

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

WEDNESDAY, February 5, 2020 at 3:00 p.m.

KAREN J. WILLIAMS COURTROOM – LAW SCHOOL

PRESIDING: Professor Mark Cooper, Chair

1. Call to Order

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR MARK COOPER (Film and Media Studies) called the meeting to order.

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes: December 4, 2019

There were no corrections and the minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Invited Guests

GUEST VICE PROVOST SANDRA KELLY - My UofSC experience is an initiative which encourages students to engage in all of the opportunities that the University of South Carolina has to offer. Students can explore these opportunities by participation in dance marathons or Service Saturday days or career fairs or participation in living learning communities. They can commit to a more intensive experiential learning by assuming student leadership roles, participation in study abroad, engaging in service-learning opportunities locally or even internationally, conducting original research with a faculty member or learning from internships or practicum. And finally, but certainly not least, completing the requirements and e-portfolio required for graduation with leadership distinction. In addition to being taught by a world class faculty, these types of engagements and experiential learning are really the hallmark of what is the value of an undergraduate education at a research one university and is something to be really proud of.

Importantly, it is these types of experiences that promote student success both as measured by GPA and graduation rates during their undergraduate career, but importantly, they actually increase both life and career satisfaction after the student graduates. And there's good data to support those assertions.

Students and their advisors have access to My UofSC experience, which is a software, basically, that tracks and shows a student's experience semester by semester. By mid-spring, we will be giving to them the ability to order an experiential transcript with the registrar's seal to be sent to employers or other entities. This ability to view experiences help students basically be intentional in what they choose to do as they progress through their undergraduate years. It also helps advisors engage students in the discussion of what will be their path. And, of course for each student, their path is unique and will be geared to maximizing their education here at the University of South Carolina.

So, here's a view of My UofSC experience. This is a student's point of view. They can see their engagements and experiential learning opportunities by semesters. They have privacy controls, if they want certain experiences to not be viewed by their advisors. We rolled this out to the incoming students in 2018 and we'll continue rolling it out to each incoming class over the years until of course, all students have access to it.

This slide shows the Experiential Learning Transcript. This transcript meets all of the standards required for a Registrar to endorse it. We have a vetting process by faculty, by professional staff. It is not simply student report. The quality of what we're doing at the University of South Carolina for an experiential transcript is unique on the national scene. And again, something to be very, very proud of. We get lots of calls for consultations on this.

So we are in the process of developing a policy incorporating recommendations from an ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee with both policies and procedures for the My UofSC experience transcript. This whole initiative has been an incredibly fruitful collaboration between the faculty, the staff, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and the Division of IT. It highlights educational value that we give our students at the University of South Carolina. The My UofSC experience is really coming to the point where it is fully implemented and will remain as an important part of what we offer our students for their educational experience. Of course, we should never actually stand still and just say, "Okay, we're done, there's nothing more that we can do." And so this is a natural lead into what we are going to do next, which is discuss the focus of the next quality enhancement plan. And with that I'll turn it over to Amber.

GUEST AMBER FALLUCCA (Associate Director of the Center for Integrative and Experiential Learning, Director of the Quality Enhancement Plan) - I'm excited to talk with you about the Quality and Enhancement Plan. And the first thing I like to share is that in reality the QEP is part of the larger SACS accreditation process that's coming up for us with our visit scheduled for March 2021. And in that, the QEP proposal will be submitted to the onsite committee a few weeks ahead of time. And in that we will relay our intention for the next Quality Enhancement Plan.

By definition, a QEP is intended to enhance student learning and student success. So many of you may be familiar with our original quality enhancement plan, USC Connect where the focus was on integrative learning or helping students to make connections within and beyond the classroom. The office of the USC Connect was established shortly after with a focus on student engagement assessment technology in faculty and staff development.

Many of you are familiar with our most notable program, Graduation with Leadership Distinction. This is a university recognition that goes on students' diplomas and transcripts and these chords are very popular at graduation. And in that students complete a variety of components to earn the GLD recognition, most notably the E-portfolio. It's an extensive process where students are asked to articulate these connections within and beyond the classroom and how it will help them moving forward. Based upon the success of this first QAP, this lends itself really well to where we're headed in the next iteration. SACS allows us to build upon an existing theme for a QEP and based upon the success, we're excited to do just that. But it's also important that we are distinctive in what we do moving forward, so we don't replicate what's been done.

Our Executive Sponsors are Dr. Kelly as well as Dr. Pruitt. I serve as the QEP Director and help to

manage this process as well as the writing of the QEP report and a couple of committees that I'll make note of, one of which being the QEP development committee. And this originates from what used to be the USC Connect Council. We have had a name change and are now the Center for Integrative and Experiential Learning and one reason for that change was to show SACS that we are intending to refresh the QEP and put a new lens on where we're headed next. This council is representative of faculty and staff across the campus as well as representation from the Palmetto College campuses because the four two-year campuses of Salkehatchie, Sumter, Lancaster and Union will follow us in this QEP process.

So, what will go into this extensive proposal that we'll submit to SACS? We will respond to five components. The first being that thinking about the topic from ongoing comprehensive planning evaluation processes, we have a lot of data from the first QEP to inform this, as well as blueprint, strategic plans as well as the overall mission of the institution. Today's event is part of our broad base or requests for broad based support for institutional constituencies, trying to gain insight to what everyone is thinking here. I mentioned the focus on student learning outcomes and student success. We will also have to show a demonstration of committing resources to the QEP including, a budget. And it was of course a plan to assess given it is related to accreditation.

So, here's another group that I wanted to make known is the subcommittees that we have in action with the QEP. And I believe the members are part of an appendix that you have in your packet. We have found faculty and staff who are experts in their disciplines, in these arenas that can really provide their insight not only where we are in terms of a scan of what we have at the institutional level, but some recommendations moving forward. If we were to think about student engagements, technology and assessment needs, how do we communicate the QEP to a variety of audiences through marketing? How do we provide quality professional development? And we also have a pretty unique pilot project in the works looking at curricular and co-curricular environments with reflection as a demonstration of proof of concept.

So, I mentioned that we've been doing a lot of outreach this year and some of you may have heard of this before, but you can see in the last 18 months we have visited with a variety of faculty and staff and students and it's continuing well into spring 2021. One thing to notice that we do have a follow-up QEP forums scheduled in March 3rd at 3:00 PM that's a Tuesday, in the Russell House Theater. There is a later slide to talk more about it, but we are intending to provide progress updates on the QAP as well as a further narrowing of the topic.

We've gathered a lot of ideas through these conversations with the different constituents. Are we thinking about extending the QEP to graduate students, for example? Do we really think about target populations and those that are showing achievement gaps, potentially thinking about sequence learning across the curriculum and the four-year career? What about a requirement for experiential learning for all undergraduates? What about a capstone course that includes integrative learning across the majors? What about large enrollment in online courses? Although I'll tell you that hasn't received as much traction in some arenas. Thinking about the interdisciplinary component as well as potentially embedding into experiential learning and reflection into the disciplines across the discipline.

When we have met with students and faculty and staff administrators, here's what we've found. For students, they're very excited about the idea of experiential learning. It's really resonating well, but they have described some current barriers to engagement and those include financial limitations. So,

for example, bridge money for study abroad or reliable transportation for that required internship. There's also this idea of white noise phenomenon. You know, we share a lot of information with students and they're having a hard time prioritizing what would matter to them in their major and their professional career and need guidance in that.

And some perceived dysfunction with university processes. And an example of that was the scholarship deadline for study abroad. You submit that application but you don't hear until far later after you've already submitted your own funds to know if you've been a recipient.

From faculty, staff and administrators. Continued concerns about capacity and representation from all the constituents as well as how to make this not feel as though it's an add on. How do we weave into existing efforts?

There is a Forum coming up on March 3rd in Russell House Theater. We invite feedback today as well as moving forward.

SENATOR BETHANY BELL (Social Work) – I know that there was a lot of discussion at Faculty Senate in previous semesters about that requirement of experiential learning and if memory serves, there was a lot of pushback from faculty about that. So, I was kind of surprised to still see it on the ideas list. At what point, who's going to finalize that because if there was not support from the faculty for that and it's still on the options of considerations, how are you going to weigh that?

GUEST FALLUCCA – Yes. So, right now we are, we're presenting this, the slides with the options to the variety of audiences we have in place. Faculty, of course, is an important voice in that. We are getting to the point where we need to narrow, and this was an important meeting that we wanted to have in readiness for that. So while it's on the table now, I agree we have not heard broad-based support and we know in terms of infrastructure and capacity that would require a lot. Is that something that we want to do right out of the gate in terms of the QEP? That's questionable. I will say the QEP is a five-year plan and so they might be something to consider further down the road, not year one but maybe year four or five. But we can take that into consideration as we develop our final topic.

CHAIR COOPER - Would you say Amber, that the best opportunity in front of us for faculty to make their will known about that topic and others would be to come to this March forum?

GUEST FALLUCCA - Yes, that would be very helpful. This will also be live streamed for those who can't attend physically and that's also to support those members on the Palmetto College campuses. And we will also have an opportunity for feedback on our website, so an open comment box where individuals can share what they think.

SENATOR GWEN GEIDEL (School of the Earth, Ocean and Environment) - And really as we kind of dig into the weeds of this a little bit and trying to think about those students that do want to do experiential learning and opportunities. Are you expecting this as we're developing the transcript for those that this to become an area for advisors to also advise our students? So, as they are coming in to get their course requirements to figure out where they are going within their curriculum, to also have them be the primary advisors for their learning experiences as well. Because in a lot of our colleges, at least in the College of Arts and Sciences, our faculty are our primary advisors and so I'm just really concerned that that will take an additional time and an additional burden for our faculty that are trying

to move our students in the right direction.

