

2
3 **THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA FACULTY SENATE**

4
5 Wednesday, April 6, 2022

6 This session was held entirely online.

7 PRESIDING Chair Audrey Korsgaard

8 CHAIR AUDREY KORSGAARD called the meeting to order at 3:00pm EST.

9 **Called Meeting of the Faculty Senate**

10
11 CHAIR KORSGAARD welcomed the members to the Faculty Senate.

12 **Corrections to the minutes:** There were no corrections to the minutes. The minutes were
13 approved as written.

14 **REPORT OF THE OFFICERS**

15
16 INTERIM PRESIDENT PASTIDES (hereafter President Pastides) stated that he is delighted to
17 be here and thanked the Faculty Senate. The President updated the Senate on the Provost and the
18 VPR search. Dr. Pastides anticipated that the individuals will be presented to the Board of
19 Trustees (hereafter referred to as The Board) at the April meeting for preapproval. The provost is
20 being approved by the President-Elect Amiridis. The VPR is being approved by Dr. Pastides.
21 Both positions will be announced by the end of spring 2022 semester.

22 Regarding legislative activity that would restrict academic freedom, there is guardedly good
23 news. With a lot of hard work by the State's lobbyists and help from the Commission on Higher
24 Education, wording was eliminated from the bill regarding Higher Education. This means the bill
25 now focuses on K-12. The reason President Pastides calls this guardedly good news is because
26 the bill focuses' its impact on K-12. The bill will not impact the University of South Carolina or
27 any public colleges.

28 Members of the university administration (e.g., the president, provost, and senate chair) were
29 involved in working with the Commission on Higher Education in drafting and sending letter to
30 make a clear statement regarding academic integrity, why the bill is not good for Higher
31 Education, and the importance of protecting academic freedom. Provost Cutler sent a letter to the
32 Carolina community in February reiterating our commitment to protect academic freedom. Very
33 few things are more important to our faculty.

34 Going forward, the university administration plans to meet with faculty organizations on campus,
35 caucuses, and others to affirm our support of academic freedom on campus. This is a national
36 phenomenon. Approximately 50% of the states have similar legislation. Sometimes it involves
37 CRT but not always. This presents UofSC and perhaps Faculty Senate with the opportunity to
38 present a vocal job on what we do. We help students think more clearly; we don't teach them
39 what to think. We help them think multiple points of view.

40 President Pastides will join the faculty on July 1, 2022. It is expected that people understand
41 what is accomplished at the university, however there is always room for education. Lobbyists

42 have explained that the major force in removing Higher Education from this legislation was the
43 testimony provided by faculty colleagues. They were universally appreciated and did a great job
44 at educating the legislators about the damage the proposed bill would invoke. In the future, and
45 certainly next year, there may be opportunities for the faculty to collaborate with the
46 administration. It is our (i.e., administrators) responsibility to speak up on behalf of the faculty.
47 In a more collaborative approach, bring legislators into conversations with faculty to better
48 understand what we try to do and why freedom to teach in the way we have been mentored is a
49 positive thing. This is down the road.

50 Conversation and attention have been paid to a restructuring bill introduced in South Carolina
51 House of Representatives. This would amend and reduce the size of the Board of Trustees. This
52 passed the House nearly unanimously. President Pastides could not speak to the chances of this
53 bill passing in the Senate. No mention of the faculty representative on the Board of Trustees was
54 included in this bill. University administration is working to hopefully find out that this was an
55 oversight or omission. This information will be confirmed with Faculty Senate at the earliest
56 possible moment. A student member and alumni member were mentioned in the bill, but no
57 faculty member. President Pastides does believe this was an oversight. If it was not an oversight,
58 there is work to be done.

59 The University is trying to support Ukrainian colleagues (i.e., faculty, student members). It is
60 still early to have detailed plans in place. UofSC is collaborating with other universities. Dr.
61 Pastides stated that if he is still President for UofSC, he will try to find ways to welcome
62 displaced Ukrainian scholars and students. Also, hopefully find resources to help these
63 individuals. More concrete details will be available in the next few weeks regarding the support
64 the University is able to offer. Dean Tracey Weldon (Dean of the Graduate School) is working
65 with concerned faculty across campus.

