

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
December 4, 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 November 6, 2019. The minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Report of Faculty Committees

a. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Elizabeth West, Secretary

SECRETARY ELIZABETH WEST (University Libraries) – reported on committee vacancies: one vacancy that is ending in 2021 for Grievance. You must be tenured at full professor or librarian to serve. Two vacancies are still on the Committee for Professional Conduct; one ending in 2021 and one in 2022. You must be tenured, but of any rank or librarian to serve on that one. Spencer Platt (Education) has volunteered to be Secretary of Faculty Senate. His candidacy will be voted on during Unfinished Business.

b. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Marianne Bickle, Chair

PROFESSOR MARIANNE BICKLE (Interdisciplinary Studies) -We have three separate yet related items on today's agenda. First, an offsite Faculty Senator from Sumter requested to table seven courses and it was emailed because Adobe connect is often a little bit slow and she was concerned that I would go a little too fast. She would like the courses tabled for ENGL 464, 465, 469, 491, 492, 493 and 494.

SENATOR REBECCA STERN – (English) And I believe the reason that the person never requested that because what was said to all of us did not actually contain the proper information that was being in the proposals. So the proposals are actually correct.

PROFESSOR BICKLE – Oh, okay.

SENATOR STERN- Yes, the proposals are correct. There was a whole correspondence back and forth and Ed Gieskes, who is the Undergraduate Director for English had responded to this email

requesting tabling and said, “No, we do not want these tabled.” The errors were from the committee, not from the department. Whoever prepared the document had inserted the old course descriptions rather than the proposed course descriptions.

PROFESSOR BICKLE - We got his email while I was in another meeting, the Steering Committee and we weren't able to confirm that.

SENATOR STERN - Okay, well I can confirm that and we have emails confirming that. So, I can say that the English Department objects to having the courses held up because there was a committee error in what they presented. The error was not on the part of the department and it's been approved all the way up.

CHAIR COOPER – So, the issue here is that there's a dispute about what is actually in the APPS Proposal System.

SENATOR STERN – No, it's not about what's in the APPS proposal system. It's what we were given. What's in the apps proposal system is visible.

CHAIR COOPER - What's in the APPS Proposal System, Curriculum and Courses was not able to confirm that it's different from what we got.

SENATOR STERN -I can show it to you in the APPS Proposal System if you would like that. You simply have to look at it.

CHAIR COOPER -Did we look at it?

PROFESSOR BICKLE - Well, I just got out of another meeting. I have not looked at it.

SENATOR STERN - You can do whatever you want. I was asked to speak on behalf of the English Department to say that we want our courses, these changes to go through. We're trying to regularize prerequisites for a number of courses and some of these are the courses. It's putting things in line with what we've got across the board and the error was not on the English department's part. So they would like it to go through.

PROFESSOR BICKLE - Okay. We have some committee members in the house.

CHAIR COOPER - So the Parliamentarian is suggesting that we take a vote on whether to table or not. We're not discussing the motion to table. I thought that's what we were discussing is the motion to table.

PARLIAMENTARIAN BILL SUDDUTH (Libraries) - This is nothing to do with discussion to table. This has gone beyond point of information, this has gotten to debate.

CHAIR COOPER - So, there's a motion to table. Is there a second? (Second.) Discussion about tabling?

SENATOR STERN - The English Department objects.

PROFESSOR BICKLE - We hear that loud and clear. Thank you. I wasn't being facetious. I wasn't honest. I'm not that way.

PARLIAMENTARIAN SUDDUTH - Speakers from the Senate first. If they're not from the Senate then they must be recognized.

SENATOR MARCO VALTORTA – (Computer Science and Engineering) I apologize for being slow, but I still don't understand what the contentious issue is. Is this just a matter that what was printed or posted on the website doesn't correspond to what is in APPS or is there something more than that?

CHAIR COOPER - That's right. The issue is, the English Department feels that the information that was circulated to the Senate does not correspond with what's in APPS. We were in a different meeting, so we were not able to confirm that. And the Senator who suggested that we table this matter is concerned with inconsistencies across the proposals that English believes is sorted out. So there's no disagreement about the substance of what the changes should be. It's just whether the language that we're about to approve is really the language that should be approved.

SENATOR VALTORTA - May I have a follow up? Are we approving what is in APPS now or what?

CHAIR COOPER - This is a discussion to table. Then you raise a really interesting question. Is it possible since we can't take action on anything that's not in APPS, but the language we have before us that we've been asked to consider may or may not reflect, I'm happy to hear that it does not reflect. Have we seen the language we're voting on would be the next logical question.

PROFESSOR BICKLE – John Gerdes, he's not a Senator.

CHAIR COOPER – Right. So are there other senators who wish to speak? Okay, please. Professor Gerdes.

PROFESSOR JOHN GERDES (Integrated Information Technology) - I was the chair last year and I just want to give a possible reason of where this problem is coming in. The report that is distributed to the faculty is done automatically directly from the proposals. But what it's pulling is directly from the justification sections and maybe a description section. It's not going in and analyzing each individual proposal. So, it's pulling in whatever the justification was. If the proponent put into the justification, this is the old description and that is, and without indicating, Oh, we're changing it to this because that is done elsewhere, that may be the source of, of the confusion. The proposal may actually be correct, but the justification may be somewhat misleading. That might be the source of the problem. I don't know. I didn't check that, but I just wanted to point that out, that's possible.

CHAIR COOPER - Thank you. That's helpful information. So other discussions? Do people understand the rationale for why we might be tabling this issue? Okay, there's contention about whether the material you've been given to review accurately reflects the proposal from the

English Department. The material you've been asked to review contains some inconsistencies that everybody agrees are not things that we want to approve or are being proposed. And we do not have a good way at this point of providing you with material you can review that accurately reflects what English thinks the proposals are. Yeah?

SENATOR VANCE KORNEGAY (School of Journalism and Mass Communications - Can I ask what would be the consequence of tabling it or in terms of your timeline?

CHAIR COOPER - It would miss the Bulletin. It would miss next year's Bulletin. It would, they would have to wait for a year to see these changes in the Bulletin.

SENATOR STERN - I'm not entirely prepared, but I can quickly, I mean if we pull up APPS, the material in APPS is what we had proposed and voted on and was approved all the way up. What we were given to review through the link on the agenda does not correspond with the changes.

CHAIR COOPER - I think everybody understands that point. It's just that the campus has not had the opportunity to see, for whatever reasons, technological or whether the error is technological or human, that's where we are. So other discussion of the motion to table?

SENATOR VALTORTA - I would like to reinforce the point that Professor Gerdes made. This is common to many of these proposals. For example, I had intended to ask a question about the Experimental Psychology program. What I saw, what I see in the document, I'm voting on, is a statement that the Experimental Psychology program's name will be changed because it doesn't reflect accurately what the program is, but nowhere it is said what the new name is going to be. Okay. I'm still going to vote for assuming you know that the committee and everything has done their correct job. But we have a problem with the automated production of these, of the documents that we have to review.

CHAIR COOPER - So a reason to vote no on the motion to table would be, we trust the committees and the people who are speaking up, that the proposals are as they say they are, even though we do not see that the letter is in accordance with what they say they are.

SENATOR VALTORTA - Yes.

CHAIR COOPER - Other discussion of the motion to table?

SENATOR GWEN GEIDEL (School of the Earth, Ocean and Environment) - I just quickly pulled up the ENGL 464 which I believe was one of those in contention and what is in APPS and was approved all the way through is different. For the description, it is a new description what is in the Faculty Senate as what we were approving is the old description. So apparently there is, they pulled old information into what is supposed to be and approved as new information. So I believe there was an error and this particular class had been approved all the way through to today.

CHAIR COOPER - Again, I haven't heard any dispute of the substance of the changes from, everybody agrees what they were supposed to be. Other discussion of the motion to table.

SENATOR KRISTINA SCHWOEBEL (University Libraries) – So, if we do not pass the motion to table and we continue, can we then vote on it as far as it appears in APPS and not as it appears in the document that we were sent out as faculty or to Faculty Senate.

CHAIR COOPER - It's my understanding that we're always on what appears in APPS rather than what appears in the Faculty Senate, because this is supposed to be a review for our information, a sampling. This is to my knowledge, the first time, a discrepancy has really caught the eye of one of the senators, but there you have it.

SENATOR MARK MACAUDA (Health Promotion, Education and Behavior) - Is there any way to get like a three sentence or less description of any concerning issues between the discrepancy? I mean, just a summary of what the discrepancy is and at what was an APPS, so we just understand what we're voting on.

CHAIR COOPER - Sure. The English Department's trying to realign its prerequisites across all its upper level classes. Some of them read one way, some of them read another way. A couple of the courses where, as Senator GEIDEL has mentioned, seem to contain old language suggesting that there are more prerequisites than English wishes there to be. So, it's about conforming prerequisites.

