1 2 3 4 5	https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_MWJiY2FkNDEtMTlhMC00NTlkLTk2YjMtZjRiNDkzMTQ1YzBl%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%224b2a4b19-d135-420e-8bb2-b1cd238998cc%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%220bb698ef-7d87-46c5-9dd6-1e40607d2783%22%2c%22IsBroadcastMeeting%22%3atrue%7d
7 8	THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA FACULTY SENATE
9 10 11 12 13	Wednesday, February 7, 2023 This session was held in person at the Russell House Building PRESIDING CHAIR WAYNE OUTTEN CHAIR Wayne Outten called the meeting to order at 3:00pm EST.
14	Called Meeting of the Faculty Senate
15	CHAIR OUTTEN welcomed the members to the Faculty Senate meeting.
16 17	Approval of the December 6, 2023, Faculty Senate meeting minutes : Minutes were approved.
18 19 20 21	CHAIR WAYNE OUTTEN welcomed Faculty Senators back from the break to the first meeting of the semester.
22 23 24 25	Chair of the USC Board of Trustees (hereafter BOT), MR. THAD WESTBROOK thanked the Senate for the opportunity to come back and speak to the faculty Senate. It is his fifth time speaking in front of the Senate.
26 27 28 29 30 31	BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK'S plan is to discuss what the board is accomplishing. It's an exciting time for the university. Things with the board are going very well. We're very excited about the work that we're doing right now. We're in a growth mode here at the university. Information will be forthcoming about the number of applications. Columbia is experiencing another record setting number of applications as demonstrated by the freshman class last year.
32 33 34	Things are very exciting for the university regarding its finances. We are strong with the AA Fitch rating being reaffirmed last week.
35 36 37 38 39 40 41	With the new president, the board is working in tandem to continue to push the university forward. The board is conducting governance work. Last year we developed a work matrix; a governance plan consists of a methodical review of our bylaws and policies. There are a variety of policies and things that we were working through to make sure we as a board are functioning in a way that is best for the University of South Carolina and fulfilling our mission, our students and to the state.

BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK stated that the board received a presentation on master facilities planning. There was an article in the Daily Gamecock about that this topic. The presentation was from consultant Sasaki. The consultant provided a variety of ideas. Some are short term opportunities. Some are very much long-term aspirational opportunities. It's a chance for the board to work with the administration and be forward thinking.

The BOT has not received a recommendation from the administration. There will be an effort from the President and his office to come to us. The board will not act on ideas or concepts until the President comes to the and says, "this is what we're recommending." The board will look at it and thoughtfully consider where we go with projects. Some projects are smaller, almost shovel ready. Other proposed projects are "a bucket of you know there won't be too far down the road, but they'll be coming here soon." There is another group of projects that are designated as aspirational.

 There are a variety of projects that from time to time the board will sponsor or will lead (e.g., desegregation monument honoring the three students who desegregated the university). You may have read about that monument that will be placed in front of the in front of McKissick on the Horseshoe. That is a board-led project that has been ongoing. They've been working on this for a while and we are thinking that in the late spring the project, the monument will be erected and will have a dedication. An invitation will be sent to two of the students and the family of the third student. This is another exciting opportunity.

The desegregation monument project was not a finance or building policy; it was however, a board-led effort that is important to us. It is important to the university to recognize the contributions of the three students.

The BOT has been working on free expression on campus. There was a report late last summer about free speech on campus. Candidly, BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK doesn't think it accurately reflected where we are here at the University of South Carolina, but it certainly was an opportunity for some introspection and some consideration of free speech on campus that coupled with the rise in tensions on campuses across the United States, was a time for us to reflect on where we are as a campus.

 USC had as a body adopted the Chicago of Principles in June. USC is around the 108th university or college in the United States to adopt those principles. We certainly had the opportunity to review the input from the Faculty Senate. We took a couple of months, looked at that, talked to the President about that, and then decided to move forward with the principles as written. At the same time, USC started working on revisions to some policies and just to look at where we are. For example, there's a university policy, I think [UNIV] 6.00 that we looked at that deals with hanging flyers or statements in public spaces. There was a requirement that a student organization's name be on the flyer. That was thought to be potentially suppressive of free speech. The policy does allow for anonymous posting, flyers, or statements.

There are things like that we were working on that will be coming down the pipe that you're here about. We certainly want our campus to be one where all perspectives are heard. People are able to engage in civil discourse both on campus whether it's in the classroom or in public

spaces, and people can choose for themselves what they believe and where they go with a particular idea. We certainly would reject any type of effort to engage in a heckler's veto. That is another issue that we've been talking about and been working on is ongoing.

BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK encourages faculty to look at the BOT website. Chair Westbrook started the annual report two years ago. He was elected to the position two years ago in August 2022. This is his first term as chair. He can be reelected for one more term if the board chooses. In Chair Westbrook's is in first term as chair, he decided to start doing the annual report. This is an idea that he borrowed from the Chair of the Board of Regents of Kansas. She is a graduate of USC, and she called to talk to us about some of the policy changes USC is making. She's borrowed some of our ideas.

This report will tell the public about what the board is doing. BOT is creating awareness about what we do as a board and some of the issues that we consider. The intention is:

- to become more transparent as a body,
- fulfill our fiduciary duties and obligations towards the fulfilling the mission of the university,
- work with administration and the faculty and staff, and
- make sure we're all doing what's best for our students to give them the best possible education, best possible opportunities to enter the workforce and to do great things beyond USC.

SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) stated his concern that the university rating is AA. Senator Altschul does not think an AA credit rating is good for a state agency. The senator asked, "what is the university using the credit rating to accomplish?" "Are we borrowing?"

BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK stated that the state government has a AAA rating. For a state agency and where we are with the universities, if you look at the bell curve, USC is on the right side of the bell. We look at the number of universities that are AA. I'm sure the President can speak to this better than I can, and Ed Walton can.

If USC goes to the market to borrow, particularly for projects going forward, that is the rating the credit agencies will use when they are working with us to grade our bonds. That has been our credit agency for a while.

When we are looking at these projects, we look at the finance costs and the debt service required to finance projects. One of the things that we get hung up on a little bit, is the approval process as a public entity it takes a while to go through the state approval process. We are very fortunate when the President spoke to the General Assembly last month about our budget, they (the General Assembly) invited the president to come back to them and say, what can we do to make the approval process more efficient. What happens is we have a project that's ready to go, if we were a private body, we would approve it and start now start moving forward. We can't do that. We must go through multiple approvals (e.g., three to four at the state level that usually takes about 18 months) and so by that time construction costs may change, and credit rates may

change. So, for us, that's a consideration as well. But for your question, that rating has been where we've been for a very long time.

BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK also stated that one of the things that the credit rating agencies look at is demand for your institution. Demand is very high as a flagship public. We're in a great place. I know many of you read about the drop off that's coming as far as the number of high school graduates. When people look at USC, they look at us very favorably as a university and as a system (i.e., because of the ability to recruit students). We are very confident where we're positioned in the marketplace.

SENATOR MARK MINETT (English) thanked BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK for the report. He asked for more detail on 1) criteria for assessing the performance of the President, 2) criteria for assessing the performance of the BOT, and 3) are the success indicators linked under the strategic plan.

 BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK stated that there is currently an ongoing dialogue with the President regarding his performance. When the President first came in July, the BOT believed setting criteria in July for someone who had not been here would have been unfair. The decision was made that during the president's first year, his salary would be held flat. There is an assessment of looking at more subjective type things. At that time, the BOT did not have a tight criterion because we needed a baseline. Going now into a second year the BOT has developed success criteria identified and a conversation was held with the President and board leadership.

The BOT identified criteria. The criteria will likely change over time depending on where we are positioned as a university and goals for the university going forward. The BOT is working on a dashboard for the board to look at, not in real time, but as close as you can get. For where we are on many of those metrics, that is part of the strategic plan. The BOT adopted an AGB tool, a board self-survey last year. The self-survey was one that was sent out to all the board members. The BOT rated themselves both as a body and individually in a variety of categories. The AGB tool was helpful. The tool was helpful in having a dialogue about 1) where we are as a board body, 2) our culture 3) some of the things we're working on, and 4) expectations. The BOT examined the scoring (highest to lowest) and identified areas the university needs to work on. Some issues the BOT was not aware of were also identified; we need to talk about these issues and work on these areas.

During the January BOT retreat, there was a governance component. Peter Eckel from the University of Pennsylvania was invited to speak at the event. He's a fantastic facilitator. We worked with the BOT four years ago. Bringing him back was a great decision because he was very effective in working with the BOT. We had him look at a couple of those components and talked to us very specifically 1) one of those being our expectations for each other as a board, and 2) what we expect each of us to be doing, not only in meetings, preparing for meetings, and 3) what we're doing as committee chairs, getting, preparing agenda you know, a variety of things.

The BOT plans to use the AGB tool again. We're going to modify it because some of it is geared towards a private board and not a public one and there are certain institutions where the

board never meets the public. You hear about things after they take place. We meet in the open.

As such, we're going to modify some of the questions to account for that, but otherwise we're

181 going to continue to use that tool.

SENATOR MARK MINETT (English) thanked BOT Chair Westbrook for the information. He asked if it would be possible to see the survey. BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK confirmed that the survey is available to faculty.

SENATOR ERIK DOXTADER (English) stated appreciation of the presentation on freedom of expression. Senator Doxtader asked multiple questions: Are the new policies related to posters and those sorts of things process and are those done completed?

BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK stated that the policy on flyers and posters has been completed.

SENATOR ERIK DOXTADER English) requested that the Faculty Senate Chair provide the Senate notification when the new policies are finalized.

 BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK stated that at times things get overlooked. He appreciated SENATOR ERIK DOXTADER's comments. FACULTY SENATOR CHAIR OUTTEN attends every BOT meeting and is involved in the action. There are executive sessions. Chair Westbrook include Chair Outten and the student representative in those executive sessions.

SENATOR ERIK DOXTADER (English) asked another question regarding a number of those who defend the Chicago principles, have argued publicly and nationally that the Carolina Creed is a speech code which the Chicago principles overrule if not simply negate. What was the discussion amongst the trustees about the relationship between the adoption of the Chicago principles and the terms of Carolina?

 BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK stated that the board spent some time talking about its principles and creed. He understands there is some discussion or concern about certain parts of the creed would require affirmative statements about certain types of speech, or certain expressions on campus that may be violative or offensive to the creed. The board will not do anything to adversely impact the effectiveness or the importance of the Carolinian Creed. The board felt that as a university, the Chicago Principles was an accurate reflection of where we are, where we believe we are and that there were differences that we can't reconcile.

It will be tested at some point; there's going to be speech that is going to be very offensive to certain people personally, BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK wishes to err on the side of making sure USC does not do anything to suppress that speech; certainly not disinviting anyone. BOT CHAIR WESTBROOK believes USC needs to be open to all comers and we need to be as flexible as we can and allow speech. Threats and violence are not acceptable. He is not suggesting that offensive ideas be heard on campus. He thinks it is a good thing and would hope that if someone finds some matter of speech offensive, they go down the hall, they rent a room, they engage in their own speech and counter to that.

The BOT is looking at the number of institutions and the quality and institutions that adopted the Chicago Principles. The BOT felt comfortable in adopting it as written.

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN provided an apology for not providing the Faculty Senate information on the revised policy and process. This was an oversight.

President's Report

PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS reminded the senators that we are in the middle of the legislative season; this is usually a very challenging time. President Amiridis testified in front of the House Ways and Means Committee (i.e., asked for money). He will go before the Senate Finance Committee next week; he anticipates that there may be more requests (e.g., education committees). The first two requests are about money. The members of the committee stayed and talked primarily about money. Our requests and our priorities are:

- 1. Tuition mitigation funds from the state so we will be able to keep the in-state tuition the same for the 7th year in a row. And I believe we will get this.
- 2. We are also asking for continuing funding through provisors for several programs that we have and the number of initiatives primarily in the College of Education, the College of Nursing, and student internships that we got last year went to continue.

PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS believes these requests will go through, but they need to be renewed every year. These are consistent with the request that we made to the governor, this is a public document. If you are interested, be happy to share with everybody. We anticipate that some of them are more important, but we'll be able to get it.

PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS also stated that the university is asking for one time money. In many cases, the funds are primarily for maintenance and it's important for us, but also for new construction. Some of you may have seen that we are planning to finish the second part of the instructional labs in the Science and Technology building. I learned this today. I always called it the old law school. That building was only half done. We have the funds from last year; we are finishing it. So there's a number of new instructional labs. I believe they're going to be a couple of classrooms there as well. This came with last year's appropriation of \$19 million.

The university is asking for funds now for a new research and innovation building at the same area at the corner of Green and Main. PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS is optimistic about it that we may get significant enough funding to be able to start construction.

Not everything that we are asking is going to happen. But again, given the state the situation in the state and given the finances of the state, PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS thinks we're going to have another good year.

