculty and some micromanagement. These are common concerns about governing boards. We recommended a reexamination of the current Board committee structure and the creation of some ad hoc working groups comprising of Board members and faculty.

That's advice that emerges from AGB literature, and we thought it was a probably a good idea. We recommended an end to the current practice of holding committee meetings in the presence of the full Board in favor of less formal concurrent committee meetings and more faculty involvement with those committees. And most boldly we suggested a grand alliance of the Board, faculty, and the President in an effort to restore public trust in higher education--also an AGB theme.

Another set of recommendations had to do with accountability. We suggested that the Board's bylaws should provide a regular a mechanism of regular evaluation of the performance of the Board and its individual members and an intervention by AGB to champion legislative reform of the Board. And finally, we hoped that the AGB would be able to do something about gubernatorial interference.

I want to talk about a couple of results of that meeting and fill in some additional details. One result was that the Chair and the Vice Chair of the Board, John von Lehe and Hugh Mobley invited this committee to meet with them to talk about a faculty involvement with the Board in shared governance. It was a frank, cordial, and I think productive meeting that embraced the idea of some ad hoc working groups that might deal with high level cross-cutting issues.

The two, in particular, that we discussed were: diversity and inclusion efforts and some planning around the health campus. There was interest in doing something where we could collaborate or work together as Board members, faculty, administration to see if we could move the needle on those issues and help them work out well for everyone. So, we'll see what follow up comes from that. I believe that's the last meeting that this ad hoc committee will have. I think our work is done.

The AGB team also met with the Faculty Board Liaison Committee. This is a standing committee of the Senate. It has myself, the past chair or chair-elect, chairs of Faculty Welfare and Faculty Advisory, the chair of the Palmetto College Senate and a rotating member from the comprehensives. That was also a very productive conversation. It touched on some similar themes except there was more attention to system-wide issues, system-governance issues.

Another result of the AGB engagement, the President also mentioned this, has to do with the subcommittee of the Senate Education Committee meeting last week on Halloween to discuss Senate Bill 798, the bill that would reconstitute our Board. Testimony from the visiting AGB Consulting team took most of the meeting. You can look at the minutes or the recording. But I'll just hit a few highlights.

The AGB team really emphasize that it's a new era for boards of public institutions in which boards need to be more engaged and thinking about big picture strategic issues. They need to be involved in restoring public confidence in our institutions and in grappling with new budget models resulting from reductions in state funding. They were quite clear about that.

They observed that independent boards have a fiduciary responsibility to their institutions first and not to the people of the state or to their elected representatives. They noted that our Board, like many other boards is confused about that particular issue. They observed that South

Carolina's process of choosing boards presents real challenges with respect to board independence and the appearance of board independence. Only four States have legislatively elected boards. In most, the governor appoints boards and most have safeguards to ensure diverse and effective membership according to principles other than geographical distribution: things like demographic diversity and diversity of professions. We're the only state that makes the governor the ex-officio chair of boards. They observed that that provision guarantees an appearance of conflict of interest, if not an actual conflict of interest. They made a very strong recommendation to remove the governor as chair of boards in the state.

They noted that most states have term limits of 9 - 12 years and they recommended that we adopt similar term limits. They recommended regular training for boards. They mentioned, in particular, that Texas now requires trustees to pass an online exam before being allowed to vote on any board matters and that more than half of states require in-service training. They did not recommend that students have voting membership on the Board. That's an AGB recommendation, having to do with how they see the fiduciary role of the boards. Happy to take further questions about that.

One last item, you asked me to constitute an ad hoc committee on the Attendance Policy. That committee has been constituted and has met once. It has 14 members, faculty, administrative, staff and students. I won't read them all, but I do want to mention the senators who are members of the committee: Senator Byun from HSRM, Senator Flora from Engineering and Computing. Senator Petkewich from Darla Moore School of Business, Senator Stone from Biological Sciences, Senator Worthy from Nursing. David Dangerfield represents the Palmetto College on the committee. We met once and assigned tasks to working groups. We will meet next on December 6th, after the next Faculty Senate meeting. If you have concerns not yet raised before the Senate about the Attendance Policy, please reach out to me or one of the senators and I assure you they will be heard.

