

**THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

**SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**WEDNESDAY, March 4, 2020 at 3:00 p.m.**

**KAREN J. WILLIAMS COURTROOM – LAW SCHOOL**

**PRESIDING: Professor Mark Cooper, Chair**

**1. Call to Order**

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

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

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

**3. Reports of Faculty Committees**

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

SECRETARY ELIZABETH WEST (University Libraries) – presented the slate of committee nominees. The sole candidate for the next Faculty Senate Chair is Professor Bethany Bell. The election for Chair will actually take place at the April meeting.

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

PROFESSOR MARIANNE BICKLE (Interdisciplinary Studies) – brought forward 20 proposals: 11 from Arts and Sciences, 2 from Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management, 1 from Information and Communication, 3 from Music, 1 from Pharmacy and 2 from Social Work.

CHAIR COOPER – There was no discussion and the proposals were approved.

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

PROFESSOR KAREN EDWARDS (Department of Retailing) – brought forward 2 proposals: HRTM 375 and MUSC 114.

There was no discussion and the proposals were approved.

**d. Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, Professor Brett Altshul, Chair**

PROFESSOR BRETT ALTSCHUL ( Physics) – brought forward one proposal from the Retailing Department to raise their minimum GPA requirement for the major from 2.25 to 2.5.

There was no discussion and the proposal was approved.

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

PROFESSOR ANDREW GRACIANO (School of Visual Art and Design) – The Faculty Advisory Committee would like to bring for consideration to the Senate the following proposed amendment to the Senate bylaws regarding senatorial term limits. Changing the last line of Article II, Section 2 of the Faculty Senate bylaws to read quote “Senators may serve no more than two consecutive 3-year terms and no more than 9 years in a 12 year period.”

CHAIR COOPER – This is being introduced for consideration now. The rules are we don't vote until one meeting after. If you have thoughts now we can hear them. But the primary discussion of the motion and action on it will happen at the next meeting. Are there any thoughts about this one?

SENATOR ABBAS TAVAKOLI (Nursing) - I just want to emphasize, I agree with this motion because a lot of faculty when they serve, they learn the first term, what is involved with the Senate and getting involved with different committee and when we limit to one term I think is not efficient for Senator and the Senator usually elected through their unit. So that is another do you know, bypass so that I think we should approve this motion.

SENATOR DEMETRIUS ABSHIRE (Nursing) - So, I'm curious about the implications of those of us who are filling vacated terms and I guess the bookkeeping of so I'm filling a term for two years I guess. And so I could run then for two additional three-year terms. Is there, yes. Because it's only two consecutive three-year terms. So technically I could run for eight years in that approach?

CHAIR COOPER - Yes. But not another term.

PROFESSOR GRACIANO - Right. And so that's why there's a cap of the nine years in 12.

SENATOR ABSHIRE - Yeah. I'm just wondering about the tracking mechanism though too. How has that been thought through about who's going to ensure that that doesn't occur?

PROFESSOR GRACIANO – Sounds like a secretary might.

SECRETARY WEST - Oh, we have spreadsheets on the volunteers and have our list of committees. And so at this point it's going back and checking to see if someone has already served, and that's part of the process of making sure that people are qualified to serve on a different type of committee. You can't serve within a year on UCTP and then Grievance and things Steering Committee does is to, to make certain of that. That's not to say there couldn't be an error, but that's what's set up right now.

SENATOR HEATHER BRANDT (Health Promotion, Education and Behavior) - So for those of us who maybe are unfamiliar unapologetically, so perhaps with the current guidelines or rules, would you go ahead and maybe give that to us for context so that we can better consider this proposal?

CHAIR COOPER - So the bylaws say you can't serve more than one, you can only serve one term. You can't serve consecutive terms. So it's pretty usual for senators to be elected to 1 three-year term and then sit down for three years and come back for three years. We hear senators feel like they're more effective the second time around. So why not make it possible for senators to serve, you know, two terms consecutively is the idea, but keeping the spirit of not allowing people to camp out for a lifetime on the Senate if their department's even allowed that.

SECRETARY WEST - And Mark also they can fill a vacancy. If they serve a term that's less than half of a three-year vacancy, then they can get reelected for a full three year term on that committee.

CHAIR COOPER - So 1.5 years.

SENATOR MARCO VALTORTA (Computer Science and Engineering) - So Mark, if I may, my understanding is that this has to do only with terms of senators, not committee terms actually. But the current wording I think I'll read it. This is very short. Thank you. It says that "No Senator shall be eligible for an additional term in the Senate until one year following the expiration of the term of service." So you can serve for three years, stay out for one and come back and this would still be allowed under the proposed rule.