Last year was exceptional. At the end we show our budget increase in the order of 10 to 15%. Such an increase in the state contribution to our budget is unprecedented in his opinion, and in experiences here and his experiences elsewhere. The university is in good shape.

The administration always monitors very carefully all the bills that are submitted. That have to do with higher education in different communities and in different in different areas. We address these and we work together with the rest of higher education. This is something that we do very well with Clemson. PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS was with them at the Commission of Higher Education just before he came here. The discussion related to what bills are in action and what are the chances that they will get through.

There has been activity in other states. PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS suspects that this will continue and will extend since this year is a presidential election year. What we have seen in other states are bills that are focusing on tenure. You know what has happened in Texas. Other states that they are going to follow.

 In South Carolina there is a Senate bill that is focusing on tenure. There is no corresponding bill at the House side, which gives you an idea that maybe this will not go through. It's not threatening in any way because it focuses on post tenure review. That's exactly what we have been doing for over 20 years now or maybe even getting close to 25 years. We have been doing post tenure review in every unit. It's part of what we prepare, and this is not going to change in any way.

There are also bills that we have seen that are by now laws in different states about freedom of speech on campuses. PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS anticipates that we are going to have on here in SC. It's not very different to what we are doing.

They're also in some states, bills about courses and disciplines. Florida has decided that sociology classes cannot be included in Gen Ed. We haven't seen anything like this in South Carolina, and we don't expect that we'll see one.

There is a bill about diversity coming from the House leadership. This one is going to move. It's very specific; it targets diversity statements used for admissions, which we don't do. I don't think any university does that. Maybe there are some that I don't know, but we don't ask the students to make such statements as well as mandatory diversity statements for hiring. Now in some cases, we have requested that information, but we must be careful. Now in terms of our policies is it mandatory or can any candidate write whatever they want to provide some kind of dossier during the selection process? PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS suspects that we'll move forward, and it may become a law. We are arguing about 1) the nuances of this; 2) How exactly it is going to be phrased; and 3) how it is affecting our ability to recruit. PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS thinks that it will become a law that is reasonable to the extent that will not interfere with our processes and will not hurt us in recruiting and hiring people.

 The fact that several flexible universities by now have come out with news questioning the financial situation of a university does not help us much nationally in terms of the federal government does not help us locally. A number of these flagship universities are in financial trouble: West Virginia, I think most know of, but by now Arizona. When Arizona comes in and declares its deficit of two million in one year; University of Connecticut; Penn State; the Wisconsin systems. The flagships are a heavy source. In all these cases the significant deficit is

related to decreased enrollment; an inability to attract not only in-state students or declining but out-of-state students as well. Let me assure you that USC is in a very strong financial position.

PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS suggested faculty look at flagship universities and you will see that double AA rating is very good in this area. I'm surprised that the BOT chair didn't point this out. There are very few elite universities like the University of Michigan or UCLA or Berkeley that are one step up. AA rating for higher education is not a bad rating.

PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS assured the senate 1) that our rating shows where we are; 2) it's the management that we have; 3) it's the excellent cash flow that we have; and 4) the reserve situation that we have that's why we have earned AA rating. The credit rating is also based on the potential of the university and the fact that consistently USC has an increased number of applications. The main issue is that these ratings remain constant, and the university had a very strong year. This year we will be able to announce numbers in areas that affect finances.

What we see right now in terms of research: It's probably a unique year in terms of the best performance ever.

Last year we had a very strong year in development. Naming the law school was important. It has been 20 years since we named a college. PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS won't be surprised if the university names another college before the end of the year.

These indicators show that the university is building momentum; that's what people outside see and that's why we are confident of where we are.

The chairman spoke briefly about the master plan. This is something that needed to be done because the previous master plan expired. By now, pretty much everything that was in this area has been completed. We are looking forward to the next 10 to 20 years.

Sasaki is one of the best firms in the country in terms of planning and urban planning. They have done an analysis of our housing, classrooms, labs, the way that we are constructed, and the areas of the different activities. For example, how can we protect and enhance the historic center of the university (i.e., the Horseshoe)? This area is rather empty, and we don't want to get to the point that what has been the center of the university for centuries now is becoming a museum.

- 1. Can we revitalize this area?
- 2. How can we increase traffic there?
- 3. What else can we add to the Horseshoe, which is a difficult area, with a lot of historic buildings?

A lot of discussion about the needs of the students. The Russell House has been in this condition for 50 years now. We have seen a significant increase in the student population. If you talk to the student government and to the students, they will tell you that it's not at par with what other institutions are providing. Several of our dorms are in a situation that they need to be to go through renovation. PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS thinks part of the reason for all of this is because 50 years ago during the early late 60s and all the way to the late 70s, that university

almost tripled its population in terms of undergraduate students and became a research university. During this period there were a lot of buildings. All of them age that the same time, and that's the problem.

We are asking for a building plan:

- 1. How are we going to change?
- 2. How are we going to deal with the change?

At the end we must figure out also what is the money going to come from because we are talking about significant costs.

PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS discussed the increase in the number of tenure and tenure track faculty members at the university. He stated his appreciation for the work that the professional faculty and the adjunct faculty are doing. They carry a lot of lot. They interact a lot with their students and they're doing a fantastic job. The reason that President Amiridis is focusing on the tenure and tenure track faculty members is because the expectations for them are higher. The expectations are to both teach and research. The second part (i.e., research) is a commitment from the university to the faculty by providing tenure and putting them in this line and at the same time is a commitment from the faculty to the university with tenure. That's why President Amiridis believes that the university needs to increase the number of tenure and tenure track faculty members that we have. Together with the Provost, the president funded 50 new positions for this year. We asked for proposals from your colleagues.

We have now defined the numbers and we have made decisions of where these positions are going to go, and the metrics were very clear. It's areas that we need people to teach and in areas that we have strengths of research to build upon the strength. Fifty of them now are in the hands of the deans and the department chairs. PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS hopes that the university can move quickly because we have another 50 waiting for next year as well.

This addition will give approximately (not exactly) 10% more tenure-track faculty. This is the first time that this happened since around 15 years ago, when PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS was a Provost. He is excited about it because there's going to be a lot of young blood coming to the university.

PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS doesn't want all of the new positions to be at the assistant level. There are opportunities to move into the associate or full professor level. It's a good market for us to recruit in other areas. President Amiridis is looking forward to seeing new faculty members coming in. He hopes that we move quickly. One thing that President Amiridis wants to make sure is that we're putting conditions in there and monitoring to make sure that these are not replacements. These positions are to be net gain of faculty members and not replacing someone who retires.

PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS encouraged faculty to attend either (or both) men's and women's basketball games. It's exciting; you will see our students. You see how excited they are both with the women's team and this year with the men's team as well.

405 SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) looked up Moody's credit rating for UCLA; it was two steps above ours (i.e., AA++). PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS stated that USC is 406 not UCLA. UCLA, Berkeley, and Michigan are elite universities that have higher ratings than 407 408 we do, but they're very few of them.

409 410

SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) isn't the state legislature taking out borrowing money on their credit rating at a lower rate to get money for the university?

411 412

413 PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS stated that the State of Carolina doesn't work like other states. SC does not continue to borrow. We haven't had any kind of a capital bill for the last 25 years at 414 415 least, so they make direct appropriations to us to use for capital projects. Now this direct appropriation of \$19 million, \$20 million, \$25 million if you're lucky. They will not allow us to 416 borrow from the state because it's a very conservative financial state. 417

418 419

420

SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) asked if they're done directly by the budget through the state legislature, shouldn't that be something that the university should be advocating for.

421 422

423 PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS stated that it will not happen. I can tell you this with a high degree of 424 confidence. I came from a state which has this process you can borrow from the state, but the University of Illinois has a much better rating than the state because the state of Illinois, 425 bankrupt or almost bankrupt at this point. We are on the opposite side here (i.e., SC). We have a 426 very strong financial position of the state because they don't borrow money and have a lower 427 position in terms of USC and the other universities because we don't have the state backing us 428 up and we have to do it by our own money. That's why it's important that we have 1) a very 429 good cash flow and 2) a very good number of applications. That's how it works. 430

431

SENATOR ABBAS TAVAKOLI (Nursing) stated that there are many changes in technology. 432 Some notifications of change are provided in advance (e.g., Blackboard Ultra). Other changes 433 happen rapidly, particularly in science using REDCap as software to collect data. Faculty 434 received an 435

436

email in January stating that by the end of February the survey is moving from one platform to 437 another platform with REDCap. The software is the same, there is no support. Senator Tavakoli wishes the faculty had more advance notice of changes in technology. 438

439 440

PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS stated that he remembers hearing that there's going to be a change. He will make a recommendation to Provost Arnett.

441 442

443 PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS announced the university will have a new Vice President for IT starting on March 1st. He was in this position for seven years at SUNY at Buffalo which is an 444 445 AAU institution, large institution. He understands similar problems and the other parts, since you mentioned software, but it goes beyond software. We must start treating the infrastructure 446 that we have in IT the same way that we do maintenance with buildings within the budget every 447 year. Unfortunately, while the buildings last for 50 years, IT needs to be really redone every five 448 449 years. It's going to be a significant cost that will have to absorb and I'm ready for it, but that

basically means that we'll have something else decreased in the budget. 450

451

SENATOR MEIR MULLER (Education) inquired about Bill 833, which is the Higher 452 453

Education, Integrity, and Learning bill. Bill 833 is also known as the Critical Race Theory bill.

It would create a chilling effect and perhaps make it impossible for us to teach our students. 454

PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS stated that this is one of these cases where we need to draw the line 455

between academic freedom and what this bill specifically says. We are lobbying together with

everybody else. It's a common issue for all universities. President Amiridis doesn't know where

this is going to go. He is confident that this is going to happen but is not sure. It's not a fait

accompli and it's something that we continue to have discussions with the leadership.

459 460 461

462

463

464

456

457

458

SENATOR BLAIR FLICKER (Management Science) asked about the 50 new positions. The message heard is to quickly move Management Science is working on that. It's just a little difficult because Management Science market tends to clear in January. Senator Flicker heard you say that maybe there's fifty more positions coming next year. Is this true that we're having more new positions next year, so we can get on the regular academic job market cycle?

465 466 467

468

469 470 PRESIDENT AMIRIDIS encouraged departments not to sacrifice quality in terms of trying to move quickly. If a unit cannot hire faculty this year, you can carry it forward for next year. We need to get excellent faculty, not whoever is available right now. So that's the message that you should send back, and you can mention you can say that here was talking about 15 more next year. And that's true. It's going to happen again.

471 472 473

474

475

476

Committee Reports

Committee on Curricula and Courses

CO-CHAIR SHARON GUMINA presented stated that the committee met in January, and we discussed the proposals. The committee moves to approve a total of 10 course proposals.

College	Number of Proposals
Arts and Sciences	3
Darla Moore School of Business	1
Arnold School of Public Health	2
HRSM	3
Social Work	1

477 478

479

SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) reminded the senate that C&C is not a Faculty Senate Committee. It is a faculty committee. This is often a confusion. Faculty do not need to be a senator to be a member of C&C.

480 481 482

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN confirmed this statement. Faculty may serve on any standing committee unless it explicitly says that in the description of the committee.

483 484 485

A motion in favor of the C&C proposals was made.

486

The motion passed.

487 488

Old Business

- 491 FACULTY SENATE CHAIR WAYNE OUTTEN CCRRC (Carolina Core Review and Revision
- 492 Committee) was established last academic year, to look at the Carolina core. That report has
- been posted for quite a while on the Senate website under the February meeting documents.
- 494 Please look at it if you have not, there is embedded in that report around page 19 or so a
- recommendation on Next Steps to take in this process. That recommendation has been
- forwarded to FAC. The Faculty Advisory Committee has been asked them to look at it and
- consider the recommendation. We might expect more to come from them if not in the spring

498 and fall.

Fall 2024, Blackboard is transitioning to Blackboard Ultra. Faculty will need an exemption to remain on regular Blackboard. There is a process for applying to have your course exempted. The exemption application due date is March 1st.

New Business

Official opening for nominations of Chair-elect of Faculty Senate begins this month. The manual says that the chair must be a tenured member of the faculty. They cannot be an assistant professor and cannot be professional track faculty. FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN recommends the person(s) be a full professor, but there's no requirement that they be full professor; associate professors are eligible.

The chair nominee does not need to be a senator. In fact, FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN was not a senator when he was nominated. Any member of the voting faculty, including professional track faculty and tenure track and non-senator faculty, can nominate someone. Even though we are opening the floor here for nominations, any faculty member can nominate someone. We already have one nomination.

We received a nomination from LIAM HEIN (Nursing). FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN invites Dr. HEIN to introduce himself. Dr. HEIN mentions that he is past chair of FAC and current chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, that he has been a senator for one term and has been doing committee work for around eight years.

 FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN thanked LIAM HEIN. We have a single nomination so far. Of course, we'd like to have a contested election. That's always more fun. Nominations will stay open through the March meeting and then in April we will have the actual ballot. The Senate will vote on the candidates here at this meeting in April and we will have no further nominations from the floor in April, so that basically nominations close at the end of the March meeting.