66 INTERIM PROVOST CUTLER (hereafter referred to Provost Cutler) thanked the Faculty
67 Senate for the time. The U.S. News and World Report rankings were just released. The
68 University is recognized. The International MBA program retained its #1 ranking for the 9th
69 consecutive year. The School of Medicine in Columbia maintained its spot as the top medical
70 program in the country for graduates who practice in underserved rural areas; we know this is
71 very important to provide. The Law School moved up 12 categories. Dean Hubbard has been
72 very active and engaged in ensuring he advances in the ranking. The School of Public Health
73 improved 10 spots, in particular with biostatistics. Thanks to all who made these efforts
74 successful.

75 Updates on dean searches include the following: The College of Education is active and
76 underway. The second meeting has been held. The search for the Dean of Libraries has been
77 active for several months. This coming Monday is the deadline for applications. The deadline
78 can be extended if needed (e.g., for diversity). The committee will begin reviewing applications
79 shortly. The VPR and Dean of Graduate Studies searches have been underway and have been
80 wrapped up. Recommendations have been forwarded to Provost Cutler. Announcements will be
81 made shortly.

82 There are several academic leadership positions throughout the University available. These
83 include: a) Director of Education Abroad, b) Faculty Principal of Green Quad, and c) Director
84 for the Center for Integrative and Experiential Learning. Faculty are encouraged to look into
85 these positions. Information on each position is available on the Provost's website.

86 Blueprint activities are ongoing. The schools are doing well in this process. Information on the
87 Blueprint will be disseminated at an upcoming Faculty Senate meeting.

88 Faculty Awards Day will be held April 27th. JEFF TWISS (College of Arts & Sciences) was
89 announced as our SEC Faculty Achievement Award Recipient. SANJAY AHIRE (Moore School
90 of Business) was recognized as one of the top 50 undergraduate business professors in the world
91 by Poets & Quants.

92 Academic freedom is so very important to us. PROVOST CUTLER emphasized his support for
93 academic freedom. He issued a letter to the faculty regarding his support on this issue (letter
94 dated February 9th).

95 The University administration worked with the Commission on Higher Education to draft a letter
96 that went to members of the General Assembly. PROVOST CUTLER signed the letter on behalf
97 of the faculty.

98 SENATOR VALTORTA asked for clarification regarding the process when a tornado warning is
99 issued, when faculty are teaching. PROVOST CUTLER stated that when there is inclement
100 weather, everyone needs to make personal decisions in relation to his or her own safety. The
101 University was monitoring the weather conditions closely. The University has advanced warning
102 systems. By 3:30pm the most serious part of the storm had passed. There was a quick and
103 unexpected flareup.

104 CHAIR KORSGAARD received a question from a faculty member. Richland One schools
105 closed early. It was understood that UofSC followed Richland One closure processes. What is
106 the relationship between the closure process and Richland One? PROVOST CUTLER stated that
107 he doesn't know the exact law for the state of South Carolina. His understanding is that if County
108 government closes, then all government entities within that entity will close. Provost Cutler can't
109 speak for Richland County school closures. The county government did not close.

110 *Questions through the chat:*

- 111 • *Is there an update on the Graduate Dean Search?* PROVOST CUTLER reminded faculty
112 he mentioned this earlier. This search is in the final stages. An announcement has not yet
113 been made because the hire has not been made in writing.
- 114 • *There is some concern regarding not knowing the correct procedure when a tornado is*
115 *announced. Does the University have a procedure?* PROVOST CUTLER stated that the
116 University does have procedures on when a tornado announcement is issued. No matter
117 where a person is located, get to a low-lying area (e.g., a ditch). If you are in a building,
118 get in the center of the building. Provost Cutler will encourage the emergency
119 management team to add this information to the system.

120 • *Are there any updates on COVID?* The numbers remain low. With 1400 tests, the
121 positivity rate is approximately 1%. The University continues to monitor the situation.

122 SENATOR MINETTE asked a) if contract tracing is still happening and b) should faculty
123 continue to keep seating charts. PROVOST CUTLER stated that if faculty are keeping a seating
124 chart, he recommended to continue the practice. Contract tracing is still taking place. The
125 numbers are low.

126 SENATOR MINETTE asked when HEPA filters will be replaced. PROVOST CUTLER stated
127 that it is his understanding that facilities is monitoring the filters. Provost Cutler stated that he
128 will check up on this issue. The White House just issued a statement that HEPA filters are
129 effective in rooms like classrooms.

130 SENATOR BROWN asked for updates on number of virus cases. PROVOST CUTLER was
131 unsure of the number as of the day of the Faculty Senate meeting. Provost Cutler thinks that the
132 cases are probably going down because Dr. Jason Stacy has not notified Provost Cutler.