GUEST FALLUCCA - Well, one thing we've learned through the QEP process, both with the first QEP and now, is that you don't want to put all your eggs in one basket necessarily. So, we would provide a variety of means for guidance for students. I think advisors would be one location that could occur, but it wouldn't be the only place. And we would work with colleges and advisers, full time advisors to figure out the best balance and how to do to deliver that.

GUEST VICE PROVOST KELLY - Just to add onto that, so the whole, My UofSC experience involves a bunch of offices that already provide advice to students. The Office of Undergraduate Research Study Abroad, the Student Affairs, Housing. There's a lot of inputs where people are aware of kind of some of these things. And, of course, many students just receive informal mentoring of things to, to access. So, we do have the first-year advisors fully utilizing this and certainly that's the point of encouragement. But in the long run it will take the whole university.

SENATOR ERIK DOXTADER (English)- I want to go back to Professor Bell's question. How is this going to be approved? I understand that input is desirable and you're seeking input. But I didn't hear an answer to her question of how the decision is going to be made and who is going to make the decision. And then following from what you said, I'd be curious to know, where can we find information about what the last QEP cost? There's obviously an opportunity cost. Where can we find that data as a meaningful reference point to evaluate this?

GUEST FALLUCCA - Yeah, absolutely. So, if you go to the Center for Integrative and Experiential Learning, we have a webpage dedicated to the QEP and that you'll find two helpful documents, to answer your second question. One is the original proposal that was approved for SACS by SACS in 2011. In that we have to literally outline line item what our budget would be for a five-year plan. In addition to that, we have to submit a five-year follow-up report about our progress with the QEP and in that you would find additional information. So what we said we would do and what we, what we landed on five years later. In terms of the final decision making, yes, we're getting down to that where we need to make some final decisions.

We are leaning heavily on that QEP development committee to provide the guidance and insight beyond what we've collected across the group, again, that's representative of faculty and staff across the campus. We'll lean on Dr. Kelly and Dr. Pruitt to provide guidance from above. But here's what I can tell you, SACS does not want this to be a top down exercise. In fact, they will frown heavily on that. It really is intended to be emerging from across the campus and interests that are supportive of all parties. So we're doing our best to do that, to not only listen but also to take those ideas and put it into the final product.

One thing to know on the ideas list that you saw presented, we don't have to land on just one. It's a good chance that we'll take elements of one area and areas of areas of another to get to our final location or final product. So. know that we are still in the gathering feedback but at a point we will make that commitment.

SENATOR DOXTADER - I understand that. But you still haven't answered my question, when the decision is going to be by what body. A decision has to be made. How is that decision going to be made?

GUEST VICE PROVOST KELLY - Ultimately that decision will be the Directors of the QEP. That would be myself and Dennis Pruitt. But we must have evidence which is what we've been doing for the past two years with many, many meetings, meeting with students and faculty and staff to talk about this evidence that we have honing in on a particular idea. That idea we are hoping to stay on schedule that it will happen sometime in March. So that Open Forum on March 3rd will be a very important meeting to start honing in on the idea.

We really need to know by March because we have to have the draft of the QEP written by August basically because then we need to send it out. People will vet it. The QEP Council will be all reading it and giving feedback. There's lots of processes in place. So, you know, and all of the minutes of all of the meetings are posted on the CL webpage. So, we have been very, very transparent in making sure that everybody knows who we're talking to and what the feedback is. You're welcome.

CHAIR COOPER - Last question and then we must do other business.

SENATOR MARCO VALTORTA (Computer Science and Engineering) - Maybe I will follow up on Erik's question and Sandra's answer. Will there be a vote at the Faculty Senate?

GUEST VICE PROVOST KELLY - No. This is faculty, staff, students, administrators. So no, there is no intention of having a vote at the Faculty Senate.

4 . Reports of Faculty Committees

a. Senate Steering Committee, Professor Elizabeth West, Secretary

SECRETARY ELIZABETH WEST (University Libraries) – The Steering Committee has several items. First, we have an election for two vacancies on the Committee for Professional Conduct. These are partial terms, one ending in 2021 and one in 2022. Leon Jackson in English will fill the vacancy for 2021 and Chris Xue from Mechanical Engineering will fill the one for 2022. These will be voted on later and under Unfinished Business. And we will take nominations from the floor, if you so desire.

The slate of volunteers for our committees to begin their service in August will be distributed electronically and will be voted on at our next meeting in March. So please when that comes out be sure to review that. We are still working on a few more slots to fill.

We will also soon be having an election for our next Faculty Senate Chair. The way the Chair serves is, the first year is as Chair-elect; two years as Chair and then the fourth as Past Chair. So since Mark will be starting his second year in August, we will need to have a Chair-elect to shadow him. Nominations will be taken over the next few weeks. That election will also be in April. And if you have any questions about what the duties of the Chair entails, please contact Mark or our Past Chair, Marco Valtorta and they can convince you if you would like to take on that opportunity. Any other questions you can certainly email Mark or myself regarding the Chair and the duties. Any questions?

CHAIR COOPER - So, just to make sure you have the timeline a call for nominations will go out

almost immediately. We'll present you with a slate of nominees at the March meeting and then you'll hear from the candidates and vote at the April meeting.

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

PROFESSOR MARIANNE BICKLE (Interdisciplinary Studies) – brought forward 74 proposals. 34 are from Arts and Sciences. One is from the College of Business. One is from Education, 12 are from Engineering and Computing. Nine are from the College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management. Nine are from Information and Communications. Four are from Music. One is from Palmetto Programs. One is from Public Health, and two are from Social Work.

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

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

PROFESSOR KAREN EDWARDS (Department of Retailing) – brought forward the following existing courses to be offered via Distributed Learning Delivery: From the College of Arts and Sciences, PSYC 455, Introduction to Neuroscience; from the College of HRSM RETL 201, Exploration of Retail Management and Fashion Merchandising Industries; and from the Arnold School of Public Health, HPEB 471, Social Determinants of Health.

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

d. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professors Charley Adams and Andrew Graciano, Co-Chairs

PROFESSOR CHARLEY ADAMS (Communication Sciences and Disorders) - Advisory has two items for you today. The first is a change in the bylaws proposed. This is a policy for apprising the Faculty Senate of ad hoc committees, which may be comprised or established by administrators. To inform the Faculty Senate of this and to give it an opportunity to confirm faculty appointees to those committees. This is just going up for proposal today. We'll vote it this next month. So already there seemed to be a couple modifications we may want to make to this which we'll probably do next month before we vote. Any questions about that?

CHAIR COOPER - So, just in case you didn't read in great detail the email I sent you senators, this is of a piece with the experiential learning policy. The experiential learning policy links to this bylaw language and this follows a recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Experiential Learning Transcript that was constituted in the fall.

PROFESSOR ADAMS - Vice Provost Kelly and Amber Falluca earlier were telling you about the UofSC experience extended transcript. This is a draft policy which will help determine what qualifies,

what should go on that extended transcript. This was developed by that committee, the BTCM [Beyond the Classroom Matters] committee, which of course is a nice committee, reflected from many different units on campus.

CHAIR COOPER - Do you want to tell them what the process is?

PROFESSOR ADAMS - From here the policy goes on to the Policy Advisory Committee and after that it's going to go up for open comment. So that would be your opportunity to weigh in on this. Any questions?

SENATOR REBECCA STERN (English) - I don't understand this. Is it? What is the policy here? Is it saying that you can put people on committees without their consent. I don't understand that.

PROFESSOR ADAMS - The idea here is that from time to time ad hoc committees are established often by administrators without maybe the knowledge or the oversight or the awareness of faculty. And so this just allows faculty via the Faculty Senate to be apprised of those committees and to weigh in if they so choose. Basically it's just a confirmation process.

CHAIR COOPER - So, just to kind of connect the dots here, in the case of the Experiential Learning Committee, it's not an ad hoc committee. It's a standing committee that regularly has faculty members on it. Those faculty members are appointed by the Director of CIEL [Center for Integrative and Experiential Learning]. And the ad hoc committee recommended that those appointments have some oversight, some checks and balances from the Senate. So, this is a set of policies that let us do that. Lets the Senate know what those appointments are and to confirm that.

SENATOR STERN - So if the Senate says, I don't want that person on that committee.

CHAIR COOPER - Imagine how extraordinary that circumstance would be. So it is, yes, an ultimate check in the case of doomsday meltdown, but the primary function would be to remind the Senate that there is a committee that it has faculty on it. That we know who these particular faculty members are and that there is kind of shared governance involved in the approval of Experiential Learning opportunities.

e. Faculty Senate IT Committee. Professors Heather Heckman and Neset Hikmet, Co-Chairs

There were no question regarding the submitted report.

f. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Bethany Bell, Chair

SENATOR BETHANY BELL (Social Work) - The memo was posted. Before we get to discussion of that, I just wanted to provide a little bit more context. As you've heard, the Provost and the President have said multiple times throughout this academic year that funding for faculty salary has been a priority, and they have come through on that. They've been working very tirelessly to get this money and they are moving forward. I just got notice confirmation that it is going to the Board this month for approval for that 7.4 million for both salary compression and merit. Provost Harding can talk about the details, but about roughly half of the 7.4 million will cover tenure-track faculty compression issues and

half will be used for merit and retention. Salary adjustments from the compression exercise are expected to occur before the end of this fiscal year. Merit/retention won't come until next fiscal year.

A little bit of how we arrived at this initial memo that was sent to the Provost from me on behalf of Faculty Welfare. Last December, Provost Harding asked the committee to develop a merit process. Not knowing the timeline Welfare was asked to come up with this process as soon as we could. So, we met before Christmas break, and we finalized it over the break, and you can see I sent it to him in early January.