The senate has one election to fill a committee vacancy today. LAURA BRASHEARS has been nominated by the Faculty Advisory Committee to fill a vacancy. Unless anyone has another nomination to fill that same vacancy, we'll just If we just leave this as is at the adjournment of today's meeting, she will officially be in that position. If someone, of course, if someone does have another nomination, they are free to make that nomination.

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR WAYNE OUTTEN provided a joint motion from FAC and the UCPTF for some changes to the professional track faculty section of the Faculty Manual.

Bill Sudduth (Libraries) provided background information and an update.

- Information was presented at the December meeting.
- Information has been available since for senators and faculty review.
- FAC and UCPTC held what a successful Town Hall on January 18, 2024, from 9:00 AM to almost 9:00 PM
- We had over 30 to 40 participants
- Input was provided from members on both committees.

The co-chairs thanked the members of the faculty and the committee.

DR. TIM BAKER made a motion to amend by substitution with the document posted on January 31st on the faculty Senate website.

SENATOR MARCO VALTORTA (Department of Computer Science and Engineering) made a motion to suspend the rules by allowing tertiary amendments to the pending motion to amend by substitution.

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN explained that the motion means "this is to allow us to essentially have the normal tertiary amendment process for this revised version we're getting ready to discuss. If we didn't do this, it would limit how many times we could amend it to be less than usual."

The motion passed.

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN reminded senators of the rules of debate.

- Each member is entitled to a total of two speeches on a particular item that we're voting.
- Each speech can be no more than 10 minutes.
- Legitimate inquiries do not count toward this time limit, so if you have a legitimate question about something, you can ask that question; it will not count against your time.

The document is organized into seven sections. We'll discuss section one first, then Section 2, then Section 3 and we'll try to deal with any amendments to each section, one at a time.

There will be at the end of that process another chance to look at the entire document as a whole thing, to see if we need to make any further changes, make different sections sync up or anything like that, but this allows us to go through the document more systematically.

Discuss one topic, hopefully to completion before we move on to another section and avoid jumping back and forth all over the document.

 SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) inquired about the consequences would of having two different tracks (e.g., tracks for both the senior instructor, versus teaching professor or teaching assistant professor teaching associate professor, or teaching professor).

What are the consequences for people who are now ranked as instructors. If they have a terminal degree, would they automatically move onto the teaching professor track? Several of these people have had professional track positions at other institutions, but most of them did not have separate instructor and teaching professor tracks and so there seemed to be quite a bit of confusion. There was also a question about money. Is there going to be a premium for someone who has a terminal degree? Are they pretty much automatically going to be hired on the teaching professor track with some greater amount of money than if they only have a master's degree and would be hired as an instructor?

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN stated that the Senate website (under FAQ) answers one of SENATOR ALTSCHUL'S questions.

SENATOR ALTSCHUL'S looked at the website but it was not clear. Some questions were resolved but not all questions were resolved.

TIM BAKER (UCPTF Chair) stated that the committee is introducing a new title set of titles which are Teaching Professor; we had the clinical professor in place for some time. Some units have faculty that are professional track with terminal degrees that hold the title instructor. Some of those units don't use a professor title at this point. The unit criteria will specify which titles are used. The unit criteria would then call for further qualifications. If you notice, for example under teaching Professor entered a clinical professor, there's not a research requirement because some of these folks are teaching a four-four load. The department needs to decide if there is a research component. If so, what type of research does the unit criteria will then go through the approval process, which does include from the unit to the Office of the Provost and finally to the UCPTF. If that is then approved, then a title change, and it would be only a title change from instructor to either teaching professor or clinical, as appropriate, would be an administrative move requested. If it's an entire unit move, it would it run from the Dean to the provost office.

 Let's say that someone is clinical. If their unit decides it has needs for core science, and other people that do clinical and use both titles, an individual could request to be moved. To have their title changed would be an individual request which again would go from that person to their chair, to their dean, to the provost's office for that administrative move. As to pay, that is an administrative decision. We don't have control of that.

 SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) feels that the professional track faculty who are currently hired under instructor, senior or senior instructor positions are concerned that new hires with equivalent or lesser qualifications are going to be hired into the teaching professor track before they can get themselves moved over and that that's going that there's going to be a pay issue.

TIM BAKER stated that this is a form of inversion. Whether there's a change or whether there's a future change right to kind of correct in version that is an administrative decision that is at the Dean and the Provost level because we cannot affect funding.

SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) stated that it just seems concerning that there is nothing in this document that provides that suggests any guidance for how like those and pay issues should be handled.

TIM BAKER reiterated that the pay issues are outside the scope of what we can recommend or have in the faculty manual. However, concerning other things that you talked about, if this document is approved with whatever amendments this body and the full faculty sees fit, guidelines would need to be published that would help the unit with criteria to understand best practices.

TIM BAKER stated that he doesn't think this is the final time that we see this document. The tenure track components of the faculty manual have been in the manual for a very long time. I bet the faculty manual was written before most of us in this room were working at this institution. There will be things that we find that perhaps are not working administratively. We said this sounds like a great idea, but suddenly it stops because something doesn't work. We're going to have to make some minor adjustments to the language as we move forward over the next probably three to five years is that make sense because it's all new.

SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) asked who will produce the guidance (of the faculty manual) and when will they produce that guidance. Regarding a time scale issue, if individual departments are supposed to produce guidelines for professional track faculty, 1) when are the departments expected to produce those guidelines, and 2) what is the time scale for them to be approved through the administrative process?

TIM BAKER answered. Currently, the dean for one large unit has mandated a due date for unit criteria to be published. That's really going to be largely a process that should start now, but we're not prescribing that it must be done by a certain date. Certainly, if we got to the end of next year and the unit says the next year, not this year, right, and the unit's not done anything, then certainly I think you might get a call from the provost office. We're this is that the other thing with regards to questions about unit criteria. We do defer those to the provost's office, specifically to the Vice Provost in charge of faculty affairs (currently Mary Ann Fitzpatrick) to work with you all with this document.

SENATOR ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) – is concerned that the responsibility that implementation of financial and scheduling things is entirely administrative beyond the departmental level (i.e., the faculty Senate and the faculty committees are not going to have any further role).

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR WAYNE OUTTEN stated that UCPTF will be the final approval of unit criteria. Pay decisions are out of Faculty Senate purview; even for tenure track, there's nothing in our faculty manual that deals with pay and things regarding enforcing the administration to do anything about pay.