133 **REPORTS FROM FACULTY COMMITTEES**

134 **Committee on Curricula & Courses**

135 CHAIR WINCHESTER presented 49 proposals from six units. They are as follows:
136

Unit	N
College of Arts & Sciences	26
College of Business	5
College of Education	2
College of Hospitality, Retail & Sport Management	3
College of Information & Communication	1
School of Music	12

137
138 SENATOR STERN noticed two cross-listed courses. CHAIR WINCHESTER stated that the
139 courses brought up by Senator Stern are not up for consideration. The courses were discussed on
140 Monday at the C&C meeting and is not up for approval yet. This will be up for approval at the
141 June meeting.

142 SENATOR ABSHIRE (nursing) received notifications regarding review changes. Is this a glitch
143 in the system? TRENA HOUP stated that in the new APPS system everyone can view (i.e., see)
144 the information and is receiving FYI emails. This has been changed. You can still access all
145 proposals, but you will no longer be receiving FYI emails.

146 A poll was provided. All 49 proposals were approved.

147 **Faculty Advisory Committee**

148 DR. HEIM stated that three proposals will be addressed at this meeting: 1) Judication Processes
149 and Faculty Bullying Civility Policy, 2) Creation of a Resolution and Review Team, and 3)
150 Consensual Relationships policy.

151 Judication Processes and Faculty Bullying Civility Policy was addressed first. This is a motion to
152 adopt this policy. SENATOR KHUSHF brought this policy to his department. Regarding the
153 value of the old policy, one person in Senator Khushf's department (who had served as chair)
154 noted that when he has to deal with borderline behavior, he would refer the person to the policy.
155 The policy would be pointed out when behavior was on the edge of being prohibited. Individuals
156 responded to the information.

157 The motivation for the change, an additional concern along this line. If you are brought to a
158 policy and told you are being uncivil, incivility may be used in a way that is much broader.
159 While it is very clear that if you are bullying someone, that is a bad action and that needs to stop.

160 Changing the wording from bullying to incivility, another faculty member raised a concern about
161 how this potentially leads to abuse. The concern is there are not examples presented. The
162 examples in the revised policy are those that would have been counted as bullying under the old
163 policy. Once identified as uncivil, (for example in Table 1) where constructs and definitions are
164 given where bullying versus incivility are presented. Incivility is defined as low intensity deviant
165 acts such as rude or discourteous verbal or nonverbal behaviors. Some examples provided
166 include:

- 167 • Little attention is paid to your statements.
- 168 • Showable interest in your opinion.
- 169 • Unwanted attempts to draw you into discussion.

170 These statements do come under incivility. They should not seem to be the type of things that
171 should be the focus of the policy because of the ambiguity of those circumstances. Especially
172 because it is tied to the definition that allows for a subjective complaint. Related to the definition,
173 incivility does not serve a purpose. How incivility is stated is purposely ambiguous. Anything
174 someone would view as uncivil would ever serve a purpose. It could also mean that if the
175 behavior is serving a purpose, it is automatically not uncivil. The latter would allow for acts of
176 bullying if the person said it is serving some purpose. We wouldn't want to allow this to happen.

177 CHAIR KORSGAARD responded to the comments. There appears to be ~~antidotal~~ anecdotal
178 evidence from SENATOR KHUSHF'S department (as just stated) that the existing policy (i.e.,
179 last policy) is effective. Evidence from the Faculty Civility Advocate is opposite. There are zero
180 causes found by complaints that went to the Faculty Civility Advocate. This suggests that the
181 definition is excessively high. The definition has been modeled after the definition of sexual
182 harassment, which is a different phenomenon and is also a legal definition. FAC is trying to
183 develop a policy that comes from before breaking the law. FAC is looking for a range of
184 behavior that we do not find is consonant with our values and that is not constructive for our
185 culture and our work environment, but not necessarily a legal issue. While it might have been
186 your local experience that the policy was working well, this is not the case university wide.

187 Regarding SENATOR KHUSHF'S comments of the potential for weaponizing the incivility
188 policy, CHAIR KORSGAARD stated that this policy will be linked to progressive discipline
189 which is an HR or ACAF policy. It is a violation of the policy to provide frivolous or false

190 claims. This is a mechanism by which the university can discourage abuse of the incivility
191 policy.