PROFESSOR BELL - Did AGB recommend a faculty voting voice or no?

CHAIR COOPER – No, and we knew from their literature that they do not. They think that the board has a very special fiduciary responsibility that requires it to be independent from students, faculty, and the legislature.

PROFESSOR BELL – Okay and then do you anticipate, because our state is one with a weird structure where the governor's not the most powerful, the legislature is, do anticipate a response for that to come back up or did the senators at the meeting say anything about that?

CHAIR COOPER - It was the liveliest topic. There was a lot of back and forth. The consultants were asked: do you believe the governor would be more independent? I imagine this will be a theme. I think a lot depends on what actions SACS may or may not request with respect to independence on the Board. But they did seem receptive, and I think they heard that it was an extraordinary situation to have the governor being a serving member of the board.

PROFESSOR BELL - Lastly, do you have any insight or any other information about the hearing on November 14th about this stuff?

CHAIR COOPER - It's been delayed. I don't know if indefinitely or until when. It's not going to happen on November 14th. That's all I know.

PROFESSOR BELL - Thank you.

PROFESSOR ABBAS TAVAKOLI (College of Nursing) - I was wondering if there was any recommendation on the number of board members.

CHAIR COOPER – That had been one of the primary topics at the first meeting of the subcommittee. I look to you, Marco, because I had to leave early. I didn't see in your notes that there was any discussion of the number.

PROFESSOR VALTORTA - The senators brought up the issue. One of the senators pointed out that the proposal calls for a reduced number of members, but they were still open to changes. This particular Senator thought that change was needed. It may not be down to seven, but you know, something like that.

The Board also, the Chair of the Board, the Honorable John von Lehe also made a presentation as testimony and he pushed back strongly against the reduction in the number of board members.

CHAIR COOPER - Yes. AGB did say something about the average number of board members, but I don't remember what that was.

PROFESSOR VALTORTA – Yes, but I, I don't know if they gave an exact figure or just a range.

CHAIR COOPER - I have accidentally bypassed the Committee on Instructional Development. If you'll come to the podium, Professor Edwards.

**Committee on Instructional Development, Professor Karen Edwards, Chair**

PROFESSOR KAREN EDWARDS (Department of Retailing) – The INDEV Committee has reviewed and moved for the following existing courses to be approved for Distributed Education Delivery. And from the College of HRSM, we have RETL 330, Asset Protection for Retailers. Also, RETL 487, Retail Management Strategies. From the School of Music, we have MUSC 110, Introduction to Music.

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

**8. Unfinished Business**

CHAIR COOPER - I have written down shared governance agenda. I keep asking you these questions. I'm not going away. I wanted us to invest some time and energy this semester, while there's attention on shared governance, seeing if we could think about how we might improve shared governance campus-wide and long term. I've been suggesting a few questions to spark conversation in your units. Not an exhaustive list of questions, just conversation starters.

One of them had to do with the size of the Faculty Senate. Are we right sized? Do we envision the current formula for representation enduring forever? Is now a time to revisit it?

One involved, diversity and inclusion. Does the Faculty Senate need its own diversity and inclusion plan, in addition to the campus-wide diversity and inclusion plan?

One involved budget. What kind of say do faculty want in the budget development processes? You've heard about the blueprint process, opportunities to interact there. The chair of the Budget Committee and the Faculty Senate Chair do sit in on the blueprint reviews. But that's not really the same thing as participating in the development of budgets. There'll be some high-level opportunities in the new budget structure for faculty participation. So, we could talk about that. Thoughts about that?

I also asked you about strategic planning. You've heard that the President's going to have a very open process when it comes to defining our strategic objectives. And I asked at the beginning of the year that if the Faculty Senate wanted to have a role in setting strategic priorities, could we do it? Do we know how to do that, to exert a collective voice as opposed to individual comments. These are the questions I asked. Has anyone heard from their unit?

PROFESSOR MARCO VALTORTA - I haven't heard from anybody. I did send the questions to my unit two meetings ago, I have to say. However, I would like to make a suggestion. Within Faculty Budget Committee, there has been some discussion of this structure for input into the budget process with various committees and advisory kind of committees. So, it may not be a bad idea maybe at the next Faculty Senate meeting to have a presentation on that structure or a new presentation on that structure.