All right. Are we ready to decide whether to table or not to table? To table or not to table, that is the question. All those in favor of tabling these courses for the next meeting of Faculty Senate, please say aye. All those opposed? The nays have it.

PROFESSOR BICKLE - So it goes forward.

CHAIR COOPER - So we go forward.

PROFESSOR BICKLE - Now we're on to item number two and we have 168 proposals in the system and 96 are in Arts and Sciences, that does include English, just want to make that clear. 10 are in the College of Business; 7 in Education; 41 are in Engineering and Computing; 2 are in Information and Communications; 3 are in Music; 6 are in Public Health and 3 are in Social Work.

There was a glitch in technology and I don't know if that was the cause of this because if it's in APPS, I simply push forward and it goes forward. I don't know what happened. I honestly don't. We have three additional items on addendum. Two, it went right past our, it went right to the Provost Office and we don't know why. One is Department of Aerospace, AERO 401. They have a change of name. Department of Anthropology is a change of major.

Now number three, this is my bad. It was Chemical Engineering. It did come into the queue on time and I missed it. Out of 168 I missed one and it was a change to the Major for Chemical Engineering. They want to change the number of hours.

CHAIR COOPER - This is a motion of standing committee to approve all of these proposals previously circulated, although not strictly speaking, reflective of what's in APPS apparently. And so we're talking about the Committee on Curriculum and Courses report and the additional proposals report, which is separate for the reasons just indicated. It needs no second. Is there discussion of any of these proposals?

SENATOR VALTORTA - As I said in my preview, I would like to know what the new name of the Experimental Psychology Bachelor's Degree is going to be. There are two of them. The descriptions, justification just says that the label Experimental Psychology no longer reflects the conduct of the program offered. But nowhere it is said what the new name of the program will be. Maybe someone from the Biology Department is here to answer that question.

CHAIR COOPER -Is there a representative from the department who could explain to us what we should now be calling Experimental Psychology?

UNIDENTIFIED FACULTY – I am here. I was in the meeting when this was discussed. I don't remember the answer to your question. So I'll, I will text my chair and see if I can get that information.

PROFESSOR GERDES -it will be in APPS, so someone with APPS access...

PROFESSOR BICKLE - I will find out in just a moment.

CHAIR COOPER - And is there further discussion?

SENATOR CAROL HARRISON (History) - This isn't about Experimental Psychology. It's about the sequence of Criminal Justice courses that have been approved to meet the requirement in values, ethics and social responsibility, the requirements for written communication and the written requirements for oral communication. My question is whether or not the Curriculum Committee, is this a departure in the way you are taking on core courses? Because right now in particular, the only courses that meet the written communication requirement are ENGL 101 and 102. And so, this seems to me to be a pretty big departure in the way the core curriculum is organized. And so I wonder if the committee could speak to that?

CHAIR COOPER - Is there someone else on the committee who could speak to that issue? Professor Bickle is busy doing another thing.

VICE PROVOST and DEAN OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES SANDRA KELLY - I think that that indeed might be another error. I believe Criminal Justice is having those approved as the integrative courses for their major as opposed to foundation courses. And so that's why it's so

many are listed. So many majors have integrative, all majors are required to have integrative courses and they should meet different Carolina core objectives for their major. So I, I haven't looked at that, but I know that there was a number of majors clearing up and getting, making sure that they had designated integrative courses.

SENATOR HARRISON – Okay, cause in what I'm looking at, they are designated for CMW writing, CMS, oral and VSR.

VICE PROVOST KELLY - So, an integrative course basically does have that listed as they're meeting those, but not foundational, not counting the Carolina core, but accounting for the major. I don't quite know how to fix that, but that is my bad. Okay, I don't remember all the courses that go through, but people have trouble putting through the integrated courses.

SENATOR HARRISON - Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR COOPER - Okay, so the answer,

PROFESSOR BICKLE - To Professor Valtorta's question. The Psychology major is not changing its name, it's changing its program.

CHAIR COOPER - So we may continue to call Experimental Psychology, Experimental Psychology.

SENATOR STERN - Just the Criminal Justice courses that, Professor Harrison referred to, they say in here that they meet the requirements for CMW, I'm quoting meets the requirements for which is, and this came up the last time these courses were put up at the last meeting and they were sent back and they adjusted one of them and the other three or four still say that they meet the requirements for VSR, CMS and CMW, which they don't. So, I would recommend that we send them back again and have them, you know, where we can approve the one they fixed, which is 551. They changed it to the course outcomes include those related to the foundational level requirements for values, ethics and social responsibility. The rest of them continue to say that they meet those requirements.

CHAIR COOPER - Again, are we sure that this is what the APPS system says? Okay. Okay. And so this is a motion to table, which Criminal Justice courses in particular?

SENATOR STERN -558, 575, 577. And that's it.

CHAIR COOPER - Is there a second on the motion to table. All those in favor....

PROFESSOR BICKLE - Wait, wait. We have a discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER – (inaudible) -500 level courses wouldn't, we wouldn't let go through on Carolina core. They're usually just 100 or...

JEN TILFORD - Committee on Curriculum Ex-officio Member – And a 500 level course, we would be letting those go through an integrative course and they still have to tell which components of the Carolina core that they are integrating into the major. So that's, it may look like they're being approved that way, but the, it shouldn't say that in, in APPS. I'm going to look at them real quick.

CHAIR COOPER - I think the question is about the language in the description, which is suggesting that they meet those core requirements even if it's positioned as an integrative course and not as a core course. Is that correct? It's a, it's a question of bulletin language, misleading bulletin language. Other discussion of the motion to table. We'll wait for a quick APPS search.

SENATOR TRACI TESTERMAN (School of Medicine) -I would like to know are there going to be some negative consequences to tabling this or can it just be dealt with at a later time once everything is corrected?

CHAIR COOPER - Again, the major negative consequences not appearing in the bulletin for next year. It would have to wait a year to appear in the bulletin, the changes, whatever they are.

JENNIFER TILFORD - So in the justification, it states that, I happened to be looking at 558 counts towards the Carolina core integrative writing requirement. That does sound sort of misleading except for in Criminal Justice's program, there's actually a section called Integrative Writing in their major and so that's what they're referring to. That's within their major requirements.

SENATOR HARRISON – I'm looking at CRJU 558 meets the requirements. Meets the requirements. CRJU 558 Crime over the Life course meets the requirements for effective, engaged and persuasive communication. Meets the requirements for values, ethics and social responsibility. That's, that's the objection.

CHAIR COOPER - Yeah. Go, go to the back there while we're doing further research. Yes.

PROFESSOR JOHN BURROW (Criminology and Criminal Justice) - If I may address the issue or add to the substance of the discussion. Several years ago, I was on the College of Arts and Science Curriculum Committee, at which time we were discussing how the integrative courses should look and I have several memos from those meetings from 2010, 12 and 13, that explicitly say that when it comes to the integrative courses, proponents must supply information about how the course address at least one of the foundational learning outcomes of the Carolina core. And that's in at least four different memos approved by the college. So, if the college says, explain how the foundational requirement is met, I don't quite understand what the objection might be.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER - I also just wanted to clarify if you scroll farther, farther up, right under the course description and this is following the rules that are put forth for submitting an integrative course proposal for Carolina core. You'll see where it says other change specify and it says Carolina core integrative course Criminal Justice 558. So, they're specifying right there in the proposal that it is an integrative course.

VICE PROVOST KELLY - Really briefly. This is an integrative course. It will get tagged in the Bulletin as an INT course. It will not get tagged as a foundation course. So in other words, it's very clear in the Bulletin whether something meets a foundational Carolina core or an integrative course. So that prevents the any misleading because it's pretty, pretty clear in the Bulletin.

CHAIR COOPER - I believe the Registrar's also very clear on that as well. Okay, so everybody understands the issue here. There's a question of how we describe integrative courses as meeting underlying requirements in the core. Criminal Justice believes it's followed the rules. It's possible that it might be misleading to some students, but we think in terms of transcripts and requirements, it should be clear enough. Any other discussion of the motion to table? All right. All those in favor of tabling these three courses, Criminal Justice 558, 575, 577, please say aye. All those opposed. The motion fails. Any further discussion of the proposals as brought forward by Curriculum Courses?

SENATOR MONICA BARRA (Anthropology and School of the Earth, Ocean and Environment) - I thank you for your work, first of all, on this committee. It can't be easy. And I had a quick question on cross listing. So I had a number of courses that went through that are listed in multiple departments within the same course, same number of different departments, but not all the cross listed courses are listed separately under their own departments, but they are listed as cross listed under the other departments. So I'm not sure if that means that all of them are going through or if only certain ones are going through, if that makes sense.

PROFESSOR BICKLE - Okay. I might need help on this answer cause you know, I've only been, it's kind of new to me, but it's my understanding that it should be under both departments. Yeah. It should be under both departments. And if it's not, that's a bulletin cleanup issue.