192 Regarding SENATOR KHUSHF’S comment that incivility does not serve a purpose, CHAIR
193 KORSGAARD stated that this section was added because of a comment made by Senator
194 Khushf during an earlier Faculty Senate meeting. Specifically, if someone stated that the
195 behavior was unsettling, can happen during academic discourse. It can happen when someone is
196 presenting a paper and there are serious flaws in the research. If a person brings up the flaws, this
197 serves a purpose. When there are unsettling comments about research, it is not classified as
198 uncivil behavior. FAC want to make sure difficult messages can be heard as long as they are
199 delivered in a compassionate manner.

200 SENATOR HUNTER (Art Department) stated that a colleague in her department is concerned
201 about the nuances of the language. The definition is overly broad.

202 CHAIR KORSGAARD stated that the university tries to not have the Faculty Manual be overly
203 precise. When adjudicating situations, it is a progressive discipline situation. Faculty will not be
204 fired or have tenure removed because someone brought up issue of incivility or said they made a
205 disturbing comment. There is a series of steps for corrective actions (e.g., counseling).

206 SENATOR SCHRAMM-PATE asked for clarification on the intent to ~~remove~~replace the word
207 bullying with incivility. CHAIR KORSGAARD stated that the word “incivility” was used
208 because it is linked with a particular role the Faculty Civility Advocate. The definition (i.e.,
209 standard) of bullying (now called incivility) is now more liberal than it was previously. This is
210 the intent of the change. The substantial amount of the revisions of the policy have more to do
211 with adjudication procedures, which were inconsistent with Provost’s policy.

212 SENATOR SCHRAMM-PATE stated that there is a predominant consensual framework for
213 bullying in Higher Education. There is not a lot of research on bullying in Higher Education.
214 Most of the scholarship centers around destructive leadership, use of supervision, workplace
215 bullying, incivility, and bully syndrome. All centers around aberrant psychological type
216 behaviors. There are various reasons why individuals would create a hostile work environment
217 for someone (e.g., personal reasons). Senator Schramm-Pate read the minutes from the prior
218 meeting and the perceived the word “bullying” could be problematic to the committee.

219 CHAIR KORSGAARD agreed that the word bullying was problematic to the committee. The
220 word incivility is more expansive to encompass the concept of bullying. The attachment to the
221 minutes includes a literature review on the subject. The phenomenon in organizations is
222 probably similar to what we see in Higher Education. That literature review demonstrates a
223 conceptual and operational overlap between the construct of incivility, bullying, and other
224 similar constructs. It is part of a broad phenomenon of counterproductive or antisocial behavior
225 in the workplace all of which are predictive of a number of adverse outcomes for the individual
226 and the workplace.

227 SENATOR SCHRAMM-PATE stated she heard from several members of her colleagues that the
228 word bullying should not be removed. Incivility could mean someone had his or her feelings
229 hurt.

230 CHAIR KORSGAARD stated that SENATOR SCHRAMM-PATE’S statement regarding hurt
231 feelings is inaccurate. Senator Schramm-Pate was encouraged to read the document.

232 CHAIR KORSGAARD stated that if there is a disturbing comment during a brown bag because
233 the research was inferior, the comment was not incivility. The presenter needed to hear the
234 comment. SENATOR SCHRAMM-PATE agreed with this information however stated that the
235 terms are different. Chair Korsgaard thank Senator Schramm-Pate for her comments and invited
236 her to read the document carefully.

237 SENATOR MINETTE asked about “interim measures” (page 8-9). In the case of misconduct
238 that presents a threat, the faculty member may be reassigned or suspended pending the outcome
239 of an investigation. If there is no wrongdoing established, the suspended faculty member will be
240 reinstated (see ACFAC 1.82). Senator Minette was unable to find ACFAC 1.82. Is this a new
241 policy?

242 CHAIR KORSGAARD stated that this is a new policy. SENATOR MINETTE asked for
243 additional information on this policy.