You can see suggestions for tenure-track and non-tenure track if you haven't read it already, but they mirror each other. One of the reasons we are bringing in the non-tenure track [to merit] is because there's no national database to be used for compression, whereas for tenure-track faculty, the Provost office uses the Oklahoma State data. So, the only option for non-tenure track will be through merit and retention. The 7.4 million to this point has not been decided. Right now, I believe it's going for tenure track, but there's still room for discussion on that. But another source of funding for non-tenure track that the Faculty Welfare's going to be pushing is as the President's office works on aligning resources with strategic priority number two, which is maintaining a world-class faculty and staff at the university. That's a place where we could be advocating for monies for non-tenure track because there were some inherent difficulties and including it with the compression process. And although the details for these non-tenure track salary adjustments are still evolving, I want personally to let you all rest assured the Faculty Welfare is not going to let it fall off the table, that it is on our, it is on our agenda. Half of my faculty, I'm sorry, half of the committee that I am chairing actually is made up of non-tenure track faculty. And so this is an issue that is of utmost importance to the committee. So those were just some context. And so now if anyone has questions, concerns, or comments. Anything you want to add before questions Mark?

SENATOR ABBAS TAVAKOLI (Nursing)- I just want to emphasize, add the comment about non-tenure track faculty. Some units of like College of Nursing, two thirds of our faculty are non-tenured, so I hope the timeframe would not be five years or 10 years and you know, stay back. And those faculty do the same thing as tenure track faculty.

SENATOR BELL - Very much appreciate it. Thank you, Abbas. Oh, I think Heather's next. Sorry.

SENATOR HEATHER BRANDT (Health Promotion, Education and Behavior) -Bethany, you may not be able to answer this, but one thing that many of us have been wondering about is how the funds may be allocated if it would be based on the number of faculty across various colleges or with the units or what that process will look like. Because if it's truly merit-based, there could be a greater variability across colleges depending on the criteria. So, I was wondering how the work that your committee with the President and Provost has maybe addressed that issue.

SENATOR BELL - That's a good question. We did not get into those details. I'm thinking that maybe the Provost may answer that during his report. So I appreciate it. I have the same question. So, you know, we're just now learning that it's going to be about a 50/50 split. At the time that we wrote these recommendations, we still didn't know how that 7.4 million was going to fall out. But I do look forward to hearing that as well. Thank you, Heather.

SENATOR DOXTADER - Thank you for your efforts on this and I understand that this happened over the December interim. That seems incredibly problematic to me at no fault of yours and I don't know why it had to happen at that particular moment. This is, this seems to me to be an issue that should be vetted with individual units. There are a number of questions in this document that I think are quite pressing. For instance, what exactly is the status of the committee's recommendation? What effect does that have? In addition, the tension between bullet point number three, "tenure unit heads should develop criteria in conjunction with the committee." And then on the second page, a list of specific criteria that must be followed. It seems to me the departments and units should have significant leeway and a significant decision-making power in deciding what the criteria and the process is for determining merit.

I'm also completely baffled as to why a merit exercise should distinguish outstanding, excellent, good, fair and unacceptable performance. That makes no sense to me and it seems to place an enormous burden on units to determine unacceptable performance. This is a merit exercise. This isn't tenure and promotion.

SENATOR BELL - Thank you for those comments. They'll be recorded in the minutes. I will type everything up. I can speak to the criteria, whereas we were trying to balance autonomy and special circumstances within units with also trying to help ensure that there was a basic level of equity across units. And so that is where the criteria came from. I believe that this document is in the hands of CAD right now or is going to be given to the Council of Academic Deans too. This was really just a starting point. I am not in the discussions with individual deans. That would be something that Tayloe is interacting with them for. But our intention was not to say everyone has to do it this way, but we were thinking broadly about what are some common themes that maybe most units would be comfortable with, such as it's not just at the discretion of the Dean. It's not just at the discretion of a person, that the process is transparent within each unit.

So, I hear what you're saying. I'm sure that this is going to continue to be revised, but because we don't have an existing process built into our university structure, we wanted to get something written that was equitable and hopefully is a good starting point. And I believe it has some good, some strong elements to it. But this is why we're putting it out now. We have time to vet it and continue to provide feedback to the people who make the ultimate decision. Yes.

SENATOR CHRIS YENKEY (Moore School of Business) - If I may follow up on that. So, I read the document about a week ago, so if it's in there, I apologize, but I'm not sure it is. Just to be absolutely clear, is the ultimate decision on the allocation of the funds happening at central administration or is the, are the funds being allocated to the departments so that they can follow up on their own evaluations?

SENATOR BELL - To be determined? That was what Heather was asking as well. We know that compression is happening across campus, but the merit side, it has not been decided or shared with us how that will be allocated.

SENATOR YENKEY - Okay. Then to add to the minutes, I think this is really important because and I absolutely appreciate the committee's work on this, it's critical. My hunch is that seven point whatever million is still not enough to bring university-wide all of our faculty on par with nationwide industry

standards. So, my hunch is that there's going to have to be some difficult decisions made. And if we look at the results of the Campus Climate Survey, I think it jumps out very quickly that most of the positive responses to that were about working with department chairs and sort of satisfaction at that local level. Right? So, to the extent that we want this money, this one-time influx to have the intended effect, I would imagine that by far the best efficacy for that is to be able to make merit decisions and execute on them at the department level instead of at the central level. Where by far the majority of dissatisfaction with the Campus Climate was registered.

SENATOR BELL - All right. Thank you for that. I hear what you're saying. I would also caution though, I think we also want to have a balance that one, especially for a college like Arts and Sciences, that one department doesn't use a process that's so drastically different than another department, that there's inequity. So, I think we should be creative and thinking about how can we give the flexibility to the departments perhaps, but also have some higher level consistency because the last thing we want is for there to be people at the end of this--I mean, somebody is gonna feel that they weren't evaluated fairly--but the goal is to help keep that to a small number and that everyone else feels it was an equitable process.

SENATOR YENKEY - I agree with that. It's just when you get farther away from the departments, right, you lose that connection and fidelity that's actually driving clear information, access and clear understanding of performance and merit. So to the extent that we trust our departments, right, to be, you know, a meaningful units that I think clearly says that, you know, a disproportionate, if not 100%, a disproportionate amount of the influence needs to come at that level to, to drive the legitimacy of the process.

SENATOR BELL - Thank you. Any other comments that want to be recorded at this point? And also, please feel free to send me feedback if or I know Tayloe has called for feedback throughout this process since August. If you have not sent him feedback directly or if you would rather funnel it through me, I will strip names, if there's anybody that feels that they want their ideas expressed, but wants to do it anonymously. Sorry, go ahead.

SENATOR STERN - It's okay. I was asked by one of our faculty members to present the problem of administrators who receive stipends but as the moment they walk out of an office, they go back to their base salary. And this person was concerned that they would be excluded from the merit pool and they wanted to raise the problem that, there's a potential conflict there between administrators who are full-time and people who are part-time and so on. So the, you had said the bulk of the pool would be going to the rank and file faculty and would leave administrators aside. And I understand that this is, you know, if you're a Dean, you're already making a lot of money. If you're someone who's in a chair's office or an associate chair's office, there's, you know, the moment you walk out, you go back to what your base salary. So just a concern that I was asked to raise.

SENATOR BELL - Thank you Rebecca. Thanks everybody. Look forward to more feedback. Thank you.

CHAIR COOPER - Thanks. I will just add because I sit on this committee, apropos of your comment Erik about ranking. The intent was to make it grievable and in order to make it grievable it seemed important for us to be able to report out where everybody ranked. So whether it needs to go all the way down to acceptable or not, I don't know, but that was the conversation behind that part.

Okay. It is my great pleasure to introduce Richard Boyer from Modern Think who's going to talk with us a little bit about the survey results, which have already been mentioned.

5. INVITED GUEST - Richard Boyer, Principal Consultant ModernThink, LLC – Discussion of Climate Survey Results

GUEST RICHARD BOYER - I've got 30 minutes with you, which is a pretty compressed timeline to do what I've been charged with doing which essentially is sharing what the high-level overview of the recent findings from the climate survey. I've been on campus the last two days doing a series of survey presentations.

My name is Rich Boyer. I'm a partner at a firm called ModernThink. I suspect most of you haven't heard of that company. We're the folks who do the research for the Great Colleges to Work For Program. We launched that program in 2007 in partnership with the Chronicle at the request of some of your colleagues, I suspect at CUPA-HR, the Professional Association for HR Professionals in higher ed who were concerned about workplace quality in colleges and universities being intentional about human capital, faculty, staff engagement and organizational citizenship. As a function of several conversations with the folks at CUPA-HR and the Chronicle, in 2008 we launched the inaugural Great Colleges to Work For Program. Every spring we survey about 250 colleges across the country and our results are published in the Chronicle every July, typically July, August. We do a lot of work with individual colleges, individual universities, and even systems outside of the context of the Great Colleges to Work For Programs. So this work that we did with you all is outside of the context of that program. I share with you that information just to give you a sense of what informs our perspective when we talk about best practice and how your survey data measures up to what we see at other colleges and universities.

I'm happy to field questions about the instrument itself. That's probably not our best use of time here, but if anyone wants to talk about the Cronbach's alpha on a particular factor, I'm happy to do that. Or the content validity of an individual item. Again, that's just not where our time is best spent here. So, we get engaged by lots for, for lots of different reasons, to deploy a survey like we did here sometimes it's the transition of a new President or a new Provost. Sometimes it's to collect information to inform a strategic plan. Sometimes it's to the crest of a Board or even in some cases a state legislature that want to make sure institutions are being good stewards of human capital in addition to financial capital. Sometimes it's a function of supporting efforts regarding civility and bullying. Sometimes it's a function of supporting efforts around diversity, equity, inclusion. That's not an exhaustive list. But it'll give you some idea why colleges do this kind of survey and I suspect not lost on you, a lot of those dynamics are in play here at the University of South Carolina.

So, among other reasons, your President was interested in getting a baseline assessment of the health of this culture at the beginning of his tenure. We did this survey in relatively short order. We deployed the survey in November. We were engaged only several weeks before. So, we are now, we generally think of surveys like this in three different phases actually four.