If the discussion is over, I do have a comment that I'd like to make. I don't know if you know this, but curriculum chairs rotate out every year. So I'm brand new at this. I want to publicly thank Mark Cooper. Yvonne Dudley. And the committee. People warned me that this would be a lot and being a little arrogant, I said not a problem. I can take this on and I have never worked so hard my entire life. I feel like I'm doing my dissertation again. And the one thing that everybody keeps telling me is Marianne, it's a learning curve and you're doing okay. I want to thank you all for being kind. And especially for the help I'm given. It's been phenomenal and remember somebody else in this room can do it next year.

CHAIR COOPER - Please volunteer for vital community service. So, are we ready to vote on the proposals? All those in favor. All those in favor, please say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

c. Committee on Instructional Development, Professor Karen Edwards, Chair

PROFESSOR KAREN EDWARDS (Department of Retailing) - The INDEV Committee has reviewed and moves for the following courses to be approved for distributed learning delivery

from the College of Arts and sciences. ARTH 105, History of Western Art; CRJU, 341, Sociology of Crime and it's cross-listed with SOCY 353, Sociology of Crime; STAT 206, Elementary Statistics for Business. From the Darla Moore School of Business; ECON 322, Intermediate Macroeconomic Theory and from the College of HRSM, HRTM 169, ServSafe Sanitation; HRTM 450 Hospitality and Tourism, Marketing and RETL 310, Digital Retailing.

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

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

PROFESSOR HEATHER HECKMAN (University Libraries) - There will be a Blackboard outage December 20th to 28th. You should have better navigation when Blackboard is back up. And most importantly, it will become a software as well, follow the software as a service model. There will no longer be December Blackboard outages. Are there questions about the upcoming outage? Please go back to your units and remind everyone that this is happening. There'll be communication about this through other channels, but hopefully everyone will be tired of hearing it so that they will actually remember that it is coming. Thank you.

4. Reports of Officers

President

PRESIDENT ROBERT CASLEN –Good afternoon everybody. I do have five things I want to go over with you.

First of all, I'm not sure if they're here or not, but I want to give a plug for United Way. We have extended the United Way campaign through the end of the giving season, through the end of the semester. And what we've asked our ambassadors to do is to do a face-to-face contact with everybody in their organization that they represent and asked for their support. So, I just wanted to give a plug for them. I thought they were going to be here and pass out forums and things like that. What we want to do is to give every employee, every faculty member and every staff a letter from me, the information about the United Way and a form that will give them an opportunity to support it if they so choose.

Second is I want to talk to you a little bit about the bus tour that I was on over the last couple of weeks and you probably heard about that, saw something in the newspapers about it. So, let me just kind of give you my report on that and I'd like to also share with you some lessons that I've learned from it.

We went out there to talk to high school superintendents or school superintendents, high school principals, high school students. We wanted to talk to alumni. We wanted to talk to people

within the community, principally with Rotary type of breakfast or lunch. We wanted to talk to legislatures and also some editorial boards. We really wanted to showcase not only the university, but this was a great opportunity for me as a new president to be able to understand the pipeline of higher edge of students coming from the state of South Carolina into higher education. And it was a great experience and I learned a lot. So, let me just share with you some of my thoughts and at the end during the question and answer, if you want to ask me about any of these, I'd be glad to discuss them with you.

Number one, the University of South Carolina School of Education. The University of South Carolina School of Education is dedicated and committed to developing teachers in students through a number of key programs like offer SC, their eighth grade in the teacher's development programs.

Number two. There is a strong desire of K through 12 high schools and superintendents to partner with the University of South Carolina. There's great eagerness to get our students into their schools to engage with their students.

Three, even though our K through 12 currently ranked number 44 out of 50 in the United States, there are indeed some great programs in our high schools that do produce highly qualified and competitive high school graduates.

Number four, we must have a conversation on what is a flagship university specifically. We have to talk about our admissions policies and programs for in-state and out-of-state students and minority students. For example, in one of our colleges, if they have a 65% out-of-state enrollment within their students. Is that okay?

Number five. Effective strategies that address access and affordability and diversity are our two-year regional colleges in the University of South Carolina system and the tech schools with transfer opportunities into USC Columbia campus. We must develop our transfer programs and developed some of the MOU's with the technicals.

Number six. University of South Carolina shares in the responsibility to serve the people of South Carolina through service and outreach in order to develop our high school students to increase the number of, in order to increase the number of students eligible to access higher education. The intent is not to increase the number of students that would come to the University of South Carolina campus. The intent is to increase the pie itself so that we increase the number of students in the state of South Carolina who are interested, inspired, and eligible to go to higher education. It's like a rising tide raises all ships.

Number seven. Number seven addresses affordability. I met some highly qualified high school students who were thriving in their high school experience who have dismissed the idea of going on to higher education simply because they could not afford it. What a shame. How can our university partner with legislators and others to make college affordable and to address need-based scholarships?

And here's one tongue-in-cheek. Number eight. Never go into a press conference without preparation and ground rules and never assume you can have a normal conversation with the press.

So, I'll be glad on any of those things. On a flagship, on outreach and service and building the pie larger, they were our high school students are interested and eligible and competitive to come into higher education, not only here at the University of South Carolina campus but across the state itself.

Number three. Let me talk to you a little bit about SACS. I think you're familiar with the issue they're on, that's being it's going to be addressed this weekend at the SACS conference. So, let me just talk to you about the timeline of what that is. First of all, the SACS committee that will address our situation will meet on Monday during the afternoon and at 5:30 central time the Vice President of SACS will sit down with me face-to-face.

I'll be in Houston at the conference and I will get the results at that time. Then on Tuesday, it will be made available by SACS to the public. What we, what we want to do and we still need to firm up our public affairs plan to inform the university ahead of time so that the university and the public know of the pending decision. And then we want to inform the university immediately after we're informed of what the outcome is. I think you know what the five options are. In worst case it would be lost a membership. Number four is probation. Number three is warning. Number two is monitoring and Number one is no action. So, we'll see how that plays out and we'll keep you informed.

Had some questions about the hirings. So this is the fourth thing I wanted to talk to you about and frankly, since I've been here, I've been without eight key positions. Seven of them were already in place and vacant and eight is just an expansion of one position. I'll explain that.

The first one is the Provost and that national search with a national search firm is still ongoing. The second is Director of Communication, another national search. Vice President of Diversity and Inclusion, which is moving from an organization within the Provost office up to a direct report to the President. Those three are ongoing with national-wide searches and frankly they're taking a long time.

Then the other ones that we are going to move forward to begin to fill is the Director of Development, which I also think ought to be a national search. The Director of Advancement, the Chief Operating Officer, the Chief of Staff and Audit and Compliance. Audit currently exists. We're creating Audit and Compliance where there will be a compliance element where all compliance issues are consolidated under our legal counsel. Like I said, I'm not necessarily pleased on how long this has taken. I feel like my hands are tied behind my back and going forward without the support of a lot of the staff. And as I said, all of these are in place already with the exception of the compliance element, which is a new one because we're consolidating and comply them or we're going to put somebody in charge of that. And the other one that's new really is, although it's not and it was Diversity Inclusion. That's going to be moved from the Provost to a direct report is being moved up to the Vice President level. So, we'll keep you

informed on the hirings, on the announcements and as far as people are filling those positions.

The last thing I want to talk to you about and then we'll open up for questions is, you probably saw some reports out on the strategic plan and the strategic planning sessions that we had, the offsite that we had, which resulted on a vision statement, a mission statement and a strategic priorities. What the next step is to put them on a website and opening it up to the entire university. And we want to solicit in a collaborative manner as much feedback from the faculty, from staff and even students on each one of those. We have taken the eight strategic priorities and we have signed them to a lead organization and their responsibility now are to develop goals, objectives and metrics. Then I plan on bringing the entire group that we had, which included all of the deans back together again around February towards the end of February and then we're going to go and talk about for each one of the strategic priorities, goals, objectives, and metrics. Soon as we get an agreement on goals, objectives and metrics, then we will begin the process of aligning programs and resources, programs and resources.

I know you're very familiar and you heard a lot about the president's initiative fund. Some of that we have already committed, and I think you might get some insight into that later on in the agenda, I think. I'd be glad to talk with you about that as well. But the principal use of the strategic initiative fund is to be able to, as we align programs to strategic priorities and, and some of those programs may need resources that will be the source of resources that will be available for that.

SENATOR BETHANY BELL (Social Work) - In your positions that you listed at a previous meeting, the CFO was still an open position. So where is that, because that wasn't updated.

PRESIDENT CASLEN - The CFO right now is being filled by Ed Walton. So he is the Vice president/CFO.

SENATOR BELL - Is that still interim or is that like done? Is it still an interim position?