244 VICE PROVOST ADDY responded to the request for additional information on this policy. A
245 suspension would happen only in a very extreme situation when the allegation was so egregious
246 that such a strong step would be recommended. The policy in development parallels the HR
247 policy on progressive discipline. The sequence of discipline being addressed is as follows:

248 Sequence of Discipline

- 249 • Oral warning first.
- 250 • Written warning probation. Probation has not been in writing in policy before. It has
251 been used in some of the EOP or Title IX cases.
- 252 • Administrative reassignment. This is when the faculty member is given different
253 responsibilities which remove the faculty member from the situation.
- 254 • Demotion. The university is not proposing a rank ~~pro~~demotion as a method of discipline.
255 By state definition, demotion can include removal of administrative responsibilities, or
256 temporary salary adjustment.
- 257 • Suspension. The university, by state law, cannot suspend with pay. Reassignment can be
258 administrative modified duties that may result in the person not being on campus, or
259 define what the faculty member is able to do when on campus. Suspension goes one step
260 further, whereby the university stated “we are not comfortable with the faculty member
261 working for the institution temporarily until more information is understood”. There has
262 been one external allegation that was so severe that suspension was recommended
263 without pay. The situation was resolved within two days; there wasn’t even a break. In
264 this particular case, law enforcement was involved.

265 SENATOR MINETTE asked for clarification that per state law, the university cannot suspend
266 with pay. If the act is so egregious and the only action is to suspend, the university must suspend
267 without pay. VICE-PROVOST ADDY confirmed that yes, per the state law, if a person is
268 suspended, it must be without pay.

269 SENATOR MCGILL thanked the committee and stated that the terms bullying, and incivility are
270 difficult terms to define and explain. Senator McGill asked for clarification on whether the brief
271 review of workplace incivility will be placed at the end of the document. CHAIR KORSGAARD
272 stated that this information will not be part of the document; it was just to assist in providing
273 context.

274 SENATOR MCGILL also asked for confirmation that if the vote was affirmative, UofSC would
275 have a faculty appellate panel instead of a grievance committee. The faculty appellate panel will
276 deal with workplace incivility. SENATOR MARK COOPER responded to Senator McGill. Part
277 of the rationale for the change was that the university had two committees that required faculty
278 membership to have the same qualifications. The two committees were the Faculty Grievance
279 Committee and the Professional Conduct Committee. The committees were hard to staff and had
280 very light workloads. The new system will make the appellate process a bit more uniform. The
281 Grievance Committee is now known as the Faculty Appellate Panel. CHAIR KORSGAARD
282 added that both committees require quite a bit of training to be a member. It is better to have one
283 smaller group than two groups since the training is extensive.

284 Poll to approve the document was issued. The motion passes.

285 **Resolution Review Team**

286 DR. HEIN presented a document to develop a Resolution Review Team. This will help faculty
287 with the preparation of motions that come before the Faculty Senate. In the past, wordsmithing
288 was conducted during meetings. It is difficult to determine “who said what and what content
289 needs to be changed”.

290 SENATOR STERN appreciated the shift from “must to should” in this version as well as the
291 guidance in crafting sound motions. A concern was raised regarding a lack of clarity in some of
292 the review criteria. Specifically “...the Resolution Review Team will review all resolutions
293 submitted to the Faculty Senate pursuant to the criteria established by the Faculty Senate”. “It
294 will create and maintain the guidelines for submission review and format of resolutions”. It is not
295 quite clear what the criteria will mean. The information is valuable. It would be better if it was
296 not as a requirement but as part of the faculty toolbox or a recommendation.

297 CHAIR KORSGAARD stated that it is her understanding that the standards (i.e., criteria) are
298 laid out in the portion of the document. The area entitled “preparation” includes guidelines for
299 the preparation of resolutions. The team does not function as a gatekeeper. Although they review
300 resolutions, they will not stop a document from being presented at Faculty Senate. Some issues
301 will be fixed (e.g., labels). The function, again, is not to gatekeep.

302 PARLIAMENTARIAN BILL SUDDUTH stated that the suggestions under preparation should
303 not be treated as a checklist that has to be satisfied in every case. It is just some general

304 guidelines to help get the process going as smoothly and cleanly as possible. CHAIR
305 KORSGAARD stated that the review does not include a decision by the team. The team has no
306 decision-making authority.

307 PARLIAMENTARIAN BILL SUDDUTH stated that the content and the goals of the document
308 will be examined. The team's goal is to help the resolution succeed.

309 SENATOR THORNE speaks as someone who has presented a resolution to the Faculty Senate.
310 He stated his appreciation to the sentiment that this document is designed to help senators. The
311 leadership of the Faculty Senate is very comfortable with formal process. Some faculty may be
312 intimidated with this document. This document may deter faculty from writing a resolution.
313 Senator Throne requests that the document specifically state that "we (i.e., the resolution review
314 team) are here to help and guide and advise. As written, the current document reads as if the
315 guidelines are rules.