CHAIR COOPER - What's the will of the Senate? Would you like a more detailed presentation about budget governance? Can I just get a kind of show of hands of people who'd be interested in that? Okay. Not overwhelming, but significant. Thank you, Marco. Any other thoughts about our shared governance agenda? Senator Doxtader.

PROFESSOR ERIK DOXTADER (English) - I appreciate these questions and I don't have a report from my particular unit, but I have some general reflections relative to Marco's proposal for a budget presentation. I think that's a useful idea, but I also want to ask the question of do we have the right kind of presentations? Do we have presentations that allow for meaningful questions and in deliberation? Do we have a structure that allows for, affords a deliberation on the assumption that this is a deliberative body, which I think it is.

I think we have a sort of pre-internet model of presentations in which particular bits of

information about presentations are not put together ahead of time in terms of, okay, here's the nuts and bolts of the new budget process. You have a week to look at that and think about questions that you want to ask. I think a lot of times in this forum presentations are made, and nobody really has much of a time to reflect on things. And the presentations don't always amount to all that much substance, frankly. So I think at a meta level, we might think about the question of what would make for a more engaging presentation that would allow for additional deliberation in his body.

The second thing that I would add to that is do we need meetings dedicated to deliberation and not serial reports? For instance, with the strategic plan that's currently underway, use their cause to convene a meeting in which it's explicitly understood that we're not going to pass motions but we're going to engage in discussion with material that's provided beforehand relative to the strategic plan. And is that a way of both engaging with the new strategic planning process and also thinking about the question of what we might do as a body. But that would be a different kind of meeting and whether or not people are inclined to come to that kind of meeting, I can't say, but I think that would at least potentially hold the opportunity for a kind of dialogue that I don't think our current meetings allow for.

CHAIR COOPER - I'd like to hear thoughts on both those points. If we were going to circulate information, say about the budget, ahead of time as opposed to having somebody stand up here and walk you through a slide stack, what kind of information would be useful? That's one.

And the second one is, if we were going to have a more deliberative meeting, I see immediately how that could be accommodated. We wouldn't have anybody at the top of the agenda. We take the votes we needed to take for committee reports to keep business going. We'd ask the officers to focus their comments on matters related to the thing we were deliberating, and then we clear out space under Unfinished Business or New Business where we would talk about issues with the idea that maybe that the action taken would be assigning particular tasks to subcommittees or committees or the Senate, to come back and work over some things to talk about.

So, thoughts about the desirability, what kind of information are you willing to peruse beforehand about the budget and does this type of meeting that Eric and I have just described appeal to you as a way of talking about strategic planning? Should I ask for show of hands?

PROFESSOR VALTORTA - Maybe you're conflating two issues. I would like to offer a couple of comments. The first concerns the strategic plan. In the past, we've had ad hoc meetings to discuss the strategic plan. I don't see a problem with having the Senate in a leading role, but maybe one should also consider the possibility of having, again, different kinds of meetings, ad hoc meetings.

And for what concerns the issue of a deliberative meetings, I think when an issue is viewed by the Senate as being particularly important, we have seen that the Senate has taken action. The creation of the ad hoc committee on the Attendance Policy has been an example of that. Now one could argue that that was a bit of a dysfunctional process in that it took a long time doing that. And we still don't know where that will work out. But you know, let's not give up on the Senate

as it is working now. We do have some business items to go through. The report of the university officers is very important. We don't want to eliminate or even substantially reduce that part of our meetings. So, I think that it is certainly worthy to when needed shift the focus of the meetings, but maybe not every time, you know, have a different model.

CHAIR COOPER - Very good. Further insight about either of these matters, the kind of material you'd like to see about budget or the kind of meeting you might like to have around a topic like strategic planning,

PROFESSOR BELL - Along those lines, know that it's prescribed the order of our agenda in our bylaws or manual or whichever one it exists in. I think part of this discussion also relates to the order. I don't know what the process is for changing the bylaws, but I would like to add to this discussion that we amend the bylaws or look into when there are items that need a lot of deliberation and a vote, so that they can come earlier in the agenda, so we have more participation. I'm not saying we have to do that today. I'm just putting it on your plate to kind of look into.