SENATOR ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) stated he understood this fact. Professional track faculty in my department have expressed serious concerns about the pay issues and how

that's going to be handled. Faculty Senate Chair Wayne Outten stated that there's not much the Faculty Senate can legislate about that question directly (i.e., pay).

MR. BILL SUDDUTH stated that the opportunity to respond and answer questions would be as each unit creates their own not only criteria but also creates the organization within their unit to respond to these questions. Instead of worrying about things as a bunch of individuals even within the department, at least they'll be some collective information gathering within each unit. Just like each unit of tenured faculty have their own tenured criteria, they have their own committees and whatever that do the shared governance part. Each unit is unique within its makeup. The number and type of professional track faculty are different across units. The opportunity here is for different titles and qualifications that each unit can choose in the manner that they want.

Discussion of Section 1 (lines 1-180 the document).

SENATOR MARK MINETT (English) stated his enthusiastic support of the document. This proposal comes from FAC and UCPTC. Senator Minett appreciates the following aspects of the document:

688 d

• The protections that it offers,

The agency it gives to faculty within the units,
The language that ensures professional track faculty can't be excluded from voluntary service and governance. The document has language that says professional track faculty should not be required expected or pressure to participate in activities that are not included as compensated responsibilities under the terms and conditions of their appointment,

• It compels units to develop criteria under which their professional track faculty can be fairly and adequately assessed and recommended for reappointment and promotion,

• The hard work that the committee members have done, and

 • My colleagues speaking with me about it as well my status a as an English senator and as a president of the IEP chapter.

SENATOR MINETT (English) proposed an amendment (Line 19 on the original document) that the "may" be replaced with "should usually". Senator Minett believes there is a meaningful difference there, although should usually is still not a requirement. The aim of this amendment is to better ensure that we move toward a norm in which professional track faculty are compensated for the important service work they contributed to the university.

The amended faculty manual proposal, brought forward by UCPTF and FAC last Wednesday, eliminates the December proposals requirement that a service responsibility allowing for minimal participation in shared governance shall be included and compensated for in all professional track faculty contracts. The provided justification for the revision to the December proposal is the need to accommodate units that do not currently include service and professional track faculty contracts.

Even so, SENATOR MINETT believes it's likely that these units do currently and regularly rely on the voluntary and frequently uncompensated service work of professional track faculty.

Furthermore, the totality of the proposal brought forward by UCPTF and FAC would seem to necessitate an increase in that service work if its policies are to be implemented successfully.

This amendment offers a compromise between the original and revised proposal language on this point that's designed to move us closer to the restatement of important standards and protections no longer offered by last Wednesday's revised proposal.

This shift from "may" to "should usually" in relation to the inclusion of service responsibilities and professional track appointments, though still no longer requiring that all professional track faculty contracts include shared governance or service responsibilities would communicate that the norm that the university and its unit should strive for is to incorporate contracted and compensated shared governance responsibilities and professional track faculty appointments.

 Shared governance is essential to effectively fulfilling the mission of higher education, and it is best understood as both the right and responsibility of all faculty. It is also the university's responsibility to create the conditions for effective shared governance by providing compensation and university resources, and by ensuring reasonable and humane faculty workloads that don't relegate participation in shared governance to volunteerism.

The absence of compensated service responsibilities in professional track faculty appointments limits the resources available to the general faculty in exercising its right to shared governance. It limits the resources and experience available to units and the university and develops effective solutions to the issues facing higher education. It also, of course, limits professional track faculty members' ability to participate in decision making that directly affects their professional lives as well as their ability to take advantage of professional opportunities essential to their professional development.

It's been communicated and SENATOR MINETT thinks it's been made clear that the requirement of compensated service and all contracted professional track appointments is a complicated issue for some units. It's been made clear that they don't have solutions at hand. The ramifications of requiring compensated service at this point are unknown.

SENATOR MINETT does not know how long the faculty, both tenure track and professional track faculty of this institution should have to wait for the administration of certain units to engage in a conversation about compensating professional track faculty for service in their contracts. Keeping in mind that this is the beginning of a process, as TIM BAKER said, SENATOR MINETT offers this limited amendment.

The motion to the amended wording passes

SENATOR MICHAEL STOELTZNER (Philosophy) inquired about the distinction between instructor and teaching professor. The senator understands the point that it's the Ph.D. and when a faculty member moves from instructor to teaching professor advancement must go through committee administration, et cetera. Each unit should define positions according to their own

criteria. Senator Stoeltzher stated that the problem is in Philosophy there are lecturers and Ph.D. faculty. Any discussions about the department's criteria would of course have to do with how to separate existing people and their qualifications. It might be helpful for such a discussion if there are some kind of general wordings which kind of qualifications apart from PhD and not, but let's say a distinguished service activity or being lab director in a small department to help with distinctions. SENATOR STOELTZNER stated that it would help if the committee could examine teaching professors as this title is at some peer institutions or introduce a debate about distinctions that has concrete phases to it.

TIM BAKER stated that one of the things that the committee looked and heard what the Faculty Senate had to say last spring and over the summer and into the fall was that the units needed to create criteria that met their specific needs. There are units that have clinical faculty, or instructors. They have very different roles from administrative to teaching only and everything in between. The committee looks for units to further define unique requirements.

There are two places in the document where examples are highlighted, while realizing that the Darla Moore School of Business professional track doesn't fit chemistry, philosophy, whatever department. The committee looked for further clarification. TIM BAKER echoed what BILL SUDDUTH and WAYNE OUTTEN said; this is not the end; this is the beginning.

TIM BAKER over the next year and a half that there's that units will need to be consulted. Units are encouraged to call upon DR. MARYANN FITZPATRICK and the Provost office to provide that. If she thinks we need to have a workshop with this department right and talk through these things to help through that process. In some instances, the document is vague with descriptions because those really become policies or guidelines. The committee is trying to give flexibility to units. The committee also understands some units may say, "please sit down with us and help us through this process". DR. FITZPATRICK is ready to help.

SENATOR MICHAEL STOELTZHER (Philosophy) stated his general concern that faculty are dealing with something completely new. It is understood that it is not possible to have directives even for a big college like Arts and Sciences where things are so different. However, some general wordings might help the discussions. Senator Michael Stoeltzher would have no problem with having an abstract order for a nonexistent department. If you give him e a humanities department that doesn't exist, that is acceptable.

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR WAYNE OUTTEN stated that if that kind of example were provided as guidelines document for criteria development, that the committee is developing they weren't unfortunately able to have both things ready and still have us meet the legislative schedule for the year. They are trying to develop a document like the goldenrod for unit criteria for tenure track. That will guide faculty or guide units in the development of criteria. Maybe we could put that kind of example in that document. FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN agreed with DR. BAKER that it's very difficult to put very specific things in here because it cuts down on the flexibility that units need for their professional track criteria.