316 CHAIR KORSGAARD stated that the Student Senate has a speaker pro tem and that person
317 cleans up all resolutions. As such, all resolutions are similar in format. The document under
318 consideration is to help faculty edit the document themselves prior to sending it to Faculty
319 Senate for a vote. The goal is to avoid meetings where the focus of the resolution is editing the
320 document. This is not meant to be a mandate. It is designed to avoid meetings where we edit
321 resolutions.

322 SENATOR KHUSHF inquired how the process would work when a resolution comes quickly.
323 This seems very valuable especially when a resolution comes into someone's head early enough.
324 This seems like a very stable resource. The worry is when something comes up more quickly or a
325 resolution might be made in relation to something that has been posted for the first time five days
326 before the meeting on the Faculty Senate webpage. It seems that it requires a mechanism where
327 first you have to make a motion so you can introduce something that wasn't vetted by it. And
328 that motion, whatever complications you have in defense of the resolution. Senator Khushf stated
329 that he doesn't understand how the requirement part of this works if the faculty member didn't
330 have lead time for vetting.

331 PARLIAMENTARIAN BILL SUDDUTH stated that the motion to suspend the rule is a motion
332 that accomplishes two things; you suspend the rule and you make the motion that you wish to
333 make. You are not voting to suspend the rule and then voting to submit the motion. You are
334 actually voting to do it as a single motion. You aren't caught up in the formal rules that are
335 similar to that of the United States House and Congress. You are suspending the standing rules.
336 This does not need a 2/3rd vote because you are not suspending the bylaws. You are suspending a
337 standing rule; standing rules can be suspended on a majority vote. That is why this is being put in
338 the standing rule and not the bylaws. You can suspend the bylaw with just a majority vote if
339 there is notice. If I am a Senator and I provide notice at this meeting that I want to suspend the
340 bylaw for the June meeting, as long as I provide notice at the prior meeting and obtain a majority
341 vote, a 2/3rd vote is not needed. You only need a majority vote.

342 A poll was issued regarding the Resolution Review Team motion. The motion carries.

343 DR. HEIN presented the provided the proposed motion on Consensual Relationships. CHAIR
 344 KORSGAARD reminded the Senators that the proposed motion was shared at last month’s
 345 Faculty Senate meeting. On the website for today’s agenda, initially, the wrong document was
 346 posted. The correct document has since been posted.

347 A poll was issued regarding the Consensual Relationship motion. The motion carries.

348 CHAIR KORSGAARD thanked the Committee for their efforts. The group worked for more
 349 than one year on this motion.

350 SENATOR STERN presented information regarding INDEV. Results from InDev’s survey of
 351 Senators (December 2021-March 2022) was presented. The Faculty Senate Committee on
 352 Instructional Development (INDEV) was charged with proposing a process for revisions to the
 353 Carolina Core. Thirty-nine responses were gathered. There is a clear preference for committee
 354 configuration Option C. Thirty-four Senators voted for Option C as strongly in favor versus one
 355 vote for Option A and one vote for Option B. A preference was also stated that the Faculty
 356 Senate elect the committee chair. This preference would be through a supermajority (i.e., 2/3rd
 357 vote). Results of the survey have been distributed.

358 The Committee will do the following:

- 359 • Conduct robust benchmarking research to see what peer/aspirant institutions with
- 360 successful gen ed requirements are doing to inform our process;
- 361 • Consult research on teaching and learning regarding best practices; and
- 362 • Consult with departments that offer many Carolina Core courses to learn about the
- 363 complexities and logistical factors that influence teaching these courses.

364 The proposed Committee representation will include:

Proposed Committee Representation			
Voting Faculty Members		Ex-Officio/Non-Voting Member	
<i>College or School (in alphabetical order)</i>	<i>Number of Representatives</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Number of Representatives</i>
Arts and Sciences	5	Provost	1
Business	2	University Advising Center	1
Education	1	University Libraries	1
Engineering & Computing	2		
HRSM	1		
Information & Communications	1		
Music	1		
Nursing	1		
Palmetto	1		
Pharmacy	1		
Public Health	1		
Social Work	1		

365 The proposed process has six steps:

- 366 1. Formation of the committee, to be approved by the Senate. Each college is encouraged to
367 have a process who they wish to nominate. The Senate approves the slate and elects the
368 committee chair.
- 369 2. Data collection and review.
- 370 3. Report to the Faculty Senate and stakeholders.
- 371 4. Proposals for revision.
- 372 5. Faculty Senate votes on proposals. If the proposal(s) is not approved, CCRRC returns to
373 step 4.
- 374 6. Implementation.