The first phase being a due diligence phase where we're trying to understand the client. This context where you are in your strategic planning process. Where you are in your accreditation cycle, you know, things that are might be related to the kinds of questions we're asking in a survey like this. So that's work we do even before deploying a survey.

The second is the design of the survey instrument and the deployment of the survey. So, in most of our clients, we're not starting from a blank sheet of paper. We've got a core instrument that we've developed specifically for higher ed and we convened a blue-ribbon panel of experts from across the country every three years to review that instrument. So, I'm happy to again field those questions, but that's what we started from. You all did convene essentially a steering committee. We didn't call it that, but it was a survey committee with broad representation across the university to kind of guide and advise the process. So that's who we worked with in terms of the deployment of the survey.

So my goal here is again to provide a little bit of context for everybody who may not know the backstory. Also to provide what I'm going to characterize as a high level SWOT analysis of these findings and kind of share with you where we are in the process. Now the reality is, while you all have done other surveys before, notably you've done the COACHE Survey. I think in the past you've done the HERI survey. In 2014 you participated in the Great Colleges to Work For Program. We surveyed a sample of 600 faculty and staff. We didn't get great response rate then, but all that's pretty dated at this point with the exception of the COACHE Survey data. But you know, well you've done surveys, you've not necessarily had a systemic approach to this kind of process. So, we don't have a project plan to follow based on what you've done in the past. So, the Steering Survey Committee, I think is doing good work, trying to follow best practice in terms of these results.

So, we deployed the survey in November. I'll share with you this exact response rate momentarily. Three weeks ago, I had preliminary findings call with your President, his Chief of Staff, who I think was on day three and the Survey Committee itself. As a function of that call, we made some decisions to do some more findings, presentations with the larger group. There was a real commitment, I think, to being transparent with the data. Let me also be very clear, nobody has told me what I can say or what I can't say or what have you. I have not, my voice has not been limited or constrained here. But the Survey Committee said, yeah, we need to be transparent about this. I think your President also was very interested in being timely and being transparent in terms of the sharing of the survey data.

So three weeks ago we made this happen. I've been on site for two days. Over the last two days I've had a number of conversations like the one that we're having here today. Yesterday morning I spent the better part of 20 minutes with the Executive Council having a similar conversation talking about the survey results. I've met with your survey, your Committee on Diversity and Inclusion. We've done three town hall meetings, one specifically with focused on the Faculty Survey results. Another specifically focused on the Staff Survey results. And I'm here with you now wrapping up my two-day tour with the Faculty Senate.

So we're, you know, Phase One is the due diligence. Phase Two is the deployment of the survey. We're now at the very beginning points of Phase Three, which we would talk about being the communication of the survey results, the socialization or the dissemination of the findings.

And I think of surveys both as an assessment tool, which obviously they are provide baseline and some

insight into the health of the quality of the culture of the faculty/staff engagement levels. I also have to think of a survey as a communication tool. They are by that, by their very nature as well. Where you go to great effort to solicit input, it's important with surveys like this to play that back to the audience, to them which you've surveyed. So that's what we're in the process.

Stage Four then would be some action planning, identifying what are we going to do as a function of these survey results. Now again, you don't have a roadmap for stages three and four, so everybody's rolling up their sleeves, doing their best work, trying to be as transparent, as committed as possible to share the results and do some subsequent action planning.

So that's kind of where we are right now. Let's do a quick review. So your first data point we'll talk about here is the response rate. And I suspect we've got a lot of survey experts in the room. For those of you who don't do survey research like this on a regular basis, you might be wondering, is that 44% response rate good or is that bad? Well, my practice for the last 10 years has almost been exclusively focused on colleges and universities. I've worked with lots of different industries on this kind of work. We generally see lower response rates in higher ed and healthcare. Having said that, for an institution of this size, of this complexity, flagship in a public system, first-time deployment of a survey of this scale and scope, we would have expected you to be in the 36 to 46% range. So you're on the higher end of the continuum.

Which is terrific, that we did go to some lengths even though we didn't have a lot of advanced notice to educate people prior to deploying the survey, why we were doing it and how the data would be used and what we were doing to protect individual confidentiality and anonymity. The 44 response rate, you know, measures well or sort of reflects well on a first-time deployment in the survey, you know, if you all to take some substantive action between now and the next deployment of the survey. If there's good communication around what actions were taken and how they were informed by survey results, I wouldn't be surprised to see response rates in the 50-60% level the next time you deploy a survey like that.

For those, and I'm happy again to go into more detail offline on this, but when we look at the confidence levels, we can operate with the data set in its entirety at the 95% competence level, we've got a margin of error of 1.46%. Obviously, you gotta recalculate those numbers when you look at different subsets, but I don't have any concerns around the validity or integrity of the dataset. So, you may not like everything you see. You may not agree with everything you see. Although that's not been my case. The case with the presentations I've been over the last two days, I think people think this climate survey data reflects pretty well their experience. But I have no concerns regarding the confidence in the data set itself.

We have provided some benchmark data. My unsolicited coaching here is, don't get too concerned at this point around the external comparisons, you know, that can be meaningful. And before you get hung up on that, it's important that you have a good understanding of your own kind of lay of the land. What are your strengths? What are your opportunities? Where are the soft spots? Where's the low hanging fruit?

In terms of the serving instrument, there are 60 core items that we ask. These are belief statements that we've asked literally hundreds of thousands of faculty and staff across the country. Your survey committee added 16 additional belief statements based on topical areas that are particularly important

to this university at this time. They generally fell into one of three categories: diversity, equity, inclusion; ethical conduct, and Title IX awareness. So we'll talk a little bit about those as well.

We had two open ended questions. You all had a lot to say. This university, your faculty and staff are a lot of things but disengaged is not one of them. We had over 200 pages of verbatim responses. I have teased a couple of your colleagues that I think one or two of those responses arguably would qualify as a dissertation. Right? So folks had a lot to say.

I'll try and weave in the course of my narrative, some of the themes there. They pretty much echo what we see in the belief statements. Now, what we don't see, we didn't ask belief statements around your confidence in the Board or your satisfaction with the presidential search. And I'm sure not surprising to many of you, those items show up in the verbatims, right? A lot of frustration, not just with the board, with the state, the perception that the legislature hasn't funded you appropriately. They don't value the work. That they're out of touch. A lot of frustration with the perceived politization of the Board and how the whole presidential search unfolded. So that's very real. I'm not going to say that that's not real. We did not ask statements about that, but I get that now. I've had some questions over the course of my two days here and even before around how much of that dynamic influences what we see in the survey results.

There is no question in my mind that these results are influenced by that. And to the extent there is some frustration with the Board. Frustration with the process. It is most acute among faculty. It's not that staff don't care, it's just most acute among faculty. I have no doubt that that does inform some of what we see. And I've spent enough time with this data set and there's enough information in the verbatims and even kind of between the lines that suggest to me, more than suggest to me, that suggests that some of the findings we're seeing as it relates to the sense of confidence in senior leadership or the alignment of different levels of leadership, that they predate this administration and arguably go back even farther. So it's, well, no doubt the events of the last year influences much of the structural issues here are part of a bigger story to be told.

Seventeen demographic questions. We asked things like protected class, age, gender, race, ethnicity. So, as you might imagine, those were particular topics of interest in my meetings with your committee on diversity and inclusion Yeah. Thank you. One of the things I think also of note, and we knew this in our due diligence when we were prior to pulling the survey, you know, after spending a little bit of time with you, we knew that as we thought, where is the University of South Carolina today on a continuum of trust? Are you a low trust environment or are you a high trust environment? I'm guessing most wouldn't be surprised to say that we did not put you up here as a high trust environment. So we knew there were going to be some concerns regarding anonymity and confidentiality of the survey results.

So, we went to great length to educate this community around what we were doing to protect that. So, towards that end nobody here at this university has the raw data file. Now for some of you faculty, I suspect that's disappointing. You want to be able to run your own factor analysis or linear regression. We're happy to work with you on that. But if you all had the raw data file, that would then enable you to run multiple cross tabs so that we could say, here's a male who's been here 8 - 10 years, who's an associate professor who's in the Law School, oh, that's gotta be so and so. We needed to make sure that people, we were addressing that concern proactively. Now we will work with you and partner you on any advanced statistical analysis that you need above and beyond what we've provided. That's not in

most of that level of granular details in our report, normal report suite, but I think you've got more than enough to work with.

So, that's important in terms of playing back to the community, the steps that we took and continue to take regarding verbatim responses. So, in the spirit of managing expectations, I mentioned there were 200 pages of verbatim responses. It would be highly unusual for any of our clients to make access to those verbatim responses to the community as a whole. You know, typically chief HR, General Counsel, members of the Executive Council and/or deans will have access to that kind of data. But despite our best coaching about not providing self-identifying information, despite our best coaching about not providing self-identifying information, some of you courageous souls, fixed your name to your comments, right? Others of you took the opportunity to either say identifying information about your colleagues or in some cases even take the opportunity to, let me just say, less than positive things about your colleagues.

In terms of my experience with verbatim responses, one of our guiding principles is first do no harm. You know, there's absolutely critical, it's a critical importance to do the analysis of those and circulating them in a fashion that potentially does damage generally serves no one. So, I think you can rest assured at this point that the comments have been read, will be analyzed and will be shared in appropriate circles with those who need access to that. But in terms of managing expectations, those who may be of cynical nature, might say, Oh they talk about being transparent but they're not being transparent. They won't let us see the comments. Right. And there's very good reasons for us treating the comments as we are in particularly protecting the commitments that we've made to anonymity and confidentiality.