PRESIDENT CASLEN – He was filling the position of CFO. So technically he is still filling the position. So, you know, so he's been the CFO when I arrived he is still the CFO.

SENATOR BELL- Great, thank you.

SENATOR TESTERMAN - I was a little confused by a comment that you made. Something about, is it okay if 65% and some programs are from out-of-state? I guess my interpretation is that if we have really high-quality programs, out-of-state students are going to want to come and that should be a good thing. Obviously, we want to serve South Carolina students as well. But to me it seems like that would be a ...

PRESIDENT CASLEN - No, I'm glad you asked questions. Good question. So, the issue is what's a flagship university and the flagship university is not only one that has some preeminent programs like International Business being rated number one in the world. Those are great

because they attract great students. They attract outstanding, very qualified students and faculty and also research programs as well. And they make us very competitive nationally on US News World Report and other different programs as well.

The question though is that if we are an institution that is a profession of higher education that serves our client, which are the people of South Carolina and the students from South Carolina and then the students of South Carolina are ranked in that higher education, 44th out of 50. How competitive are those students to compete for positions here at the University of South Carolina? If 65% of our graduates are from out-of-state and they most likely go back to the state they came from, back to the home they came from with their employment opportunities there and not staying in South Carolina. What's the impact of having less South Carolinian students here going back into the South Carolina economy working into this and building the South Carolina economy? So these are some of the, some of the questions that we ask. Is it okay to be, have 65% of our graduates said leave the state when they graduate altogether, when we're the flagship university that serves the state of South Carolina?

The question is, where's the balance in all of them? What's the right balance? And it's a good question. It's something that puts some thought into it, but it's 65, 35%. Okay. If 65% of our students leave the state when they graduate from here and given the fact that we're the flagship university of the state, the feedback I'm getting from legislators and others is that is probably a little bit too high. Maybe if it was a 55, 45, maybe that might be more appropriate. But that's it. So, what is the impact though on our quality of students? The question I'm looking at is not to lower standards and admission standards. The question I'm looking at is what do we need to do and this is where I should feel that we share the responsibility to make the quality of the students that are from the South Carolina K through 12 system more competitive so that by being more competitive they get, they come into the university system here and they have earned the right to come into the university system and they have successfully competed against some of the out-of-states students as well. So it's not necessarily a lowering of a standard, it's trying to get a more competitive student that would come from South Carolina that would come into our state or come into our university. Something, that type of balance is what we're looking for.

SENATOR ABBAS TAVAKOLI (College of Nursing) - I was wondering about the money, the initiative money for faculty. My understanding is that when they are located only for tenure track faculty, there are some colleges and units including College of Nursing, most faculty or clinical faculty. Is there anything for a clinical faculty like Medical School or Sociology or Pharmacy? They are the same situation.

PRESIDENT CASLEN -Yeah. I'm going to ask the provost if he can jump in.

INTERIM PROVOST TAYLOE HARDING - I can deal with that now. It was also in my report, but I can deal with that now. As I've said to the Senate a couple of times through the fall, and the president just reiterated, there are aspects of the president's initiative fund that he has already told us our priorities of his, that we will seek approval for the Board. That includes a \$7.4 million pay package that would be distributed in two ways: a compression market equity exercise and a merit

retention pool. The procedures for which are yet to be determined because the money hasn't yet been approved by the Board. For one thing, that compression exercise is specifically for tenure and tenure track faculty. But I have asked the Faculty Welfare Committee to give me recommendations not only for what they believe with respect to the merit retention pool should be for the tenure, tenure track faculty, but also what could be considered for non-tenure eligible faculty as well. So, there will be some degree of attention paid to non-tenure eligible faculty in the pay package, but it's not included yet in that \$7.4 million. If we're going to find money for the tenure track, the non-tenure eligible pay package, we're going to have to find that elsewhere from the initiative funds. Is that confusing or ?

SENATOR MATTHIAS SCHINDLER (Physics and Astronomy) - You had shared your vision statement with us before and I had a question that I think the current version is that USC is the preeminent flagship university in the nation. Is that the current version?

PRESIDENT CASLEN – To get to be the preeminent flagship university in the nation, that is correct.

SENATOR SCHINDLER -Okay. Could you comment who, which institution you currently see in that role? Or several? You don't have to pick your favorite.

PRESIDENT CASLEN -You mean which institutions where we compare ourselves with?

SENATOR SCHINDLER -No. Which institution do you currently see as the preeminent flagship university in the nation?

PRESIDENT CASLEN -Well, you got the Ohio State, the Stanfords, yeah, the Michigan and you know universities like that that are, those are pretty sharp. Pretty good, right. But see what's unique about this vision statement is not a flagship university that would be preeminent in the programs and in the academic programs and the research that they are doing similar to us with a Stanford is or the University of Michigan is or something like that. We're looking at a flagship university that also focuses on the people that its clients are the people of the state. The people of South Carolina where we share in the responsibility to develop them to be more competitive so that by being more competitive they would come as well. I was saying before that they would come into our university and when you serve the people, when you serve them, it's a, it's "us" and this is what the College of Education is doing so well.

It's "us" going into the schools. It's "us" going into those high school programs. It's "us" engaging with those students. It's "us" becoming mentors and role models that will help inspire them that they'll want to take their high school seriously and now and by doing so they'll get the grades and the standardized test scores that they need to.

And the other huge issue of all of this is they are tremendously qualified students that are out there that could come to higher education and are extremely competitive but they can't afford. And this is something that we, I think really need to address. And I was walking through one of

the high schools with one of the principals and we're just walking the halls and this one high school student came up. A minority student and the principal introduced me to him and he said that he is the spirit of our high school. He's just, you could tell right away. It was just a great kid. And I asked him, I said, what are you going to do next year? He's a senior, he's going to graduate in May. What are you going to do next year? He said, I don't know. I said, why don't you come over to the University of South Carolina here in Columbia? He said, I can't afford it. I mean it was an immediate response and it just kind of hit me right in the chest that this one kid who's bright, brilliant and you know really full of life and just would be a perfect candidate and want to come to higher education, but he couldn't come because he couldn't afford it. He had dismissed, he and his family had dismissed the idea of going to higher education because of affordability. To me, that's a shame. That is something I think we have to address.

PARLIAMENTARIUM SUDDUTH - We have a question from Palmetto College - Bob asks, how will you lower tuition?

PRESIDENT CASLEN - How should we lower tuition?

PARLIAMENTARIUM SUDDUTH - I think the question was how will you lower tuition?

PRESIDENT CASLEN - I'm not planning on lowering and I'm planning on keeping it the same. I don't know if that answers your question.

CHAIR COOPER - You might want to address the need based on the idea of need-based.

PRESIDENT CASLEN - Oh well. Oh yeah. So, what Mark said is addressed the idea of need-based and need-based scholarships. Right now, believe it or not, by statute we are, I as a president of the university are limited to use 4% of my institutional funds, which are really tuition dollars for need-based scholarship. And that's what I'm limited by statute. And the Dean of Student Affairs says we're pretty much using every single penny of that. So we have been talking to legislators and trying to make the case to increase the law to go to increase from 4% to 8% and also it's also the criteria that need-base is described at the poverty level. But we want to increase it from the poverty level to 100% so that we would use not just 4% but 8% for need-based scholarship. And this is one of the ways that I think we here at the university can address some of the need-base and talk to some of those young kids like I had met who are, who are quality, really quality kids, very competitive academically, but just said dismiss the idea of coming to college altogether because they can't afford it.

SENATOR MARK MACAUDA (Health Promotion, Education & Behavior) - What you're saying makes a lot of sense and I was wondering, and this kind of is part of this question about the legislature. What is the role, like how do you see, other than, you know, allowing us to use some of our funds to, to increase scholarships? What other roles do you see for the legislature and helping the university attain some of these goals because it seems like there are some very real barriers to that. Like the amount of tuition dollars out-of-state students pay versus in-state

students and the resources that are needed to get some of our students up to the level that they could be truly competitive with our out-of-state students who, you know, choose to come here from several other universities. Like, is that something that we can do on our own or how do we partner with the legislature to help those things happen?

PRESIDENT CASLEN - Well, we need a partner with legislature. So let me give you a couple of statistics. Every student that comes here from out-of-state brings in an extra \$9,000 a semester. So that from a financial standpoint, paying the bills is very attractive, you know? So, if that's where the competition's coming from and you're going to bring extra money in at the same time, you know why not? Why not go in that direction? But to me, I'm not sure we're serving adequately the people of South Carolina, which is my concern.