375 *Step 1: Formation of the CCRRC described:*

376 Each college/unit will determine their own internal process for election. The slate of
377 representatives will be approved by the Senate. The Chair of the committee is selected by the
378 Senate. All members except non-voting members and those who withdraw from consideration
379 are eligible for the role of Chair.

380 *Step 2: Data collection and review described:*

381 Data collection and review will be global. Peer and peer aspirant information will be collected.
382 Data will include relevant accreditation requirements and recommendations. “Robust
383 benchmarking research” will include best practices for a) general education, b) diversity, equity,
384 and inclusion, c) staffing, and d) staffing.

385 Regarding local data collection, there will be Carolina Core Assessment reports. Infrastructure
386 and internal practices, including software and advising, major map structures, and course
387 approval structure, online course offerings etc.

388 Reported issues with Carolina Core include transfer difficulties (internal and external),
389 assessment issues, accreditation issues, overlay issues, inconsistent practices among programs
390 will be examined.

391 Stakeholder engagement: Solicit and respond to a diverse set of stakeholders, including two
392 categories a) required and b) suggested. Required stakeholder engagement will include the
393 entities below:

- 394 • Faculty at department and program levels
- 395 • Deans
- 396 • APLS
- 397 • Academic advisors
- 398 • Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
- 399 • Current students
- 400 • OIRAA
- 401 • Libraries
- 402 • Palmetto college

403 • President's office

404 *Recommended stakeholder engagement includes*

- 405 • Alumni
- 406 • Graduate students teaching in the Core
- 407 • Business partners in industry

408 *Step 3: Report to Senate and other stakeholders.*

409 CCRRC will present a summary of the findings.

410 *Step 4: Development and Presentation of a Proposal for Improvement.*

411 Proposals will be developed in conversation with the various stakeholders. CCRRC will keep all interested parties throughout the process, soliciting and responding to ideas and concerns.

413 Proposals may include a range of adjustments to small changes that can be taken care of quickly to larger shifts in General Education. The Committee may wish to consider a truly common core among the many colleges.

416 *Step 5: Approval through Faculty Senate.*

417 CCRRC will advance proposals through Faculty Senate with a supermajority (2/3rds vote).

418 Proposals will be distributed to Senators at least two weeks prior to a Faculty Senate meeting. To ensure Senators have ample time to consult with their colleagues, the Faculty Senate vote will come no sooner than the Senate meeting following the initial meeting.

421 *Step 6: Implementation.*

422 If revisions are accepted, the Faculty Senate on Curricula & Courses will develop a process for implementation in consultation with the Office of Academic Programs and the Registrar. Any implementation plan(s) will be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval. Many checkpoints have been built into the process.

426 Thanks are extended to Dr. Sandra Kelly, Claire Robinson, Jenn Tilford, and Catherine Studemeyer. Appreciation and thanks are extended to the Carolina Core Committee. Members included Leslie Lovelace (chair), Annie Bourbonnais, Darin Freeburg, Valerie Lookingbill, Mark Minett, Aisha Haynes, Trena Houpp, and La Trice Ratcliff-Small. Also, thanks to all participating InDev members including Annie Bourbonnais, Wanda Fenimore, Darin Freeburg, John Gerdes, Ramy Harik, Valerie Lookingbill, Leslie Lovelace, Haylee Mercado, Mark Minett, Allan Pangburn, Stacy Winchester, Aisha Haynes, Trena Houpp, and La Trice Ratcliff.

433 Feedback and suggestions are welcome. The proposed document will be shared with Senators.

434 CHAIR KORSGAARD reiterated her thanks to InDev and the subcommittee for the work. This was a heavy lift. Results of the survey are attached to the agenda.

436 **Faculty Welfare Committee Report**

437 SENATOR HENDERSON-PLATT provided an update on access to the Blatt facility. Faculty
438 Welfare Committee (hereafter referred to as Committee) has met with constituents regarding the
439 fees. It is the plan of the Committee to work with several other entities across campus to support
440 an application toward the support unit allocation committee in the late summer/early fall to
441 address the fees.