All right, so let's move forward a little bit quickly. So I want to, I've just got a handful of slides I want to show you that I can't do a complete findings presentation in 30 minutes, but I want to share a few highlights. So, on this slide, what we're looking at, the number on the far left is the seat, the item number of the statement in the sequence of the survey. And if you've got the belief statement and we have some positive negative results for the University of South Carolina and the first two columns in this benchmark that I alluded to here earlier. This is a version of top books analysis. We're doing the top 2 box in this case, combining the strongly agree and agree response options. Characterize that as a positive response. We use the same thing with the negative response, the strongly disagree and disagree collapse those two negative response.

For those who are doing the math in your heads right now, you may ask where's the remainder, fair question three and went up two points. The not applicable response option, which is very infrequently selected or the midpoint which simply reads sometimes agree, sometimes disagree. For our purposes here today, if you do the math, it's generally a safe assumption that the remainder is in the midpoint.

There's a lot of folks here in this room who are my age or at least have recollection of Tip O'Neill. Among the things he was famous for was his quote, "All politics are local". My variation of that is all great workplaces start at the local level. Hence we ask item number 25 and that's actually a pretty good finding today. When we ask specifically about the frame of reference in the department, we see generally pretty good results. 74% positive, 8% negative. When we expand the frame of reference as we do on item 60 all things considered, "This is a great place to work", it drops a little bit. Given the

contentious nature of the last year and some of the dynamics at play, I will tell you I'm a little surprised that 63% as high as it is. That's a great foundation on which to build.

Let's add two more here to the, to the dialogue real quick, little more grist for the mill if you will. Item 59 this is a really important item and at the best workplaces we can find whether that be in higher ed or other industry or sector where we've done this kind of research at the very best workplaces, Item 59 correlates very closely with Item 60 all things considered, "This is a great place to work".

So, we talk about Item 59 being essentially a differentiating quality of great workplaces. We see this over and over at the very best workplaces. There's a commonly held perception of what's special and unique about your culture. Now, some institutions, even in the world of higher ed today, we'll talk about their employment brand or we're in a law school, their employment contract or their employee value proposition. We use language around special and unique, at the end of the day, that's all very much related. While I've not seen the drafts of your strategic plan, I've heard and even in this meeting reference to some potential strategic goals around ability to attract and retain world-class faculty and staff or diverse faculty and staff. If you're going to succeed on those goals, you better be able to tell the story around why a candidate that you want should come work here versus the two or three other options they have. And to the extent that we can all tell that story and not just a search committee or not just our HR professionals, that will really serve you well.

Item 57. While it doesn't specifically say senior leadership, it certainly gives us some insight into the perception of the job senior leadership is doing. I will share with you, you know, we don't have time to go through the entire survey obviously, but of the 15 major survey dimensions. So, there's 15 dimensions we call them dimensions or themes. We get to them as a function to the factor analysis in the literature review on engagement, organizational citizenship and faculty/staff morale. So there's 15 different kind of groups of items that we look at. The second highest scoring item was the supervisor department chair dimension, which I think was referenced by one of your colleagues earlier.

The highest scoring was around job satisfaction and fit. So, when we look at items related to job fit and autonomy, we see really good results on those for faculty and staff.

Second highest scoring dimension was a supervisor, department chair. What was nice in this data set is those results are very strong among faculty and staff, both and I think that speaks to some of the good work that you all have done. And it's only recently that I've learned about some of the managerial and leadership training that you do here that's relatively new. If I say relative exists over the last eight years, you know, 10 years ago it was unusual for us to see management training on the academic side of the house. And today I still regularly see universities that put people in department chairs or associate Dean positions or assistant Dean positions with very little support and very little training in terms of what it means to be a good manager, supervisor, or leader. Now that's not the case here. You all have been doing some things over a period of time. So you've got some evidence in this survey that that work makes a difference.

In terms of leadership. So, we know that that's a primary driver of engagement as a function of the academic research and employee engagement, the experience of one's immediate supervisor, regardless of what the title or role is. There's a growing body of research. It's finding a similar dynamic as it relates to what we think of senior leadership, the sense of connection we have to senior leadership, the sense of confidence we have in senior leadership. Do they have the knowledge, skills and abilities and

experience to lead to be successful? Are they credible in their actions? Do they follow through on their commitments and do they communicate effectively? Now, one of the things that surface is loud and clear in this survey is faculty and staff, both, it's not isolated. Any one group are eager for more communication from and with senior leadership, particularly as it relates to direction and vision. So you know, the timing is right. You've got a new President, you're going to have a new Provost. You're going to have a new Chief Diversity Officer. You're going to have a new Chief Communication Officer. You know, when I met with your Executive Council, I noted with interest, there's a, as I was doing my due diligence, a lot of folks with interim labels in front of their titles. So, you right now have an Executive Council, that senior leadership team, that's very much in transition. That's more common than not with, with the new President or Provost. I generally think of presidents and provosts as new for about three years.

If I were had more time with you, we would not just do a few highlights, we do a more robust SWOT analysis. But if I were to look at the thematic analysis under that SWOT analysis, what are the things that stand out as strengths? This would be my bulleted list. A couple of these we've already talked about. There's a tremendous sense of connection to mission and sense of pride. That sense of pride is influenced for different people for different reasons. For some it's the impact you have in the lives of your students. For others it's being part of an institution with a reputation like the University of South Carolina. For others, it's the reputation in the community and the impact you have in the state, but lots of collectively a lot of things contributing to a strong sense of pride. A notable of the three topical areas that were unique to you all. You did really well on the knowledge and understanding of the Title IX issues.

One of your colleagues was giggling in a meeting I had earlier just around how all those hours in those videos seems to have paid off as tedious as they were. So, I suspect that there's a model there because when we look at the statements related to code of conduct and ethical conduct, we don't see similarly positive results in terms of people aware of the resources available. So, potentially there's a model in what you've done with your educational efforts around Title IX to have some applicability for what you do with the code of ethics and conduct.

All right, so one way, and it's very simplistic, I acknowledged, but to get into, provide a little bit more data into the conversation around that the bulleted list is simply to look at the top 10 statements. I affectionately refer to this as my homage to David Letterman and in a minute, in the spirit of transparency, we're going to look at the bottom 10 statements, right?

But let's start with the top 10. So, you've heard me talk about connection to mission. That's item number five. This is considered a primary driver of engagement. It's really solid finding on that item. The asterisks are there because we don't have benchmark data on those because those items were unique to the University of South Carolina in this survey. 72 and 73, you'll see our Title IX type surveys. 24, we've talked about this a little bit already but about relationship and the supervisor department chair. So, we know it's an important driver. You know, this is a good foundation in terms of good relationship, but as we all know, good relationship doesn't make for an effective manager supervisor. The good news is when we look at specific managerial competency, does your supervisor, department chair make expectations clear? Do they provide meaningful feedback? Do they actively solicit your suggestions and ideas? We generally see some pretty good results on those.

Item two is about autonomy. The antithesis would be a micromanaged and a good finding there. What's nice here is while we generally see good response on that among faculty. We also see very solid response among our staff on that item.

Second half of our top 10 items, 76 and Item 75, you'll see again Title IX related. I will tell you, if I'm General Counsel here, I'm pleased to see five of these Title IX items in the top 10. You know, it's the right thing to do for multiple different reasons. It is also a human capital risk management issue. So good findings there.

In terms of work life balance, so there's a dimension that we group a couple of things together. Comp benefits and work life balance. You do well on the work life balance items. There's a couple of those that speak to this. Item 47 really is where the rubber hits the road. Does your supervisor actually support it? I've seen lots of organizations over the years where they've got great policies on paper, but people really can't use this effectively rather. So nice. Finding item 47.

In terms of the code of conduct, you know, people do understand that we've got a code of conduct. They just don't know necessarily what the researchers are if they see violations or comfortable reporting those violations, you'll see us some of those in the bottom 10 momentarily.

All right. In the spirit of, of, of ripping off the band-aid, let's go right to the bottom 10 statements. I will carve out some time for questions. Timely that this presentation is taking place where it is in sequence of your meeting, right? So the first conversation you all had today, there was some conversation around accreditation. There was some conversation around decision making in terms of where are these decision made. Who owns the decision making and what's the timing of that decision? We also had a segment, we've talked about compensation, some of the work that's being done there. Potentially some real connections to make it even what we see, I am paid fairly for my work. Nobody has got a monopoly feeling under compensated here. You will note that even our benchmark is lower than what it consistently as was on the other items that you had a chance to see, the compensation is more. Well you all may be frustrated as faculty with your compensation, the staff results are even more acute. So, nobody's got a monopoly on feeling under compensated. Conversely, when we ask about benefits, staff are more positive on the benefits in terms of the perception that they adequately meet my needs versus faculty. So flip flopped on that.

There's a theme on the opportunity side of the ledger that I would characterize as resource constraints. And you know, candidly, you're certainly not the only university that's dealing with issues of resource constraints. It's shown up in a lot of different ways. For some it's a function of compensation. For some it's a function of staffing levels, which we see here low on Item 28, "My department has adequate staff, faculty to faculty/staff to achieve our goals". And for some it's a function of adequate facilities. In this case, one of the themes that emerges in the verbatims is a frustration with facilities being adequate or deferred maintenance not being attended to in a regular consistent fashion.

I earlier talked about Item 59 being a differentiating quality of great workplaces. Similarly, Item 58 is another one of those there. And at the best workplaces we can find those three items track very, very closely. When there is a commonly held perception of what's special and unique about a culture, it tends to bring a community together. So I'm not surprised by the finding here on 58 given what we saw in 59 and I suspect and as I look at you from afar through a somewhat objective lens, I think you all have all the components of a really compelling narrative around what it means to be a faculty member

here or what it means to be a staff member here. You've got a compelling story to tell your employment brand. You just haven't done it in an intentional systemic way yet. If you were to do that work, I think that would have potentially substantive impact on the sense that we're all in it together. One of the dynamics at play, particularly when you look at the verbatims, people appreciate the relationships. They have the sense of comradery, the sense of community. But despite that high regard for that, it's not translating to strong cross functional collaboration.