CHAIR COOPER - This will come back to you in April for further discussion and a vote.

PROFESSOR CHARLEY ADAMS (Communication Sciences and Disorders) – So today is the day that we vote on the second item that you see. You may recall that we put this up last month. I can tell you that we changed two words this afternoon in the Senate Steering Committee meeting.

In the first line we changed the word "may" to "will", The Senate will be asked to confirm faculty appointments.

CHAIR COOPER - Thank you.

PROFESSOR ADAMS - And then the last line we changed "shall" to "will". Any discussion?

CHAIR COOPER - So if you weren't here last time, this is a companion to a policy proposal that's coming through the policy pathway that was recommended by the ad hoc committee we had on the

Beyond the Classroom Matters Experiential Learning Transcript. The policy that's working its way through that policy process is going to include a hook into this confirmation process so that we maintain some contact between the Faculty Senate and faculty members appointed to serve on that Experiential Learning Transcript Committee. That's the idea. And there's additional language here to suggest that other processes might also envision taking advantage of this confirmation.

There was no further discussion and the motion passed.

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

PROFESSOR HEATHER HECKMAN (University Libraries) - A survey is going to come out from our committee hopefully before our next meeting in this room. We just really hope that you'll reply to it, take it seriously. It's going to be very similar to the survey that went out last year and we're hoping to get some longitudinal data on satisfaction with IT among the faculty. Are there any questions for us? Neset, anything you want to add?

PROFESSOR NESET HIKMET ( Integrated Information Technology) – It's a good survey.

CHAIR COOPER - I just put in a plug for the survey to the longitudinal data is really helpful to us as we try to decide whether we're making any headway on matters IT and how long have we been doing that survey? About four years now? Five?

PROFESSOR HECKMAN - Actually this particular form of the survey has only gone out once before, but we have collected data in two previous years. It's just that for the first time we're really asking the same questions.

**g. Faculty Welfare Committee, Professor Bethany Bell, Chair**

PROFESSOR BETHANY BELL (Social Work) - I just wanted to make sure everyone saw and I posted the reported the lunches that President Caslen is having with faculty. It goes through your Dean. Does anyone have questions about that? So the dean is only there to try to manage the workflow. The coffee conversations have been very well attended, and I encourage everyone to go. The next one is April 22nd at the President's house.

PROFESSOR SUSAN BON - I'm currently the Presidential Faculty Fellow, so I'm working directly with President Caslen. I wanted to add that we took extensive notes at all of these events that we've been having with faculty, and I've come up with answers to some of the questions, or at least a progress report for some of the questions. I'm tasked with trying to get that back to the faculty who attended. And so I'm wondering would it be too much of a burden to send back the feedback on those,

on the questions, the various questions and issues that were raised. Would it be too much of a burden, Mark to send it through you for distribution to Faculty Senate for distribution to colleagues?

CHAIR COOPER - No, not at all. I'm happy to do that as long as the questions and replies are of a nature to be shared broadly. You know, no one's asking about their insurance, personal insurance benefits or something of that sort.

PROFESSOR BON – There were really great questions about PeopleSoft and grants management, for example, and I suspect many people had that issue. So we're trying to dig in deep to find out solutions to some of these challenges.

PROFESSOR BELL - And then last, if you can please share with your staff as well because although they are working on creating a Staff Senate, it's not there yet. So distribution information to staff is still somewhat limited. That's why I included the staff coffee conversations and you might remember that when I met with President Caslen and Susan and the Chief of Staff, the Staff Senate was one of the things I brought up from Welfare There are people working on their bylaws and figuring it out. So that is actually in motion and I'm very happy that we've accomplished that.

#### **h. Ad Hoc Committee on Attendance Policy, Chair Mark Cooper**

CHAIR COOPER - Several members of the committee are in the room. Thank you very much for being here. I think we can answer any questions you might have about the process or the proposals. Really as my cover letter indicates a big change here is being driven by the General Counsel's office who made very clear to us that our current policy was not the most helpful policy for us legally. Our own review of policies at other SEC institutions kind of confirmed that many, many schools have highly legalistic policies. Some don't. So the particular legal provisions we have in here are not only recommended by General Counsel but also correspond to what we're seeing in other schools' policies.

There are three approaches. One approach attempts to approximate the current procedure. It's 5% rather than 10% because of the requirement to excuse certain classes of absences.