442 In addition, the Faculty Welfare Committee continues to have ongoing conversations with the
443 Provost's Office regarding COVID and post-COVID education including the use of student
444 evaluations during COVID (i.e., best practices). Senators should know that faculty and their
445 chairs should be using guidance regarding the use of faculty evaluations. This information has
446 been shared. Please ensure that chairs are using this guidance. In addition, ongoing conversations
447 exist regarding the unequal impact on caregivers, particularly women faculty members and how
448 to strategize career disruption, development, and redevelopment.

449 Some concerns have been raised regarding EDA accommodations. These have been updated.
450 Accommodations and information should be sent out soon. Parking is an ongoing issue,
451 particularly during a special event. The Committee is working on this issue.

452 SENATOR NAGEL asked if the Committee would be able to address the issues of traffic safety,
453 speeding, and running red lights. SENATOR HENDERSON-PLATT stated that these issues
454 have not been brought up in the past. These issues are valid for this committee, and will be
455 brought up to the Committee.

456 **Committee on Professional-Track Faculty**

457 CHAIR KORSGAARD thanked the Committee on Professional-Track Faculty for their hard
458 work. The Committee is doing very important work.

459 **Secretary's Report**

460 SENATOR BICKLE shared exciting news. Volunteers are needed for university-wide committee
461 positions. These positions include IT Committee (one year), two members are needed for
462 Curricula & Courses, FAC (one year), Senate-Chair elect. Please send your name or
463 recommendation.

464 **Chair's Report**

465 CHAIR KORSGAARD stated that after 30 years in academia, her position as Senate Chair is
466 teaching her a new skill set. It is a wonderful learning experience; it is fun and exciting. You will
467 get to know the university community on every facet (i.e., faculty, staff, administration, students)
468 in a different and wonderful way. Chair Korsgaard stated that she feels proud to be part of the
469 university and in this role. This position is also compensated. Considering the new structure of
470 the Board of Trustees, it will be important to have a committed person in this role, especially to
471 help ~~user~~usher the Board into the role of collaboration of governance.

472 Another upcoming opening is the Faculty Athletic Representative. This will be announced by the
473 Provost.

474

475 Two recent resolutions are under considerations. One resolution was regarding investigating
476 divesting funds from the fossil fuels industry. The report was excellent. The Committee worked
477 with the foundations in developing the report. The foundations received the report. CHAIR
478 KORSGAARD received a progress report from Jason Caskey, from the foundations. He was
479 invited to a Faculty Senate meeting to discuss the status of the activity.

480 The second resolution was advanced from the Social Justice Committee. The resolution was on
481 academic freedom and Critical Race Theory (CRT). Some aspects of the resolution were already
482 in progress. Some of the work has been going on behind the scenes. In addition, the President
483 will be meeting with the Committee to ensure their concerns are being addressed.

484 CHAIR KORSGAARD thanked senior higher administration and the Commission on Higher
485 Education for their collaborative efforts in producing a letter regarding teaching and academic
486 freedom. The efforts are very much appreciated. The hard work toward protecting Higher
487 Education is acknowledged. Chair Korsgaard also thanked and acknowledged the faculty
488 members' testimony to legislators regarding what we teach.

489 There is pending legislation regarding the structure of the Board of Trustees and how it did not
490 include a Faculty Senate chair representative. The current statute doesn't specify either the
491 Faculty Senate Chair or the Student Senate Chair, however, our bylaws permit it to be. The
492 proposed legislation only references the Student Senate Chair. Chair Korsgaard has been in
493 communication with the Administration and articulated the justification for why the Faculty
494 Senate Chair should be on the Committee.

495 CHAIR KORSGAARD will be meeting with the incoming PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS as part of
496 this onboarding. Please forward concerns or suggestions via email to Chair Korsgaard.

497 *Included in the chat:* SENATOR VALTORTA stated that an Associate Professor or Full
498 Professor is qualified for Faculty Senate Chair. CHAIR KORSGAARD thanked Senator Valtorta
499 for the information. Caution was given to Associate Professors. The Senate Chair position
500 requires a great deal of service time.

501 **Old business:** none

502 SENATOR NAGEL reminded faculty that the ad hoc committee on Environmental
503 Sustainability has produced a report. The report was presented at the end of the last Faculty
504 Senate meeting. Please circulate the report to your faculty. Direct comments or questions to
505 Senator Nagel. The report is in the Faculty Senate files.

506 CHAIR KORSGAARD stated that the file is located under the March 2022 meeting file.

507 **Good of the order:** none

508

509 The meeting adjourned at 4:57pm EST