We're going to go to questions in just a minute. Let's look at the second half of our bottom 10. So, there's another theme around. So, on the opportunity side of the ledger, I'd mentioned the theme around resource constraints, informed by frustration with compensation, staffing and facilities, largely. There's another theme on that opportunity side of the ledger around performance management and accountability. And when I think of performance management and accountability, I think about it holistically. I don't think just about a tenure review process or review process. I think about everything from your onboarding process to even your recognition and awards programs, So, we've got two items that show up here. "Recognition work programs are meaningful to me" and "issues with low performance are addressed in my department".

Let me stay on those two before we go back to senior leadership. So earlier I acknowledged and kind of applauded some of the good work you've done in terms of department chair and supervisory competencies and even leadership training above and beyond that. That's good work and that's work is not an end product. It's a continuous work in progress. And one of the things that I have more than a suspicion, I would bet good money today, that we've got a number of folks who are in significant supervisory managerial and leadership roles who aren't comfortable with what I would characterize are the difficult conversations and difficult conversations can take a lot of different forms. Telling somebody that their performance doesn't warrant a merit raise. Telling somebody that they're not getting the resources they thought they were getting. Telling somebody that their behavior is incongruent with a Carolinian Creed. And I could go on and on. But I suspect that we've got a lot of folks who aren't comfortable with those kinds of conversations. In fact, that's a known issue. Your HR and ODI teams are working on some materials to help build those muscles, cause those conversations, they're difficult and they don't, we don't get better without practicing. So this survey also on that note did identify some things that are known issues and there's work in progress. One of the things that I think is, no thinking about it, it's being done, is looking at some of those connections. What's some of the work in progress already that's related to some of the findings from the survey.

So, the senior leadership results. Let me just spend a minute on these before we go to the questions. So I shared, you know, all of this with your Executive Council and this morning with the CAD, the Council of Academic Deans, and I will share with you very candidly, you know, one of the things I've not gotten with those groups is any real data denial. Now, sometimes that happens when there's results that come back that aren't as positive as we would hope they are or don't reflect well on senior leadership. You know, we run it, it shows up in different ways. People don't like the timing of the survey. They don't like the wording of the item. They don't like this guy Rich Boyer. It shows up in different ways. And yearly deans and vice presidents, I have found them to be very open to this. Not defensive to it and eager to have access to do more so that they can use it to, to serve the good work that they're doing.

Before we go to questions, the bulleted list of the opportunities, you'll have an opportunity at some point. We're still working on exact details of what the next phase of the communication looks like, but we've covered most of the major themes here.

One of the questions that certainly I suspect them to get out in front of, and vice presidents and deans are going to be getting their individual reports suites, which have not just the overall data but the data for their particular portfolios, potentially as soon as tomorrow, if not by the end of the week. So, we want to give them some time to, to adjust, to make meaning of what's going on and a potential next step is for them to share in some form or fashion those results in their particular areas. Now again, because we don't have the roadmap I could share. There's a lot of questions. I'll do the best to answer those questions and some of those questions, there's decisions that are still being made on what that looks like.

Last piece is timing of the survey, I suspect we'll get that. For an institution of this size, this complexity in most cases we would see a three-year survey cycle. Given where you are right now, I think a two-year cycle, survey cycle makes sense probably for the next two deployments of the survey. So, there's been some questions of 18 months or two years depending on how things move quickly, things move in the next six months. I think you'll be better positioned to make that decision but eventually I could envision you all go into a three-year cycle. So that's it in a relatively short order. It's more like a movie trailer than it is a full-on finding presentation, but let me open for questions or Mark comments you might make.

CHAIR COOPER - If there's a question or two we can take them. I did see the President looking at his watch, which I understand, so I do, we want to hear from him. So if there's a question or two?

SENATOR YENKEY - In the interest of transparency, why, why not just make all the responses for each question publicly available? We got the top 10 and the bottom 10. What's, is there something odd about the middle 40? I mean I would, I would think that a transparent way to do it would just be to post all the responses and then also break them out by school or something. I mean it would be good to know the overall, you know, climate not just within my school but others as well. I think everybody would appreciate it.

GUEST BOYER - Sure. A couple of thoughts on that really quickly. So in the open forums that I've done where I've had an hour, we've pretty much gone over every item in the survey. So, we are doing some of that, we've not gotten everything but certainly 75 to 80% of those. A couple of reasons to do that in terms of we want to be good stewards of the data and help people understand the context of the survey items and the findings as a whole. When you just do a data dump, if there are folks of cynical nature or bad actors, they can make this survey data tell a story that frankly isn't accurate. So one, we're trying to be out there and provide an objective read of what the survey results are. Right? That's why I'm up here. I'm external to the organization. I don't have any dog in this hunt. Just here's the strengths, here's the opportunities,

In terms of why we're not showing it this point, you know, all the college's data to all the people. In my experience, I think it's fair to give vice presidents and deans the opportunity to see their data, to make meaning of it before that's disseminated in a more public fashion. I think at this point it's certainly reasonable to see your results in your respective area, high-level results, potentially of other divisions and areas. But I will tell you, it is uncommon that at any college or university that everybody would

have access to every division and/or departments results.

CHAIR COOPER - Last question.

PROFESSOR JIM BURCH (Epidemiology and Biostatistics) - I'm curious about the representativeness. How do the demographics of the respondents compare to the demographics of the entire university?

GUEST BOYER - That's a good question. I don't have a slide that speaks to that right now. We had roughly a third of the respondents were faculty, two thirds were staff. We can look at your question more specifically. We have the ability to do that. We just didn't do that for this presentation here today. Fair question. We've got the ability to dig deeper on that.

6. Reports of Officers

Report of the President

President Robert Caslen - First of all, I just want to give you all some reactions for me as a President, of this particular survey that Rich just talked to you about. First of all, I directed it. I do this all the time. Every time I take over a new organization, I want to get an assessment of the strengths and the weaknesses, some opportunities of each organizations. So, I wanted to see and get a good assessment of where this university was. I recognize that the Presidential search, it was mentioned, had an influence on the survey itself and I accept that, but you should know a couple of things that are, I wanted to use this word “alarming,” to me.

First of all, we are below standard in every Carnegie point and we are below standard in every regional comparison and every single category. So, we're not average. We're not above average in some categories, at an average in other categories. We are below average in every single category. So, we could blame it on the Presidential search, but there are culture, climate, and systemic issues that really have to be addressed and I'm eager to address, address them. And I invite you to participate in them.

Some of the recommendations that Rich didn't get to, a lot of the recommendations. Some of them are already being implemented through a vision and mission in a strategic plan and other transparency efforts. But you should know that I'm doing this because I'm a believer in a leadership style called “Authentic Leadership.” And “authentic leaders” are number one, transparent. They don't hold their cards close to their chest, they're transparent so that everybody can see the information.

We do not have to do this survey. We didn't have to roll out the results in such a wide audience as we had. And I'm not afraid of bad news. Because if I was afraid of bad news, I would have vacated a long time ago. But transparency is important for all of us to understand where we are so that we can know where we have to go. And it's the first step in building trust.

Transparency or authentic leadership also believes in high values and in a strong caring attitude. And caring attitude carries into what do we do about the survey and how do we address some of these issues and what are the programs and policies we need to put in place. Nothing I would mention about the survey itself as you saw the collective results just recently, but we have broken the survey results

down to each unit, both staff and academic and I'm asking each one of the unit leads, the deans, to share their information with their constituents as well. So, you should see a similar sort of breakdown for each one of the units that you're with. But I look forward to the plans and programs and I know you're very generous to say three years for the next survey. I'm planning on 18 to 24 months. If you want to go one year, then you'd probably try and make some business or something. I don't know.

Let me quickly give you an update on the strategic plan. First of all, I would just say I appreciate everybody's feedback on the Vision Statement, the Mission Statement and the ACE Strategic Priorities. The feedback's been outstanding. I've read as much of it as I can. The feedback on the priorities goes directly to the points of contact that we put in charge so that they can take that feedback and put it back in place.

The next major step is, I think the 27th or the 28th of February. We're going to have another all day offsite with the same leadership team that we had before and we will take the feedback that has been received by including this body here and each one of the strategic priorities. But the purpose of that offsite is to develop goals and objectives for each one of the priorities and then we're going to assign metrics to them. So when we leave that day we will have each one of the priorities with goals and objectives. Those are your ends.

And then the next step is the hardest part. That's to apply ways and means to your ends. Ways being the programs. And some programs will have to be reestablished. Some programs will have to be shifted. Some programs are made the same.

And means are the, is the money. I should say up front that the money is really the source of revenue is the \$25 million initiative fund that you had heard about that was put in place for the next President and when the President would take over. I'm very grateful that's available. You should also know as Dr. Bell had briefed that of that \$25 million, 7.4 is taken off the top without it competing with anything else to address the compression and the faculty merit issues. I know there's other faculty demands in that. Those additional demands will compete against the other priority requirements once we sort out what the goals and objectives are for each one of the priorities.

All right, so if you have any questions on strategic planning or if you have any questions on the compression or I know you, you talked to Bethany about that earlier, but the Provost here to help address some of that as well.

Real quick on the last couple of points I want to make is that if you remember when I was here last time, I told you my priorities for this semester. Priority number one is to continue to build relationships with faculty, students and other constituents. So, in the area of the faculty, one thing I'm doing is, I'm visiting each one of the colleges this semester to spend a morning or an afternoon with them. It's totally up to the deans on how they want to spend that afternoon. My only guidance to them was I want to spend some time with the leadership, some time with the students and some time with the faculty and really take a hard look at their research facilities as well.