SENATOR MOHAMMAD IRANI (Finance) inquired about section 1-2 clinical faculty inquired about professional caliber to supervise and instruct students as part of qualification for

clinical faculty. This may mean in the finance department that somebody who has already worked for an investment bank or hedge fund or mutual fund. So maybe usually hire clinical people like new PhD graduates, they don't have such a background. The word professional doesn't apply to the unit (i.e., Finance). Senator Rani asked if it is possible to add something so for the first sentence is defined by the unit itself. Each unit could define what do they mean by clinical faculty, because sometimes they can do research as well.

TIM BAKER stated that this was a question that the committee had from many different units. The only place where anything exists (i.e., faculty titles) is in ACAF 1.06. The committee took the definition straight from ACAF 1.06. Technically if we read the definition in ACAF 1.06, the university does not have a lot of people that would fit that definition. The flexibility would be at the unit level. to decide that right and currently we're into unit criteria now. The unit would have the criteria to further define the criteria. Dr. Baker doesn't think that would prohibit recruiting someone in finance and placing them into that clinical position if the clinical title is still to be used,

SENATOR MAHOMMAD IRANI (Finance) stated that the wording is not used in this document.

TIM BAKER reiterated that this paragraph is the generic (wording) The unit will further prescribe criteria.

FACULTY SENATOR WAYNE OUTTEN asked for confirmation that there's nothing. in this section that prohibits any certain qualifications. TIM BAKER answered yes; that is accurate.

SENATOR BLAIR FLICKER (Management Science) stated that on line 86 of the original document, it addresses eligibility for appointment at the rank of instructor. All the other ones have both titles listed. For completeness perhaps it's worth adding lecturer just to avoid future problems. A motion for an amendment to add lecturer was made.

The motion was passed.

 SENATOR LAURA SMITH (Journalism) inquired about the prior question of unit criteria. Regarding clinical faculty, is it possible to stipulate that years in a professional career could continue with these parallels to industry experience? Even if we don't use the term clinical faculty, we could continue to use the term senior instructor but allow for equivalencies as we do now when we have a professional coming into teach a professional program. That would be it wouldn't require the master's nor necessarily the years teaching in service if they had mentorship as a 25-year advertising executive.

TIM BAKER stated that he can't speak to the master's degree versus not having a master's degree because of a SACS requirement. Frequently we see and we even have the Professor of practice, which we have several of our campus. As far as promotion in rank, that's a different question. But certainly, looking at it in that perspective, yes to answer your question.

SENATOR AARON DECKER (English) stated that there's something that might have been overlooked in this document. In the original document, (a year ago) we separated out teaching professor from instructor, lecturer there was confusion as to separation. The original document had a promotion year schedule that was different between the two. That had the teaching professor promotion lines (1, 5, 9 years). The instructor line was getting a promotion (6, 10 years). That inconsistency has been rectified in this document. Now, whenever there's a dual line in any of the sections, both lines are going up for promotion at the same time (1, 5, 9). There is no penalty for the lower section for having an additional year. Senator Decker thinks it's a good thing.

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR WAYNE OUTTEN stated that Senator Decker was with us through most of that town hall. The committee appreciates all his hard work as de facto member of FAC as well.

 SENATOR RONDA SANDERS (Mathematics) stated that there's a line that says that an instructor cannot be held to do service if it's not in their original contract when they were hired. If an instructor steps up to say that they wish to be judged by the faculty manual that was in place when they were hired and thus not have to do that service, does that mean they will be held to the six-year requirement that was originally in the faculty manual?

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR WAYNE OUTTEN stated are grandfathered into their position. They are allowed to follow which faculty manual they follow under (i.e., original, or new).

TIM BAKER further explained that when new unit criteria are approved, professional track faculty have a period of two years during which they may apply for promotion under either criterion. Faculty may use the old unit criterion or your new. If they go a year earlier and meet all requirements to use the new criteria, that will include the service requirement.

Section 2

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR WAYNE OUTTEN Section 2 consists of the creation of the unit professional track faculty committee. There was no discussion on Section 2.

Section 3

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR WAYNE OUTTEN deals with appointments.

 SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) brought up a question that came up at recent faculty meeting that if about how appointments would be handled with the increasing integration of the professional track faculty into the faculty as a whole and faculty governance. The senator inquired about the role of the unit faculty in the professional track hiring. The senator was told that expectations in his department would continue as they had previously and

senator was told that expectations in his department would continue as they had previous that professional track hiring would be done completely at the discretion of the chair and

administrators.

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN stated that in the new section lines (e.g., lines

2:15 and 2:16) cover this information. The new description of the hiring process requires recommendation from the unit, faculty and the appointment process. It would no longer be just by single person's decision.

SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) inquired what does a

person better.

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN stated that ALTSCHUL has a valid question. The form the recommendation takes is a unit criteria issue.

recommendation mean? If we provide a recommendation and the Chair just says no, I like this

MR. BILL SUDDUTH states that the document states that "the academic unit shall define its criteria and procedures for accessing its candidates and appointments". It's the opportunity for the unit to establish criteria which also includes a recommendation of the unit faculty must be included.

SENATOR MICHAEL STOELTZHER (Philosophy) was on UCTP. At that time, he saw recommendations from units where somebody had a concurrent appointment and that was not the tenure home. It was sometimes controversial or not. Senator Stoeltzher believes that that for a committee, that might be interesting to know how faculty voted (i.e., if it was controversial).

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN stated that it is up to the unit criteria defined it that way. The Faculty Senate cannot mandate that the units label the vote. If you have a specific amendment, you'd like to offer those states exactly what you just said, you may, you may certainly do so. We'll have the discussion and the vote. I'm not trying to short circuit anybody's changes. There will be a guidance document that lays out some recommended practices for all recommended principles for all these things when criteria are being developed.

SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) asked who will be producing the recommended guidance.

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN stated The University Committee on Professional Track Faculty will complete this task. It is part of currently already part of the faculty manual.

 Section 4

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN stated Section 4 addresses reappointment; this includes the involvement of faculty in that process of evaluating the candidate and evaluation from faculty. The definition it takes will be defined at the unit level.

SENATOR LIAM HEIM (Nursing) asked for clarification. Say and in-house clinical faculty member starts off on a one-year contract. Does this document ask for the evaluation of in-house clinical faculty to be reevaluated every year until their contract becomes three- or five-year contract?