CHAIR COOPER - Thank you. I didn't have enough on plate, so...

PROFESSOR BELL - I know, every meeting I add to your plate, but I just think that, I think sometimes by the time when the deliberation comes at the very end.

CHAIR COOPER - The provision is in our bylaws. Anyone could bring a motion to amend the bylaws. We cannot amend the bylaws in the same meeting where the amendment is announced. There has to be notice given and another meeting before we can amend. But certainly if somebody or some group of people wanted to entertain a motion to amend the bylaws to allow the order to be more flexible that's something we could debate.

PARLIAMENTARIAN BILL SUDDUTH (University Libraries) - What is in the bylaws is there to provide a guide because we change our leadership from time to time. But there is no problem in changing the agenda from one meeting to the other. All you need to do is to have a motion to change the meeting. I mean Erik provided one sometime about a year ago and I ruled that it wasn't necessary, but it's possible to do that from meeting-to-meeting and you have the, you have the options of New Business and Unfinished Business. They are general enough, but if you want to switch who wants to go at a different time, you can do that at the beginning of the meeting. I would not tinker with what's set in the bylaws too much because then you will create a situation that you will tinker with the agenda every time.

PROFESSOR BELL - Thank you.

CHAIR COOPER - Thank you Bill and certainly I enjoyed consulting the bylaws when forming my first agenda. Other discussion of any of these matters? Yes.

PROFESSOR MARK MACAUDA (Health Promotion, Education & Behavior) - I did have



some comments from our faculty, not really about your questions, but when we presented the resolutions. And if you remember, I probably was more on the Pitchfork side when we have our discussions, but we did have some concerns, from our faculty about whether we're picking winnable battles. How are we prioritizing where we place our effort? And there also was a concern to making sure that we were approaching some of these issues in a way that was productive and measured. And I'm not saying that we're not, it's just that's what they relayed back to me. I'm wondering if that has any bearing going forward about the questions we ask and how we think about our role within this sort of self-governance idea and structure. I just thought I'd put that out there since they related it to me.

CHAIR COOPER - Thank you very much. I think that speaks to a general concern. I'm hearing a lot that units and their Senate representation really need to be in a better conversation than they often are. So that when you come to the Senate, you can represent the will of your colleagues and also convey the will of the Senate back to them. So that's the big picture note I would take from that comment.

PROFESSOR JOHN (College of Arts and Sciences) - I'm going to just be anonymous here and say John from Arts and Sciences cause I don't want to embarrass my unit. When asking colleagues in faculty meetings about the resolutions, about the questions that you posed, I kind of side with Erik on this one. Having something to present that's a little bit more firm to them would be helpful. So, having discussions on these or having presentations, the response I got was largely, when the Senate comes up with something that we can vote on or talk about, let us do it then. But just to collect information or perspective, don't waste our time right now. Okay, you can see why I have not mentioned my name.

CHAIR COOPER - Thank you. The idea was this might be a little bit bottom up, but okay. Noted. Other thoughts? Are you willing to read a slide deck in advance on budget? All right. Okay, so that can be done when we have a budget discussion. Any other comments on this?

PROFESSOR MACAUDA – It's about the anonymous John from Arts and Sciences' comment. That's actually a real problem, and it's something that we're discussing a little bit with our faculty. That faculty sometimes generally don't feel that this is something that is going to help them out in any way because they're worried about things like tenure and getting grants and it kind of pushes these questions sort of low on the priority list. So, I feel like thinking about how to make this higher on their priority list somehow, and I have no idea how to do that, might help get these conversations moving cause I've seen that in our faculty too.

CHAIR COOPER - I'm open to suggestions there, including the idea that these were sucky questions and that there's something else maybe closer to grants or something that we could be more productively engaging folks on.