Here's another interesting statistic. If you take the average per capita income of the people of South Carolina and compare that with the average per capita income of every other state in America, and compare that to the average tuition of public colleges in the state, South Carolina ranks 50 out of 50. So, if you take the average per capita income for an average family in South Carolina, 33% of their income is going to pay for in-state tuition at the University of South Carolina. And that brings us 50 out of 50 and so this is a, this is an incredible statistic. So, I mean if I was a legislator in South Carolina, I would just say, what am I proud of that fact? That as a legislator that I'm going to be 50 out of 50 in tuition ratios with the average per capita income? Certainly not. So, I think it's something that's got to be addressed. The Commission of Higher Education wants to address it at least on a one time because you know the governor's got the surplus right now and he's looking for ways to address that. And I forget what the exact prices, but they're looking for a one-time need-based scholarship out of the governor's availability. And so we're endorsing that in a big way. And so, I think we're going to make some progress towards needs-based interests and address some of this affordability issue. But it needs to be more than just a one time. It's got to be on a recurring basis. But the good news about the General Assembly is that they stopped the waterfall attrition of college tuition support. You know, even though we're at 12% of our budget, it's plateaued now and, and we're really hoping it starts going back up to where it really needs to go back up. But this is one of the things I've been doing a lot and talking to legislators about every time I do talk to legislators about that one statistic and what we really need to be doing about it.

SENATOR CAROL HARRISON (Department of History) - I have a question about your strategic priorities and particularly number eight about building winning teams. And I understand from your letter that that doesn't simply refer to Athletics but given that I'm not sure what the limits of that category are, in fact, what, what isn't included is my first question. And then my second question is, the person responsible for operationalizing that strategic priority is the Strategy Planner and COO. And I'll confess, I have no idea who that is or what the limits of that position are. But given that the build winning teams seems to me to be enormous. I wonder what is the remit of that position and how do you understand this as part of the strategic plan?

PRESIDENT CASLEN - Well, building winning teams is kin to excellence. So as Coach Mike Krzyzewski says that I don't necessarily strive to win, I strive for excellence because out of

excellence success naturally happens. Excellence is operating to the upper level of your potential and everything that you do, whether it's the practice field or whether it's game day. Whether it's studying at night in the library, whether it's taking a final examination that you understand that I'm going to operate to up my potential and everything that I do. And if you continually operate to up level your potential, then that becomes a new average. And that's where growth occurs. And that's where excellence occurs. So, it really is building winning teams. Everybody wants to be part of a winning team. I have to do is just kind of read Twitter about the football program at the end of the year to see what I'm talking about.

Everybody wants to be part of a winning team. So, but we're not just talking about athletics. This is being a part of winning team as an individual, being a part of winning team in my classroom, being a part of a winning team and in the student residences being part of, you know, teams that like to Excel. Teams that like to live within a culture of excellence because out of excellence success naturally happens in successes to win. As far as who that person is, it's well, that person is, there is a staff member within CEO. We're wondering exactly where to put it. We thought about initially with the Athletic Director but intentionally didn't want to put it with the Athletic Director because I didn't want the whole idea of winning just to be reside with athletics because I see it as a culture of excellence across permeating across the entire university.

So we wanted to put it in a general area and for lack of exactly who that would be, whether it was going to be the Provost or whether it was going to be somebody else, this person said I'd be glad to take it on. So that's why he's got it. He's got feedback. I mean, so regardless of who it is, it's really an administrative position. So, your feedback and everybody else's feedback is what we're seeking. So whatever concerns, recommendations that you have, those recommendations are certainly welcome and I encourage you to send them in.

SENATOR HARRISON - But if I could follow up, could you give us an example of like what would come under this person's remit and then something that would not come under that person's remit?

PRESIDENT CASLEN - What winning is and what winning is not?

SENATOR HARRISON -The Strategy Planner who's responsible for far priority eight. Like what are things they would not do and what are things they would do?

PRESIDENT CASLEN - Well his job is to come up with goals, objectives and metrics. So, we'll see what he's going to come up with. Yeah, you know, I mean, I think, you know, it's kind of a, maybe this is the wrong term, kind of a mushy sort of thing, especially if you want to put a metric to it. But if you focus it on excellence, you know, you can talk about excellence in student retention. You can talk about excellence in a job employment after graduation. You can talk about excellence in grade point averages. You can talk about excellence and at least in the student affairs on the athletic field as well. You can talk about excellence in your murals, in the club teams that we have. You can in some are academic club teams and some are athletic club

teams as well.

So we'll see exactly what really evolves out of that. And I'll make sure to see what they're going to come up with. But whatever thoughts you have on it and I open up to anybody who has a sentiment, but it's what it should be focused on excellence in a culture of continuous improvement that gets people out of their comfort zone into areas they're uncomfortable with. And by being in areas they are not comfortable with they have the opportunity to learn, make mistakes, to learn and grow and learn from their mistakes and get better. And out of that, excellence occurs. When excellence occurs, success naturally happens.

SENATOR KRISTINA SCHWOEBEL (University Libraries) - I'm just wondering because some of the things with the strategic plan and other things about the teams and other things like that. It seemed to be a little bit at loggerheads with other things like the budget model. We're pretty much, we're in competition and not that we're fighting necessarily, but we're having to prove our worth and it's almost each department or area for themselves in some areas. So I'm just wondering how you can kind of meld those different together.

PRESIDENT CASLEN -Yeah, well the process is going to be like I said, once we come up with and agree upon this now, this is not just me. This is a collaborative model from the leadership to include all of your deans. So, you know you are represented through your Dean so please recognize that and send your concern directly to them or send it to the website. But the process is goals, objectives and metrics. Once we all agree, have the discussion on that and we all agree on what they are, then we go to what are the programs they're going to achieve that goal or that end state. What programs already exist. What programs are adjacent that needed to be shifted and what programs need to be new. And then it's because a strategy are your ends your ways and your means. Your strategic priority objectives are your ends.

Now we have to come up with the ways and means so the programs to achieve goals and objectives are the ways and then the means are the resources, the money in other words. So, we just got to make sure that as we look at the programs that are going to achieve those goals and objectives. We've got to make sure that we have the resources, the money to be able to do that. The primary source of that is the strategic initiative fund, which is designed specifically for this, for the new president to developed a strategy. I choose to develop the strategy in a collaborative manner with the leadership of the university and all the deans. And so this is what we're going to use it for. So in answer to your question, is this strategic funds, is a principal source of resource for that. And then we'll, I mean, it's all a matter of priorities. Obviously there's not going to be enough money. We'll just sort out which ones are going to go and which ones are not.

SENATOR VALTORTA - So this is the follow-up on the point about being a state flagship university. We have many of those state students. Another way to help the state is to try to keep the students in state. So, I wonder whether there are any initiatives of that sort that are on your radar.

PRESIDENT CASLEN - Well, brain drain and brain gain. We would love to have some brain gain. Unfortunately, the statistics, I'm told don't support. There were, we do have a lot of brain gain, although you know. You have a good question. So what can we do within the state to be able to encourage people to remain here? You know, that's a good question. You know, some we got to look at and but not only that but we are looking at now in who we partner with from the outside.

SENATOR MONICA BARRA (Department of Anthropology) - Going back to the question about high school students in South Carolina and being able to retain them and get them in affordability, I think I want to underscore the importance of advocating both for our K through 12 educators to get legislators to support an education system that would be putting potential students up to become members of the university community. Because I can certainly think that a lot of faculty here are very invested in making sure that higher education is accessible, especially to students in South Carolina. So advocating for funding and support to K through 12 education makes a lot sense as it aligns with advocating for support for our university system as well because they're connected as you point out.

And I think another aspect of, of talking about affordability beyond tuition and things like that is making sure that our financial aid officers are people who come from the university to speak to K through 12, college recruitment offices. Make sure students understand that there are a lot of options available to them. I think this is something that many universities struggle with and especially students coming from historically underrepresented groups, students who are the first in their family to go to college. They don't know how to navigate these things. And if there are ways to coordinate better between our financial aid offices and um, those individuals working in high schools to help teach students about what's available to them, they could see different opportunities for affordability and things like that.

PRESIDENT CASLEN - That was the key point that came out of some of the discussions we had with the superintendents and the principals. Dean Pederson is, in my opinion, running an incredible job and an incredible effort what he's trying to undertake on, on really developing and mentoring teachers, high school teachers and junior high school and middle school teachers. One of the conversations we had though was exactly that about how do we inform some of these students about the financial aid that's available to them. How do we fill out the forms, the federal forms, things like that? And that comes to guidance counselors. So what we hadn't, you know, normally people immediately turn to the guidance counselor to be the person responsible for that. So, the question we asked ourselves is, where's our mentoring programs? We have them for teachers. Where's our mentoring programs for guidance counselors so that we can train them? It's like train the trainers. Train them to be able to understand the process procedures themselves so that they can adequately inform students of what's available for them as you suggested. So you're exactly right.