942 FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN stated that the process would be defined by the unit. It would be within their purview to have the one-year extension, or the one-year contract

evaluation process done a different way as long as unit faculty have input. That would have to be defined at that the unit criteria level.

TIM BAKER stated that the unit, for example, may decide that the one-year appointment, the initial one-year appointments need to be an administrative decision. Sometimes you can't at the end of the year, or you don't have enough information right to understand how this person is doing as student evals and peer evaluations are coming out. The unit might decide for example that it will be an administrative decision for the first one-year appointments or multiple one-year points when they go to the three- to five- year, then that unit might decide that's when faculty needs to speak and have a voice. We're trying to leave this to the unit.

Section 5

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN stated that Section 5 focuses on promotion. There was no discussion on Section 5.

Section 6

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN stated that Section 6 focuses on the identification of applicable criteria for reappointment and promotion. There was no discussion on Section 6.

Section 7

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN focuses on the promotion file (i.e., creation, review, and voting procedures).

SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) asked what happens in the meantime while criteria have not been developed, and in particular if like the UCPTF does not approve the criteria developed at the department level? What is going to become of the hiring and promotion procedure in that case?

TIM BAKER stated that all units have criteria, even if they are very limited. Currently, where it's an administrative hire in a unit, it will continue until that unit has its new criteria in place to follow those procedures, both from the unit criteria as well as the policies and procedures that administrative level.

SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) asked if it would be possible that departments could evade the new procedures by not providing acceptable criteria? FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN likened it to the creation of the unit budget committee; it is also an ongoing process. It will boil down to the Faculty Senate to keep an eye on the process and make sure it happens. We'll start with the UCPTF. It will have to be on the Faculty Senate leadership to also keep an eye on this in the same way that we're trying to do that with the budget committees.

Section 8 989

FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN stated that Section 8 is the annual report. Promotion information for professional track faculty, somewhat analogous to what is currently done for tenure track faculty, where the provost office will have to report numbers essentially as defined here in the in paragraph to the Senate. This is very similar to the tenure track, UCPTF process that must be done every year that report. The discussion or changes to that. There was no discussion on Section 8.

 SENATOR MARK MACAUDA (HPEB) asked for clarification regarding time as a professional track faculty member. If somebody moves from a professional track faculty line to a tenure line, they start at year zero. Senator Macauda asked for clarification because during the town hall there was discussion about this topic.

TIM BAKER stated that ACAF 1.18 specifies that, if a professional track faculty member moves to a tenure line, the faculty member's tenure begins at year zero. The wording was somewhat vague, so it is being rewritten.

SENATOR ALEX REYNOLDS (Psychology) thinks the document looks great. Senator Reynolds does have one concern. Psychology has clinical faculty and instructors. Sometimes it's difficult for faculty to know where they belong. Psychology is adding another tier. It makes sense to have individuals with terminal degrees at the professor level having a professor title. However, units that don't have these tiers should be clear with faculty about where they are and where they belong. Psychology will have a faculty meeting and issues are brought up and not all topics apply to everyone. Instructors go here and tenure track faculty go here, and often clinical faculty feel like they're kind of in between and they don't really know where they belong. Thinking forward, making sure the professional track faculty don't feel isolated and that they know their role and understand the expectations. Psychology is trying to do even better with faculty understanding where they fit in the department.

SENATOR ABBAS TAVAKOLI (College of Nursing) inquired about the composition for professional track. Nursing is a heavily professional track, with two-thirds of the faculty on the professional track. Senator Tavakoli made and withdrew his motion.

TIM BAKER reminded the senate that the unit is responsible for the wording of the criteria.

They may mandate (i.e., should) or recommend (e.g., may) what will take place.

SENATOR MARCIA PURDAY (Journalism and Mass Communications) stated that his school is heavily professional. She is curious about the professor of practice. Usually, although not always, a professor of practice has a master's degree in the discipline or master's degree with the minimum of 18 graduate semester hours. Why must this have the approval of the president?

TIM BAKER stated that the university also has the title of Distinguished Lecturer. It's used only on very, very rare occasions. The provost's office helped us with something that they dealt with chairs to put that in place and use it this year for promotions. The goal is that the professor of practice should be unique and very distinct. For example, have somebody come in that has a master's degree in another field that's not in the field that they're in. I know journalism might be but perhaps you bring in an attorney. That's the thought process; it should be unique, rare and

1036 1037 1038 1039	decided at the president level. It is straight out of a ACAF 1.06. We haven't had comment yet as to it right if there's a reason that it should be different, we probably would need to discuss it with the provost's office and see what objections we have or what does the President's office have to say?
1040 1041 1042 1043 1044	BLAIR FLICKER (Management Science) inquired about voting shall be by faculty of rank higher than the candidate. Is this well-defined with the tenure track and professional track and lecture positions? Does this need more clarification or is the information well defined?
1045 1046 1047	FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN stated that the document has all these different ranks (tiers); he believes all of the tracks have three tiers.
1048 1049 1050 1051 1052 1053 1054	TIM BAKER stated that the term that the committee uses in tenure track helped in the evaluation process, but the peer is always a level above you or greater. The committee tried to clarify that by specifically calling it out, but that is the expectation. Let's say for example we had professional a teaching professor and a clinical in the same unit. We would look for the people looking at perhaps the hiring process to be a level above or the promotion process specifically to be a level above.
1055 1056 1057	BLAIR FLICKER (Management Science) wonders wondering what does the term "rank or higher" mean?
1058 1059 1060 1061	FACULTY SENATE CHAIR OUTTEN stated there's some degree that would have to be maybe spelled out by the unit criteria. That may be one that the committee do have to tweak in the future.
1061 1062 1063 1064 1065	SENATOR MARK MACAUDA (HPEB) stated that the fear is that all tenure track faculty are considered higher. Maybe it doesn't need to be dealt with now, but I could see that being a concern.
1066 1067 1068 1069 1070	SENATOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics & Astronomy) stated that this is a very complicated issue. Is an associate profession higher than a senior instructor? Probably. But it is not at all obvious. The senator stated that the document should either be made clear to departments that they need to state in their criteria who is eligible to vote on which things. There should be a chart somewhere that states the equivalent ranks (e.g., position A is higher than position B).
1071 1072 1073	The motion passed. The motion for the substitution passed.
1074 1075 1076	The motion for the entire document passed.
1077 1078 1079 1080	CHAIR OUTTEN thanked Faculty Senators for staying a few extra minutes and for the thoughtful discussion.
1081	Good of the order: None.

2 The meeting adjourned at 5:08pm EST.