PROFESSOR HEATHER BRANDT (Health Promotion, Education & Behavior) – So I want to go back to some suggestions Erik has made previously about engagement and the forum in

which we hold these Senate deliberations and then the expectation that faculty senators will go back to their units, have meaningful conversations with our fellow faculty and then, you know, report back. Maybe that's part of what we need to revisit is how do we offer the opportunity for participation and engagement. Is this space the most conducive? Is this type of a forum and presentation set up the most conducive to that or are there some other ways in which we could create those spaces for the interactions of shared governance to come to the forefront and for us to talk about. And I'm not sure what the answer is, but I, I've heard Erik talk about this before and I think it's an important and valid point. Reviewing things in advance, having substantive information to take back. And maybe there's a way for us to think about, uh, those structures and the directionality of our information sharing too.

CHAIR COOPER - Very good. So, one problem may be that the minutes, which are the easiest way to share what Senate did, need approval, so there's a month time lag. Maybe there's something we could do to produce some more formal but not yet official minutes that you could easily circulate to departments. It would be great if we had a secretary-elect!

PROFESSOR BRANDT – May I add, so the Graduate Council offers bulleted actions steps or things you may want to pay attention to. And the turnaround on those as much quicker for those minutes because they're sent out in draft format and then of course approved at the next meeting. But I wonder if there might be some way to highlight actionable items and at least give a little bit more information in that kind of a quicker turnaround too.

CHAIR COOPER - Sure. I take your point. We do have those things for the standing reports of the committees that come to you to look at, but for other items on the agenda, we could maybe do something like that. I heard, I think, an interest in less formal opportunities to talk about shared governance. So, something the Faculty Senate at the University of Tennessee did was to have a kind of open mic night to which all faculty could come, but the faculty Senate sponsored it. People could talk about their research or matters of concern to the faculty and that was an opportunity where the Faculty Senate felt like it got some conversations going about what the faculty wanted to do. Is that the kind of thing?

PROFESSOR BRANDT - Yes. And even thinking about smaller meetings with maybe dividing up the faculty Senate, you know, cross across different units represented to have, you know, groups of 10 to 15 or 20. I'm not sure, you know what the right number is and then having some questions around which they bring. We brainstorm and then bring back and consolidate that, and I'm just thinking through different strategies for ways in which we can encourage engagement and then thinking about how the directionality that information will then flow.

CHAIR COOPER - .Thank you. Interesting suggestions.

PROFESSOR BELL – And this kind of piggybacks on Heather because we were kind of talking about engagement earlier by ourselves. Someone said your faculty are worried about getting tenure and their grants, but to second Heather, we have to make it easy for engagement. Otherwise they won't do it if it's not high on their priority list.

Related to the bullets. This action item idea of sending something out before full minutes, I was also thinking about, again, not to add more work to Mark's plate, maybe it would be the secretary's job, but keeping a weekly digest of links to things that are going on, such as I had the November 14th meeting on my calendar. I didn't know it was canceled. I'm glad I asked you. And just things that are going on that relate to governance across and so that way faculty that read their USC Times, get used to just seeing like, this is the Faculty Senate biweekly digest or something like that. And I think if you start slowly with those things, people will see, oh, that interests me. I'm going to attend Faculty Senate so I can hear more about it. Or I'm going to ask my Senator to explain this to me.

CHAIR COOPER - Understood. I will remind all senators that the schedule of upcoming faculty committee meetings is on the bottom of your agenda every time. If you know, or you think you have colleagues who might be interested in any kind of area, those meetings are published consistently every month.

PROFESSOR HEATHER HECKMAN (University Libraries) - I'm not a Senator, so I think I have to wait until all the senators have done. I served as a faculty Senator a few years ago. I don't think I ever spoke at a Faculty Senate meeting, and I have been chair of a couple of faculty committees now, and I learned a ton in those roles and serving on Faculty Steering. I think, and I include myself in this, that maybe committees could do a better job of having regular updates and I know that our Chair has been pressuring us to do that a little bit more, which I appreciate. Not to put everything on to Mark Cooper's plate. But I guess I would be curious to know whether there's interest in that and you know, perhaps it could go into the digest that Senator Bell proposed. But, I think maybe, I think a lot of work gets done in committees and maybe seeing that work and maybe even better yet seeing when it yields something could make people feel a little bit more invested in, in all of this.