SENATOR BETHANY BELL (Social Work) - I just want to point of clarification. You've stated several times that the statistics you've been provided are that most of our out-of-state students

leave upon graduation when that's actually not the published report from the Darla Moore School of Business. It does the economic impact on the university to the state every year. It's approximately 50% of our out-of-state students stay in state. So, I just want to point out that I don't know where there's a discrepancy happening here and if you're, if the legislature thinks that most of them leave, that would end, the Board thinks that most of them leave. That would explain why there's, this seems to be this anti out-of-state student sentiment going around right now. So, I just wanted to say that because year-after-year, about 50% of our out-of-state stay in the state of South Carolina, and that is a documented fact from the economic impact that the university has on the state that the School of Business puts out every year.

PRESIDENT CASLEN - Okay, thank you.

PROFESSOR MICHAEL STOELZNER (Department of Philosophy) - I understood your idea about a preeminent flagship university as a systems concept that you said, well, we can have light towers in excellence in research, but we have also given our rather complex structures more means to serve the breadth and the needs of the State. So, I think that gives you a good basis to reject such simple questions like how many out-of-state, how many in-state, et cetera, that have often dominated the debates, but on the other hand, and when you said, well, how brain drain **bank** brain gain, how to interact with the K-12 education system of the house, whole state, I mean, that makes us as a university very dependent on what happens everywhere else in the state and on the timeline on which higher education, high schools improve. And then the kids might just want to get out of the state because they want to get somewhere else. It also depends on actors, like the industry, et cetera. So, and then there are other actors, other universities and politicians of course always want to solve the statewide problems. Is there a danger that in our goal we are also overexposing ourselves a little bit? We are part of a solution and want to drive the solution for the whole state.

PRESIDENT CASLEN - Well I want to make sure I understand your question. First of all, you had asked about the system, so I want to comment about the system because I'm the president of the University of South Carolina, but I'm also President of the University of South Carolina system. That includes three other comprehensives and four 2-year regionals and the Palmetto degree completion online program.

But I do want to reiterate, you know, from a service-oriented perspective where our profession of higher education has our students as our client and we are the flagship university for the state of South Carolina. My principal focus are the students from South Carolina who currently ranked 44 out of 50 and it causes some great concerns. So when I look at how competitive they are to gain admission to the University of South Carolina Columbia campus, there are some challenges.

And like the Dean of Education, I share in the passion to address some of those challenges, that we share our responsibility in their development so that they are competitive and not only competitive, but they we can find ways that they can afford, especially the competitive ones who can't afford it, who can come to the university and this affects our diversity as well.

The Dean of Student Affairs told me that we had 1200 African Americans who were offered admission to this freshmen class that chose not to come. And I asked why, and they said principally because of affordability. So, these are some of the challenges and these are some of the challenges that are out there that not only affect access and not only affect affordability issues, but also affect our diversity. So, these are, you know, that's why I'm passionate about this. And this is something I think we ought to address as a flagship university for the state of South Carolina.

That perspective is what makes flagship us, as a preeminent flagship university and division statement different from way other people perceive flagship universities, you know, because there's this other dimension which I think is very important.

As a system, however, there are system strategies and a lot of them are working very well. If you go to USC Aiken or Upstate or Beaufort, their African American population is a 25 26 27%, which is pretty much reflective of what the African American population is of the state. Their tuition is much more affordable and as a result they're getting, they're regionally focused. They're getting students from their region who are coming to their colleges, their universities and their diversity is representative of this, the client that they serve, the families from their particular region. That's good.

The technical colleges are in a similar situation. But you know, if the student aspires to come to the flagship campus and a lot of them do and they want to come to the University of South Carolina, Columbia, then I think one, as I mentioned, one of the strategies that we want to work and develop is the transfer program because they would go two years affordability that they can afford and then they can transfer over to Columbia campus.

I don't, I'm not encouraging by any stretch of the imagination that students in the system were transferred to Columbia. If they want to transfer anyway, they would transfer it to here or the other comprehensives. So, I'm not trying to take any students away from the comprehensives, but these are the, we have four, 2-year regional colleges and those, when they graduate from that and we're going to encourage them to, if they, if they elect to, to seek a bachelor degree program to come and consider coming here.

And same thing with the Technicals. Although we do have a couple of already great programs, at least with Midway, I'm sorry, Midlands Technical College, which is a Gamecock gateway program. Which is 400 students spent live on our campus their freshman year. And then it's a one, it's a one three, so one year at Midlands and then three years back with us. So, these are some of the other strategies that are out there that we can address. Not sure I answered your question.

PROFESSOR STOELZNER - Maybe when we say we are the flagship university, we attract politicians who would ask us to solve the big problems that they would never dare to ask. Let's say other players in the state like Clemson or College of Charleston, etc.

PRESIDENT CASLEN -If we go into high schools across the state and increased the population,

the eligibility population of high school students, a rising tide raises all ships and not only benefits us, it benefits Clemson, it will benefit, Charleston college. It'll benefit the other colleges as well. And, and I'm perfectly fine with that. I don't want to take, I don't want my piece of the pie to be bigger. I want the entire pie to be bigger. So that's what we're trying to do.

PROFESSOR DEBORAH HAZZARD (Associate Dean for Diversity Inclusion/Moore School of Business) - I wanted to just share. You talked a bit about diversity and inclusion in some of our African American students or students of color that we're losing. I will tell you as a mother of two who are currently in college right now, both of my daughters were accepted here, one in the School of Business and the other in the School of Engineering. Both opted not to come here. Part of that has to do with the fact that we didn't qualify for anything, need-base, everything was merit base and what this university offered paled in comparison to other universities.

Both of them are in school, out of state, one at Queens University in Charlotte and the other at North Carolina State University. It costs me less to send them to those institutions, with Queens being a private institution, than it would have for me to send them here.

So I just wanted to offer that as am somewhat of a different perspective. Affordability, of course, was a concern for us, but it wasn't in our case, not so much that we don't qualify for anything need base, but it was other colleges and universities looking at the best and brightest African American students and being willing to make an investment in them. And we found that not to be the case here and that was something that was really disconcerting.

PRESIDENT CASLEN -No, I'm glad you raised that up and brought it to my attention. I will look into it because I mean not only do you want need based scholarships, we also want merit based to attract the best and brightest for sure. Yeah. And other schools seem to be doing that and they took two great candidates out of USC.

Provost

INTERIM PROVOST TAYLOE HARDING - I just wanted to make sure that I said a word about budget matters. I spoke a little bit earlier. I went specifically to the pay package matter. The president indicated a few moments ago that, the president initiative funding, the vast majority of that is going to be tied in some way to the results of the strategic plan as we resource the objectives and the goals of the strategic plan. But there are the two commitments that we have talked about now for months that are upfront; restoration mitigation dollars for colleges relative to the efficiency cut that came this summer and the pay package, laying on the colleges that came the summer where we will be working on that and presenting that to the Board for approval. And then of course, as I mentioned before, the \$7.4 million pay package part of the initiative funds to that he has already supported that will take before the board.

I, my assumption now is that because we're thinking about the, the financing of the strategic plan after the strategic plan becomes finalized towards the end of February, end of the spring, that we're going to have to split up this, going before the Board and getting approval for dollars and do what we need to do for those two that we feel like must be done in this fiscal year, that are the two that we've already talked about. And then the remainder that the president will see fit to recommend as he wishes to make the strategic plan work will come later in the spring, may be dollars that are committed in fiscal 20 may be dollars that get committed for the first time in fiscal 21. I think that's one of the things that we probably can understand from today, on the conversation relative to both budget and strategic plan. So, I'm going to stop there and let you ask me some questions if you would like in the interest of time and where we're headed with the rest of the meeting. Yes, it's all right.

SENATOR KRISTINA SCHWOEBL (University Libraries) - Will there be some additional details coming out later about how the compression money and all that other things will be split up or, and divided out?

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING -Yes, yes. I probably should have added that. I am still taking official input from individuals and organizations about the best way to think about what categories of individuals are affected by the compression exercise as a part of the \$7.4 million pay package. I'll tell you a little bit about the process. I hope to collect information, bring it together. When I mean information, I mean feedback about principles and process from faculty, from deans, from organizations. The best way to do that Cheryl Addy in our office is already crunching the numbers to see what getting everyone on the campus to 90% of Oklahoma state would actually cost. That's going to be far beyond what we have, so, we have to think about ways to make compression work based upon our principles that will address a certain portion of that \$7.4 million.

A portion of it that we can devote to compression. And then once we come to some kind of understanding about what that looks like there will be several vettings undoubtedly with the Senate and Senate committees, but also with University Legal to make sure that we're not benefiting one category of individuals over another category of individuals on the faculty that would put us in some sort of legal jeopardy, which almost happened in the second of the third previous compression package activities. Does that answer your question? Yes ma'am.

SENATOR THERESA MOORE (Exercise Science) - I wanted to ask a little bit about the clinical faculty in this. I know you had mentioned that's not going to be part of that 7 million, but you may be looking for some money elsewhere in this process. Will you still be looking at clinical but looking at separate money or are you going to...