Thanks to the Faculty Welfare committee and Dr. Bell, the recommendation was for me to come to have faculty lunches, which I've initiated and already had the first one. We'll do that once a month and also in the morning take an hour and just have an open coffee time for anybody who wants to come by both faculty and staff. And we already had the first one and it was very, very helpful.

Last thing I just want to say is that we are in the process of moving forward on the new budget model and I know there's still a lot of concern and I had the same and I share some of the concerns. Actually I'm getting some great feedback during my unit, academic unit visits when I visited the colleges because their concern has been expressed to me.

But my intent right now is to make sure that this is implemented correctly. That the training is in place and most important that we have a good understanding of both the intended and the unintended consequences. It's one thing to do things right, but it's also important to do the right things. And by doing the right things we want to understand what we're doing and what the consequences are, which are really manifest in the concerns expressed and then make sure that we address them and put them in place. I am satisfied there's ways to address a lot of these, particularly with policy with the governance committee. That's a part of this and I'm also looking for opportunities as I go through this to recognize and reward collaboration.

I'll just leave you with one last bit of good news. In-state applications, if you haven't heard is up 11% over last year and out-of-state applications are up 17%. I see that as a good thing, despite all of the clamor that occurred over the last year. Our applications are increasing and particularly on the outside, where outside, out-of-state students are increasing by 17%. I don't know if there's a some type of narrative that's going out in the, at the national level that's attracting an increase, but I know that we have a problem dealing with the additional increase that there's many, many universities and colleges across the nation that wish they had this same problem.

And the last thing is, the last bit of good news is the woman's basketball team is rated number one in the country.

Report of the Provost

INTERIM PROVOST TAYLOE HARDING - I have also a very short report, but I do want to provide some degree of clarity on the faculty compression and merit retention, salary increases that the Board will hear about on February 21st.

It's probably good to define again what we mean by compression and merit retention because, that I think it's reasonably clear, but then sometimes we get confused about how these things are going to go forward. Part of that confusion is completely understandable because one methodology is completely finished for how we'll award the money. The other methodology has hardly started yet. We're going to get approval for both at the same time in one big chunk of money. The money will be awarded at different times. It's for different purposes. So there's obviously there's a possibility for confusion there. So let me, let me again give a little description of this.

The compression exercises designed to raise all tenure and tenure-track faculty salaries that are compressed on the campus. Compress being below the 95% mark of the Oklahoma State Survey. So, we started with 95% of the Oklahoma State Survey. And the goal here is to get as many salaries to that 95% that may not already be there as we can. That, as was pointed out by someone earlier, would take quite a bit more money than 3.4 to \$3.7 million, which is a portion of this 7.4 devoted to compression. So, there will be caps on how much at each rank level and the tenure stream assistant, associate and full, that an individual can get no matter how compressed they are.

It's the only way to equitably do a compression exercise progress towards a goal but makes progress evenly and equitably across the entire faculty landscape. This will be by far the largest single compression exercise done, certainly in the last 25 years at the institution. Although the last three compression exercises were sort of seen and approved by the Board of Trustees as one exercise over the course of six years. And that one exercise that was done in three different iterations over that six-year period was \$5.1 million. So, in that way it's less, but in one single exercise, it's a good deal more. Twice as much as any one of those single exercises.

I'm not going to get into any more of the methodology than what I just said, sort of at a 30,000 foot level relative to compression because the Board might tinker with this some and then I'd have to come back and change everything that I told you. So, I'd like for the Board to approve it and then we can talk through the methodology openly. This was a methodology designed primarily internally in my office by statistical experts led by Cheryl Addy and then vetted by General Counsel, the Institution for Fairness so that we do meet all equity standards.

That's compression and we do want to make sure that once it's approved that money is transferred to individual salaries through college means between now and the end of this fiscal year, so that we have made the difference in those compression salaries that I've been promising you we would make before the end of this fiscal year.

The second half of this \$7.4 million and it didn't start out a half and half because we hadn't crunched the numbers to know exactly how much of that 7.4 would be compression and how much would be merit retention. But as it's worked out and we did crunch the numbers with compression, it turns out to be about 50/50. I think that makes it an easier sell with the Board of Trustees and with the public who will all have opinions about \$7.4 million directed to faculty salaries and over the course of one or two years. This is a very strong narrative that we want to raise all our salaries because salaries at South Carolina are nationally low. We don't like that narrative and the compression exercise changes that narrative. That's important.

Then the second side of this merit/retention, let me say a word about that. Merit/retention. We have not done the methodology on this as was brought up by Bethany and the Faculty Welfare Committee report. I have been collecting information and calling for information from as many different sources as I can on the campus about ideas and suggestions relative to how merit money should be awarded to faculty at the institution.

And I'll talk about the differences between tenure stream and non-tenure stream faculty and staff in just a minute. So collecting that information we've, I've been doing, but I haven't engaged in any methodology that would determine how much of the Faculty Welfare proposal should be engaged, in how much from other individual suggestions to me from departments, individual faculty, deans, others should be put into a package for, or a methodology for determining a merit and retention. Because the compression exercise was so important to get done first. So, compression is the methodology. All the numbers are done. We're going to present it. Hopefully it will be approved. The money can be awarded.

Merit we have between now and the end of this fiscal year to get this right. So even today, I'm still collecting information and ideas about how the best way that you believe that we can benefit individual faculty relative to merit and retention.

And the goal there being that we will be done with a methodology for that by the end of the academic year. So that on the 1st of July when we can give out that money that was at, been hopefully been approved by the Board in February, that deans and department chairs, Provost, whatever methodology we decide is able to be implemented at that moment for as long as that money is still there.

So, it is recurring money given out in a onetime capacity. When I put together a committee in the Music School to determine merit salary increases procedure, 13 years ago when we were getting annual merit money from the state, we had a procedure that, that the Executive Committee of the School of Music and myself, as Dean, just executed each year. And then the merit money stopped and that policy has sat on the desktop of my computer for years. Now, I don't want to just take it back out because we're not starting up new exercises that will be annually looked at again. We're doing it one time and gratefully the Faculty Welfare Committee's proposal to me about how to do this takes into account that there really will be only this one, well, all we can be sure of now is this one-time infusion of about \$3.7 million in the way of merit and retention that that proposal and other pro-proposal suggest a methodology be determined by college faculty in consultation with department chairs and deans.

When the subject came up earlier, Bethany's, said that the Faculty Welfare proposal and other proposals are currently in CAD. That's not exactly right. CAD has been briefed on the Faculty Welfare proposal, but we're neck deep in strategic planning and CAD will not be looking at the proposals for merit that we'll have conversations about. And ultimately the interim Provost or a permanent Provost will make the decisions about how best to go forward on merit relative to the recommendations that come in. They're still many, many weeks left to do this and so CAD has not even really delved into recommendations on methodology for merit and retention.

So, let me move on now to the non-tenure track and staff salaries. As was said before and been said many times it is difficult for us to arrive at compression statistics for non-tenure eligible faculty. It turns out it's not impossible, but it is difficult and it would have been impossible to try and do on this timeline that executes, the president's honeymoon period with the university, this \$29 million of efficiency funding that he has that he can use on various priorities, 25% of it going to faculty salaries. It just is not compatible for us to do the compression study that would be necessary to arrive at a recommendation in time on non-tenure track faculty relative to compression.

So, I have suggested two things routinely about non-tenure track faculty salaries, which are acutely, as acutely troubling and in some cases more acutely troubling than the tenure stream faculty in colleges that are heavily dependent upon and heavily populated by non-tenure track faculty. And here are the two: Number one, that the deans keep in mind and that the department chairs and whatever methodology is decided upon by the interim or permanent Provost relative to merit, have some degree of a flexibility for deans and department chairs to consider rewarding non-tenure eligible faculty with some of that merit retention money. So, it may be that not all of the merit retention money goes directly to tenure stream faculty. In the College of Pharmacy or in Nursing or in Social Work, there are so many clinical faculty there that it may very well be in the best interests of department chairs and

deans and certainly in the best interests of clinical faculty for clinical faculty to be eligible for some of that merit money in whatever process that college has decided it should be rewarded. So that's one. Through this merit exercise, clinical faculty and non-tenure track faculty would be eligible for dollars to the extent that their colleges provide for that.

And then the second way will be, as was said today earlier through strategic planning. So, the Strategic Plan gives us opportunity to build priorities, under priorities, goals, objectives and actual programs that could be funded that would fund directly salary increases for non-tenure eligible faculty and for staff. And that would likely come under the priority number two of assembling and cultivating a world-class faculty and staff. So, the deans were working on that priority just today. Peter from the Senate is a member of the group that's looking at this and undoubtedly there will be objectives there that will articulate the fact that staff and non-tenure eligible faculty salaries have to be competitive. And in that way, perhaps they will be funded through the Strategic Plan under an exercise. It's entirely different from this initial \$7.4 million one that the President embraced in his first month in office.

So that sort of constitutes what I wanted to say to clear this up, to try and advance your knowledge and familiarity with it. And I'm open to any questions that remain on this matter.

SENATOR PETER CHAMETZKY (School of Visual Art and Design) - Early on you said, assistant professors in the compression exercises that we had previously that I was involved in when I was director, they were ruled out. Are they going to be included this time?

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING – Oh, yes sir, they're definitely included.

SENATOR CHAMETZKY - Good. If nobody else has a question, I have another one or comment. I've been always puzzled in the seven years I've been here and about 20 elsewhere, that every time there's any kind of salary increase and there've been three, I believe since I've been here, it's always as you were saying, a one-time thing and we've got to figure it out really quickly. How are we going to use the money that either the state says we need to devote to that, which has been twice, I think 2%, once 3.25. I would just encourage some kind of more long term thinking in terms of faculty and staff compensation, whether it will be possible in the long term to think about some kind of minimal, minimal across the board raise yearly like 1%, 1.5 and then when there's a mandate that we need to do more, we've already thought about, you know, the 1.5 and if we have to do three, we only have to find 1.5 more.