CHAIR COOPER - Thanks. What do you think, generally in favor of more regular updates, including the work of committees? All right. This is a matter that we'll talk about in Steering and see if we can come up with some efficient ways to do that. I think we'll probably move on unless there's other business under the shared governance agenda.

SECRETARY WEST – There were no nominations from the floor and Zheng from Public Health and Kulkarni from Physics and Astronomy were elected to fill two positions on UCTP.

## **9. New Business**

PROFESSOR CAROL HARRISON (History) - I have a very minor matter here. It is a correction to our resolution endorsing legislative reform of the Board of Trustees. That resolution was from September 18th of this year. It goes beyond a scrivener's error, so it does require a motion and a vote. The resolution, I won't read the whole resolution, but we resolved four points. In the fourth we resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses legislative reform of the Board of Trustees that will

require both new and content continuing trustees to complete the SACSCOC New Trustees Orientation so that they will be better equipped to serve the interests of the University of South Carolina and the resolution included a website. It seems that it would be more appropriate if that training were offered by the Association of Governing Boards. So, my motion is that item four should now read, require both new and continuing trustees to complete training such as that offered by the Association of Governing Boards so that they will be better equipped to serve the interests of the University of South Carolina.

CHAIR COOPER - So this motion to amend a previous action requires a second. It's been moved and seconded that we amend the language of this fourth "whereas"--which you'll interestingly note has been in a number of recommendations from AGB--to require both new and continuing trustees to complete training such as that offered by the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities so that it will be better equipped to serve the interests of the University of South Carolina. Discussion? Senator Doxtader.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER – “Such as” are we interested in specifying a specific training or something analogous to?

PROFESSOR HARRISON - The AGB training would be fine. And I think my understanding is that the Board of Trustees is willing and interested in the AGB training, although, I suppose other training that I'm not aware of could be reasonable.

PROFESSOR DOXTADER - I'm not aware of any other training, but to have the language “such as” allows them to say, well, this is essentially like the other thing that the Senate actually wanted us to do, but we're going to do this other thing. So if we think this particular training is suitable, then I wonder if we might just amend it to say this is the training they should take.

PROFESSOR HARRISON - That would certainly be fine with me.

CHAIR COOPER - Okay. So that's a friendly amendment. So the fourth “whereas” would read “require both new and continuing trustees to complete a training offered by the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities so that they will be better equipped to serve the interests of the University of South Carolina.” Further discussion.

PROFESSOR REBECCA STERN (English) - I was just looking at this SACS webpage and they do have training and they do recommend that all new board members go through their training.

CHAIR COOPER - But it's for members of their own board, I believe.

PROFESSOR STERN - Oh, it's for members of SACS' own board?

CHAIR COOPER - I believe that's the case.

There was no further discussion and the motion was passed.

### **10. For the Good of the Order**

PROFESSOR CHRISTIAN ANDERSON (AAUP Chapter President) - I want to thank everyone who came to the September chapter meeting of the American Association of University Professors. We had a very productive meeting with lots of great discussion and items for an agenda going forward. Just a reminder that all faculty are welcome at all of our meetings. If there's any matters for voting, only those who are AAUP members can vote and we will hold our next meeting on Wednesday, November 20th at 4:30 PM in Wardlaw, 110 which is the same room where we held it last time. Wardlaw is right next to the Hunter Gatherer. So, the idea is that for those suggesting we find more social ways to get together after we meet there, we can adjourn. What we in the College of Education call the Educational Annex, the Hunter Gatherer.

One of the suggestions that was made at the AAUP meeting mirrors one of the points of discussion today, that we break into smaller groups to discuss certain items. So that's one thing that we're going to do. We will elect a new at-large member. So, if you're interested in being an officer, let us know and the agenda will be posted on our chapter website, which I'll make sure , its tweeted and Facebooked and emailed out and all of that

One of the things that we are certainly interested in, is getting more of this kind of engagement that's been discussed today. So hopefully you'll come to the meeting and we can continue the conversation. Thank you.

### **11. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed. The next meeting of Faculty Senate is December 4, 2019, at 3pm in Gambrell 153.