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - Well, the problem here, the problem, well, it's not a problem. Well, it is a problem. We're trying to find meaningful data on compression for clinical faculty is hard to do. So for to address clinical faculty salary inequities, I would like to make sure that we have either enough money in a merit pool or that we go and address that separately as

merit from other money, which is hopefully other dollars of the \$29 million Presidential Fund or perhaps even in other money. If new approach appropriations come to the institution in fiscal 21 like they did in fiscal 20, I would make a very strong case to the people that control that money at the institution, should I still be interim provost at the time that we need to earmark some of that money in some kind of way for clinical, non-tenure eligible writ large clinical and research faculty salaries as well. It's likely to be, as I said, though, more merit and retention based rather than compression based because compression based has got to be based on data and it's hard to get data on non-tenure eligible faculty.

SENATOR MOORE – Thank you.

SENATOR SCHWOEBEL - Will there also be an examination of what the pay is for adjuncts and other faculty that are going to qualify for tenure and anything else about. Just to make sure we're still current and able to retain all that great you know, working population that we have.

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING -I have to tell you that that's the first time adjunct faculty been brought up that I'm aware of and colleges handled their paying of adjunct faculty very different from one another. I don't think it would be wise for the institution to make institutional policy on adjunct pay. So, I would leave that myself, if that's still something that happens during my interim provost time, I'd leave that to the deans. Thank you very much.

CHAIR COOPER -Thank you Tayloe. Those are great questions about the salary exercise. I do want to let you know that Faculty Welfare has spent some time trying to understand how this has been done in the past and what the various ways of doing it might be. So, if you have curiosity about how compression exercises work, I'd encourage you to reach out to one of the members of that committee or you can reach out to me or to Bethany Bell, the chair of that committee and we can put you in touch. I'm happy to share what we've been learning about that with you. We're at the report of the Secretary.

5. Report of Secretary

No report.

6. Report of Chair

CHAIR COOPER - So I had wanted to talk with you about three things and I'm going to trim the list. I'll tell you what the two I'm not going to talk about are. First is there are some people who have put their hats in the ring to run for our Board of Trustees. There's a press release which you can find on the University and Colleges Screening Committees website. And so we may see some change in the composition of our Board through that process. I was going to describe the process to you in entertaining detail, but I'm not going to do that unless you ask me.

The second one is you may have read reports about the new alumni representative to our Board of Trustees, Robin Roberts. And I'm prepared to describe to you how that person is selected. He

was selected two years ago by the Alumni Association. You can ask me about that if you would like.

The third item I want to talk about in some detail because I think it's important to understand and this is the REACH Act, the Reinforcing College Education on American's Constitutional Heritage Act, otherwise known as Senate Bill 35 or House Bill 4292. This legislation would replace an even more horrible 1924 law, which requires state, in higher education institutions in the state to teach the constitution, administer oaths, et cetera. A law with which none of the higher education institutions in our state currently comply. But one of the features of being the flagship is that you tend to draw the fire. So our institution has been particularly under attack for not teaching the constitution like we should and this is very good politics in this state.

So, there is this effort to recraft that law. And the text of the law on the website, which you can find is not the form of the rule that's currently working its way through and is probably about 90% likely to pass in this session. The current form of the law on the Senate's webpage requires students to read the US Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, and five essays from the Federalist Papers and pass a comprehensive examination on those documents. The comprehensive examination plank has been eliminated in the current language that seems likely to go through. So, their requirement is that the students read those documents.

There's also in the current language on the website, the requirement that this be a course in American Government that lists through our lobbying efforts has been expanded to include courses in History, Political Science, or African American studies.

As I mentioned this is very good politics in an election year, so it's very unlikely, I'm told, that we will see significant changes in or failure to pass the law at this point. You may be thinking that, wow, this is an accreditation issue. The statute contains the provision that nothing should happen here that imperils our accreditation. But since Georgia has similar legislation, the feeling is that SACS is unlikely to suggest that there's a problem with this approach, which does not describe how these documents should be taught simply that they should be taught.

That is about as short as I make that description. There's been a lot of work by our legislative affairs folks and folks in the Provost's office to try and produce the best possible version of this legislation for us. And they think that's about where we are. Do you have questions for me about the REACH Act or any of the matters I did not really discuss? Senator Bell.

SENATOR BETHANY BELL – Just briefly, does the Alumni Association do like professional organizations, all members get to vote on the president of their professional association? Do the alumni themselves elect their president?

CHAIR COOPER – They do. It works like this. So, there's a nominating committee which is led by the immediate past president that nominates a list of, that seeks nominations for officer candidates from the whole membership. Then there's a nominating committee that presents the

slate. So, there's a vetting process and then the full board of governors, not the whole association, but the full board of governors, which is large, votes for its president for its officers. So, nominations from everybody in the association and nominating committee that, that's the list. And then voting from the full board of governors and it's

SENATOR BELL – (Inaudible)

CHAIR COOPER – The Board of Governors is elected from the, let me make sure I got this right. The full, the Board of Governors are elected by the full association.

SENATOR BELL – Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - I just had a quick question about the constitution information. I wondered if there was a credit hour requirement.

CHAIR COOPER - Three credit hours or equivalent and, an AP course in American government can satisfy.

SENATOR VALTORTA - I would like to hear a little bit more about the trustees and how that is progressing.

CHAIR COOPER – It's a College and University Trustee screening commission. Here's the letters of intent that had been received for our school. Let me just go down here. Here we go.

At the top of each circuit is the incumbent member and you can see in several circuits, uh, they've received, uh, additional candidates. So how this works is the screening commission. So you can see the full name, screens the candidates and decides if they're qualified or not. Then there is a period of time in which candidates who are qualified may seek commitments from legislators. There's something called commitment day on which you can get your kind of pin from, from the legislators. And so when once the legislators declare their commitments to particular candidates, it's very usual for the other candidates to drop out. So, it's rare that there's ever a contested election for one of these positions. The things to watch which you can do by following the press releases here are who gets out of the screening commission is qualified and then who receives commitments on commitment day. And I'm sorry, I don't know when exactly that date is.

7. Unfinished Business

CHAIR COOPER - There are two items here, shared governance agenda. If you have reports from your units about a feedback to the questions I posed please send those to me. I will try and package them and present them at the next Senate meeting. The Steering Committee did talk about some suggestions from the proceeding meeting that you all had. We're going to form an ad hoc committee to advise about the strategic planning process. I will be seeking, I seek from you now, expressions of interest in serving on that committee, which as usual we will try to balance

in terms of its disciplinary and demographic composition and have approved by Steering. This is a committee that will probably need to go to work fairly soon. I'm looking at you and in order to be able to participate in shaping the strategic planning process,

You also asked for some information about budget governance. We circulated to you a slide deck, which I have right here and I'll call Professor Hazzard to the podium to answer any questions you had about this slide deck.

BUDGET COMMITTEE CHAIR DEBORAH HAZZARD - So, I would like to first say that I need to make a couple of disclaimers. So this is on Darla Moore School of Business template. They have in no way sanctioned any of this information. This is just a template I use when I'm teaching, so I use that same template.

The other thing is I wanted you all to know that I essentially attempted to capture information here that has been shared in other forums. At the Provost Retreat, I know Tayloe has presented quite a bit of this information. At Faculty Senate meetings as well. So I really attempted to try and capture some of that.

As a point of information because I know it kind of throws people at times when they see. But if you looked throughout this report, in many instances I referenced, million with two M's. My background is in Financial Services and Commercial Lending. In that forum, one "M" meant thousand and two "Ms" was million. So I wanted to explain that, but I'm happy to answer any questions that you all have about any of the information that was in our budget update.

SENATOR CAROL HARRISON - Thanks very much Deborah. I found this really helpful. The question I have is not so much about the detailed information, although I think it does come from the, I think it's the 12th slide where you describe operational support teams and advisory committees. And I was thinking back to the meeting we held last year when the consultant who created this budget model spoke to us. And one of the things he said that I thought was really important is that any budget model of course, can be gamed. And of course, I'm sure most of us are in fact sitting here like waiting for the budget model to be released. So our departments and our units can figure out how to game it. And so policing that as it were to ensure that the priorities of the university, hold against efforts by individual units to game the system that's going to be important.

And you've described in this slide more or less what, who's going to do that job. My question is more, do you and the Faculty Budget Committee think that those structures will work that way? Do you see or do you foresee incentives that the budget model creates that these structures aren't well prepared to forestall? I think we can all see some of the incentives in this. For instance, all our units are now competing against each other and so there will be a real incentive to ensure that students don't leave their college for Instruction, for instance. But I want to know if you think, if you and the Faculty Budget Committee think that these advisory committees are adequate and that you have foreseen that they, these committees have foreseen eventualities that don't support the strategic priorities of the university?