One other comment, sorry, I don't want to go too long. My previous institution we did do merit for 14 years. I was involved in doing that either as a senior faculty member or as a director of a school. It was a huge amount of work generally for a very small bit of money and like what we're doing now, it was done sort of quickly, down and dirty. Let's get it done. Let's make the rankings, let's do this--led to a lot of bad will, although the economist will tell us those incentives do work. They do encourage people to be productive in whatever way that you're ranking. I've always thought though that in academics we do the best in of any profession, I know of, real evaluation of performance a couple of times when people go for their promotions, where we take a lot of time, lot of effort, huge amount of expertise. Why not just have small, you know, across the board things and then really increase the promotion raises when we really do a conscientious job there and maybe have just for full professors some kind of pool for merit. Anyway, that's just my modest proposal.

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - Thank you, Peter. I'll tell you that when the state stopped giving money that the institution could consider giving out merit raises to faculty with which was 2007, what increases we have received from the state have typically come in election years and been so small that it didn't make any sense to make everybody mad by giving out merit raises that were 0.06% different from one another. So, we just, in most colleges, we have given those raises out of course, across the board.

So this begs the very question you talked about which I broached any number of times with Michael Amiridis when he was Provost. And that is some sort of systematic university-funded way to think about salaries long term even if it's modest so that there is some way that we can use a merit based process across campus or by individual college that has some degree of alignment with another college, so that we're doing something about salaries as a part of our normal operating procedure. I will tell you that it's the number three most important item on the list of things that I have to cover with the permanent provost candidates when they're on campus for their interviews. I'm going to go down my list of things that from my perspective are big issues and this long-term faculty salary merit based issue is number three on that list, so thank you for bringing it up.

SENATOR VALTORTA - What are number one and number two?

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - How about I tell you what those are after I visit with the candidates. I think that's what's fair because I have my own priorities and they're very personal and I don't know that I'm all that comfortable sharing them in an in an environment of full disclosure or total transparency. Go ahead and beat me up on it but I think I'd like to hear what the permanent provost candidates have to say about them before I then tell you what are. I don't want to tell you what they are and then have you hammer the provost candidates with my hammer. You know what I mean? Thank you.

Cheryl are you here? Okay, I'm going to let Dr. Addy take one second to report to you on a matter about summer compensation for information. This is not a policy approval but it is a summer compensation, has been an issue and Mark is leaning over profoundly like we don't have time for this

CHAIR COOPER - We don't have time for this but, Cheryl you can have 10 seconds.

VICE PROVOST AND DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL CHERYL ADDY - I'll be as quick as I can. This is simply HR and trying to make sure that we do not have any of the issues we had last summer. Is figuring out the best methodology and one proposal they are considering is to have summer compensation. That's for compensation, for those of you who are on nine-month salaries, are nine-month pay basis, to be paid once a month rather than twice a month. Okay, just very simple. Once a month. So it'd be three pay periods over the summer. They feel like this would be a much more efficient, given the wide variability of what's processed for summer salary. It also would allow time for the compensation to be adjusted when necessary for low summer enrollments and those kinds of things. And Vice President Caroline Agardy asked if I would simply solicit your feedback on that proposal. Given Mark's reaction, I will not ask for questions now, but please feel free to follow up with me either after the meeting closes or via email. Thank you.

CHAIR COOPER - You can also send information to Bethany Bell. Caroline will be coming to Faculty Welfare at some point too and so that's another avenue.

7. Report of Secretary

There was no report.

8. Report of Chair

CHAIR COOPER - I have a few items and they're all brief. So, if you haven't had the time to look at President Caslen's message to us about African American history month, I suggest you take a look. It includes a call to participate not just this month but every month in realizing the value of diversity on campus. There's resources provided by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. If that's not enough for you or you're in doubt in any way about what you can do to enhance the project of diversity, equity and inclusion on this campus, I am among the people who can connect you to resources. So please do not hesitate to email me.

Second item was the Board. I emailed you some information from the Board Retreat as well as the AGB report that was discussed there. I think the Board deserves a lot of credit for engaging a pretty uncomfortable conversation in a public forum. I think our President deserves a lot of credit for getting them to the table. I know that that was a not an easy lift. I think the Board is trying to confront honestly the need to rebuild trust with the public and campus. And I think a conversation about how to develop good habits of shared governance was a major theme of the retreat.

Everybody knows, I think, that this will take some time. I wanted to show you a slide that lists the seven short term things that the Board has agreed to do, including establishing governance committee code of conduct, oath of office, and statement on outside interference. That's four out of the seven. I can maybe remember the other three in a minute, but I won't do that. Instead, I'll just email you the slide so you have it. So, we should be expecting some action in the next month on those things and we should try to keep an eye on that and hold the Board accountable for making those decisions. So stay tuned, be vigilant on that.

Apropos of accountability. Some of you have yet to have filled out your Conflict of Interest Report and if we are not accountable in fulfilling this requirement the Board has something to say back to us. So please, please, I beg you, fill in the Conflict of Interests Outside Responsibilities Report. Don't make the mistake I made. Do in fact hit submit. If you've received a second email that you didn't think you should be getting, it's probably because you didn't hit submit on your form. So, so fill that in please. We're going to keep emailing you until you do, so fight spam, fill in the form.

The President had asked me to talk about admissions and I had a slide about that from Mary Wagner and I just want to tweak the picture he hastily provided for you, a little bit. Admissions overall are up 11%. 17% out of state. In-state admits are down a percent. That's expected because the high school population of South Carolina is declining. It's in the second year of an anticipated three-year dip.

So all of the growth in admissions' interest is coming from out of state and that's to be expected. There are 49 other big States, we're a tiny one in terms of population. The takeaway is still pretty good. We're on plan. These were the expected numbers. We will provide an opportunity at South Carolina, either

on the Columbia campus or through one of our gateway pathway programs for 97% of South Carolinian graduates. So I think we're doing pretty well there.

Three more items quickly. Provost search everyone wants to know about the provost search. One more day please. There were negotiations about when announcements could occur. I believe we will have complete schedules, candidates, vitas, everything announced tomorrow.

Look for the ad hoc attendance policy committee report out probably by the end of the week. The committee has largely finished its work. I need to write up a letter of transmittal to you. The idea is that we will have some proposals for you to take back and talk about with your units so that when we have a conversation about them in March, we can have some good discussion and hopefully you'll like one of the options and we can approve an attendance policy.

Last item, Budget Governments. So at the end of the last meeting we were talking about the need for unit level, college level conversations about budget. That was interesting to a lot of people. Some schools have got that going. Business for example. Anybody have a conversation like that in their college? Marco, would you care to say how it went?

SENATOR VALTORTA - At our college faculty meeting, I asked to give a presentation on about 10, 15 minutes. And some people took photographs, which made me think that they hadn't really seen the issue such as the new budget model differs from the old, even the state and the governance structure which is what I emphasized. But so I ended asking for comments and suggestions as to have to specialize things for our unit but there were none at that time. I must say this was the last thing in a fairly long meeting. Hope this will continue.

CHAIR COOPER – I don't know how you're feeling, but in light of the survey results, people feeling more or less confident at the department level, but wondering how decisions travel up, concerns about infrastructure, resources, priorities, that trying to build those processes to inform budget development at our college levels might well be one of the most important things we could do in terms of communication, trust-building, shared governance on campus. So I'll just put that idea out there for you to consider. And we can talk about it more at a later meeting. That's my report.

9. Unfinished Business

There were no nominations from the floor and Leon Jackson from English and Chris Xue from Mechanical Engineering were elected to the Committee on Professional Conduct.

10. New Business

SENATOR DOXTADER - I'm sorry to keep people a little bit longer, but this seems to me to be a particular moment of import. We have in our hands a report from SACS, a report from AGB, A strategic plan draft of some various drafts, I suppose. We have survey results and I think there's a tremendous risk that we get distracted and that we miss a couple of things in all of this. We need to talk about those documents. We need to talk about them explicitly relative to the problem of building trust

and enhancing communication and readdressing what the AGB concluded is a fundamentally misguided governance culture.

I don't share your optimism Professor Cooper and I'm very wary of apropos of your comments that we get distracted by the shiny promise of more money. I am very worried that we begin to talk about the presidential search and the events of the past year as if those are things over there.

President Caslen is not in the room. I will say this to him, to his face if he chooses to be here when we have this conversation. But he was a constituent of participant in that search and I don't see authentic leadership being exercised to acknowledge that participation. I don't see, in light of his memo on African American history month and the call for diversity, his acknowledgement of being an aware member of a search which did not feature any diversity in on many registers. I don't see him stepping up or I did not see him stepping up to acknowledge that the search was contested. That there was unequal treatment of the candidates and that that has fundamental implications, I believe, for what authentic leadership might mean and the way in which the President has defined himself as an advocate of character.

I think this is a problem. I think we need to meet as a body to discuss these reports and what they mean relative to the question of building trust, enhancing communication and addressing the governance culture and advancing what professor Cooper has articulated as a strategy of governance. And I would then move to convene a meeting of the Senate dedicated to discussing and to have discussion and assessment of materials and reports including the SACS report, the AGB report, the survey results and the strategic plan.

CHAIR COOPER – A special meeting of the Faculty Senate to be convened before the next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate? That might be a tough one. I think you'd be talking about the last week in February logistically. That's the motion to have a special meeting of the Faculty Senate with discussion of the reports, structured in some way or open report by report or ??

SENATOR DOXTER – [INAUDIBLE]

CHAIR COOPER - Okay, that's very good. So discussion centered on building trust and how we communicate it with those reports as necessary preparation for that discussion.

The motion to hold a special meeting in the last week of February was seconded as passed with no discussion.

11. Good of the Order

There was nothing for the good of the order.

12. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate is Wednesday, March 4, 2020 at 3:00 pm in the Karen J. Williams Courtroom, School of Law.