PROFESSOR HAZZARD - So, I think that's a very good question, Carol. In terms of my initial

response, I would say that this particular governance structure or model, is what is in place for now. At least for the first year, we do have faculty input through a number of committees here. In particular, Mark, on the policy review, Policy Review and Development, we have our Faculty Welfare chair. And let me just make sure I get this in here. Faculty Welfare Chairs or designee are a part of that. As well as Faculty Advisory chair. So, they're members of that Policy Review and Development Committee. Support Unit Allocation Committee is our Faculty Budget Committee chair, so I'm a part of that. Okay and then Budget Motto Governance Advisory committee, Mark as a Faculty Senate Chair is actually a member there. So at least for this first year we do have members of the faculty that are sort of infused in those committees and participating. I think. Oh, Courses and Curriculum, my bad, we are participating in that as well. Did I cover everything?

CHAIR COOPER - Yeah, I think so. It's my understanding that of these committees, the only two that have actually met so far are the Support Unit Allocation Committee and Courses and Curriculum. And Courses and Curricula to your point, Senator Harrison has that major job added to its duties of making sure that when courses are added that seem to overlap with a course in another college, that there's a real pedagogical justification for it and not an attempt to gain enrollments. So that's a major add, to the work of Curriculum and Courses and why you should all volunteer for service on that committee. Yes.

SENATOR BETHANY BELL – I have a question about that. With that added responsibility, has there been any discussion, I mean, I'm on Steering and I should know the answer to this, but or maybe should there be a discussion about increasing the revisiting the constitution of that committee and if it is, should stay as it is or if maybe it should be enhanced in any way to make sure that there's adequate representation on the committee to make sure that that pedagogical process is sound.

PROFESSOR MARIANNE BICKLE - Oh, I wouldn't take that as an offense. Trust me. No. What's so interesting is there is a subcommittee. No, we have not worked on it yet, but we are and there actually is right now a running list. And how do I know that? Because I'm making that running list of things that are bumps in the road of what either people have, I'll give you an example. It will be fast.

Someone emailed me and I called him and I said, well thank you for being so kind in your email. And the person said, really? I thought I was really direct. And I said, Oh no, let me tell you, I have got some real emails. And, and so there's a whole long list of things of how perhaps it's not because of APPS, it's just how the system works. So that your question is actually that's already starting to work. That's already starting to happen.

But also one thing that will also be helping is there's a new program that the university is getting and it's called Course Leaf. And that's going to also help with the system and APPS is being replaced. And so it's already where we're on that. And no, I did not take offense to that, you have to do better than that.

CHAIR COOPER - Yeah. I mean the question was, are we confident that this will work? And the answer, the real answer is we don't know yet. We know we've got to make sure that Curriculum and Courses can do the activity as assigned. We have to see how these other committees actually function once they get rolling and so we have to just keep an eye on whether it's going to work. I think that's the answer.

PROFESSOR HAZZARD - And quite frankly, we have had discussions about possibly needing to look at expanding the Faculty Budget Committee just because the role is changing more to that of possibly needing to do more, coordinating more training, different things like that. And so certainly we need, I think different capabilities but also more committee members. So, that's the kind of thing that we're, I know Mark is going to be leading the charge on that, but that's a concern as well. Our workload has significantly increased as of late. I am a new chair and didn't really realize it took all this. But anyway, you know good stuff going on, but there's just a lot and it's really important because it does relate to the governance in this new budget model.

CHAIR COOPER - And precisely for the reason you said, can we function as a university as opposed to a kind of war of all against all kinds of situations.

PROFESSOR HAZZARD - Any questions? So, a couple of points that I wanted to make. I was going to talk a little bit about some of our overarching concerns relate to a faculty's ability to really inform budget priorities in the new budget model. That's something that we've had some conversations about. Again, the things that we've shared with you about faculty involvement that's at least for this year, but I think long term we'd want to ensure that there's some faculty input there that's going to be sustained over a period of time so we don't lose that ability to provide that input.

In addition to that, we do have some concerns about the pools of money, Excellence and Efficiency. So, the concerns there are just that much of that decision making rests not at the advisory committee level but at the executive group level. In particular budget update groups or the budget update groups. So, what that means is that we don't necessarily have involvement or input into those priorities. How those are established or the rates at which the academic units are going to be taxed, if you will, going forward.

And so those are things that we have concerns about as well. I just wanted to kind of throw it out. I know you can speak to it much more eloquently than I can, but one of the things that I think is really important is, you know, one the foundations or hallmarks of this budget process has been transparency. And I think if we're going to maintain that, then it needs to be transparency throughout. And so there's a little bit of a concern about the decision making for those Excellence and Efficiency funds being at the executive level where we have no input.

CHAIR COOPER - I would just, that's, that's a very apt summary. I would just add that we're trying to think both near term and longer term. So, we know near-term, a lot of this is going to be embroiled in the strategic planning process and the priorities that come out of that. The provost has spoken about how that's going to kind of, Provost and President have both spoken about how

that might play out over the next semester. We also want to make sure that we're thinking farther ahead in it. If at some point in the future that percentage of central tax for these kinds of initiatives needs to change, would we be able to have a say in such changes? Those kinds of things are what we're thinking about here longer term as well as near term.

PROFESSOR HAZZARD - Right. And I think just one other thing is a point of information. We talked about wanting to ensure that we had the perspectives that are brought about by the Council of Academic Diversity Officers. And so at this point in time, CADO is not officially, that's what Council of Academic Diversity Officers is referred to. They're not officially a part of this budget governance process. So, somewhat by default now at least some of those insights can be provided because I serve as an Associate Dean for Diversity and Inclusion. But going forward we want to really make sure that as we start to prioritize Diversity and Inclusion a little bit higher. That we're also making sure that those insights are in the budget governance process as well. Any other questions or comments at all about the presentation?

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - If you don't mind that I'd like to make a comment if that's all right. I think it's important not to conflate the budget model and its governance system with the decisions that will be made about Presidential Initiative Money. It's a totally different set of circumstances because while the Faculty Budget Committee and other committees, can you go back to the committee? This slide, the Advisory Committees have a very important advisory role as it relates to the expenditures and management of the budget model and of a university operating funds. The President Initiative Money, which has been born from the Efficiency Initiative from this last summer. We are taking lots and lots of input from faculty, from the Faculty Budget Committee, from Faculty Welfare, from anyone that wants to give it about how the President's Initiative funds should be spent.

That's why the first two big priorities that I keep talking about emerge because it came from faculty and from deans. So, the input to the Initiative Spending, to the Efficiency Initiative Spending is ongoing until such time as that \$29 million of recurring money is expended and that will be at the discretion of course, of the President. The expenditures that happened as a part of the budget model, that are a part of the financial system of the institution and our existing funds currently are subject to this. And that's a very important distinction that I want to make sure that that gets made. So, thank you.

CHAIR COOPER - Yes. I mean, my short term, long term thing was a little bit code for that. So, thank you for amplifying. But I also wanted to reassure people that we haven't lost track of the \$41 million of Excellence Initiative Funds, which are sometimes, sometimes rhetorically, if not materially conflated under the rubric of initiatives. So, we've got our eyes on that.

I just, I don't want to keep people over long, but I just wanted to make sure folks saw this slide. In the new budget model, a lot of prioritizing that affects you, the faculty, is going to happen at the college level. Some colleges are responding to that situation by forming faculty advisory, budget advisory groups. If you're in one of those colleges, we'd love to hear how that's working for you. If you're not in one of those colleges, we'd love to hear how you think that might work

for you. So just wanting to make sure folks saw this slide.

PROFESSOR HAZZARD - Questions or comments?

SENATOR MARCO VALTORTA - Could you mention some examples of good people who can, we could contact from our particular unit concerning this kind of process within a unit?

PROFESSOR HAZZARD - So I can just share at the Moore School of Business, we were having a faculty meeting, full school faculty meeting and Dean Brews was talking about budget. He was sort of giving a budget update and one of our faculty members talked about the fact that there appeared to be a need to have more faculty involvement in faculty input. And so, in that forum when that was put out, Dean Brews said that he would be amenable to that. So, we're not as far along as I understand College of Ed is, so if anybody is here from College of Ed that might want to speak to that. But for us it was just faculty making that statement in a meeting. And Dean Brews said he was amenable to that and just sort of understanding that there is going to be a need for a much more academic unit level involvement. And getting the Dean to, you know, sort of acknowledged that and accept that.

SENATOR VALTORTA - Thank you. This was an excellent answer.

SECRETARY ELIZABETH WEST – There were no nominations from the floor and Spencer Platt, Education, was elected Faculty Senate Secretary.

8. New Business

There was no new business.

9. Good of the Order

There was nothing for the good of the order.

10. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed. The next meeting of Faculty Senate is **Wednesday, February 5, 2020 at 3:00 pm- Karen J. Williams Courtroom, School of Law.**