The other, the second approach just is the minimalist one. This one would leave the most discretion to faculty in determining what they want their policies to be. It only specifies the requirement to excuse certain types of absences and provides a provision for requesting absences and assistance and appeals.

And then the third one is the one which would bring the biggest change. It would make it forbidden to penalize absence but permitted and encouraged to reward student participation in grading policies .

So I'm happy to answer any questions, or refer back to members of the committee present, any questions you have about our deliberations or differences among the approaches. We can't get too far into discussing specific details without a motion to adopt one form or another of the policies. So once we get beyond the questions about what the committee is doing, I need someone to make a motion to adopt one of these policies and then we can discuss that motion. If you have amendments, that's fine. If

we decide to reject one in favor of another, that's fine. But we can't get too far down into the details of discussion without a motion to adopt. Is that clear enough? Okay.

So any questions about committee process or how we deliberated or decided or discussed? This is a policy that would have implications for the Palmetto College campuses as well as the Columbia campus so, I'm going to particularly be looking to the back there in case there are questions from off site. Okay. Hearing none. Is there a motion to proceed with one form or another of the policy?

SENATOR BRANDT - And I would like to make a motion to proceed with option one.

CHAIR COOPER - Thank you. Is there a second? (Motion seconded)

CHAIR COOPER - Okay. Discussion of option one.

SENATOR JOSHUA STONE (Biology)- I was also on this ad hoc committee. After talking and surveying the Biology department as a whole, I got about 10 people who responded with their opinions and the majority said they would like this option but changing it to 10% which reflects the previous policy. And the main reason for that is just, it seemed a more reasonable number. It was, that translates to about one week of classes. So I would motion to or I would like this to be amended to say 10%.

CHAIR COOPER - Okay. So there's a motion to amend. I need a second.

(Motion seconded) Okay. Discussion of the motion to amend everywhere this policy says 5%. It would then say 10%.

SENATOR BELL - I just, I had the microphone at the same time. I was going to make the same motion. We did not talk about that. I just think that the 5%, if it's a twice a week class, it's one day and I think that's penalizing students. I understand giving the excuse for illness now, but what happens if there's the student who was ill and the athlete and they had all these excused absences versus the student who didn't have these life excuse absences, but man just overslept for their eight o'clock class twice. Do they deserve to be penalized because the actual hours not in class could really rack up for the excused absences and penalize the students for, or if there's an accident on the highway and it's a commuter student.

CHAIR COOPER - I understand the point. Thank you. I just want to be clear that people have seen these points here: One, two, three. Let me blow them up. So the policy specifies instructors at their discretion may excuse any other absence deemed excusable by the instructor. So raising the cap from 5% to 10% just would take away a little bit of discretion from instructors about which of those absences to excuse as a practical matter. Further discussion?

SENATOR EVA CZABARKA (Mathematics) - Some of the concerns brought forward by my colleagues in regard to this, that all excused absences must be excused and it is the burden of the instructor to make up for them. Now, I will admit this is a very extreme case, but I had a colleague who had a student who was attending some of the sports, I don't know the sport now and that the student

claimed that therefore all his excuses for that particular sporting event and his practices has to be excused. The problem was that those regularly overlap with the class. So this pretty much meant that, if we take this at face value, that's an excused absence and the student needs to be excused for all the classes practically and somehow allowed to make up.

Also in the case when the students are sick, have to attend military duty and so on. If it's so happens that the student has to go away for some military reason, this has happened in one of my previous institutions that the College of William and Mary, that someone came to me that, I'm sorry, I have to withdraw from all my classes because I'm going to abroad because I'm a soldier.

It is neither reasonable nor enforceable to require the instructor to make up in this case because (a) the instructor might be going away next year because they happen to have a sabbatical or (b) the instructor may not be an instructor who is there next year. It might be a temporary faculty who is not employed the next year. It might be a graduate student who is graduating and leaving and that means that who is going to make up for those classes? I think it would be reasonable to include something that says that even if the excuse is allowable, if you are missing, say, half the class, I'm not saying that this is the right amount, this class you have to retake again.

Sooner or later, the University of South Carolina is required by law to excuse absences in the case that the student has military duty or obligation imposed by state or federal law. It is the University of South Carolina and not the instructor. So some burden should be shared by the University of South Carolina. For example, in these cases, a student missed practically the entire semester. Perhaps the university is the one who needs to return the tuition fee, allow the student to withdraw from the class because the reason that he didn't attend the class is something that's not up to him and allow him to retake the class next year. Does not putting burden on the instructor.

CHAIR COOPER - So you're raising a number of issues that are not specifically related to the topic, which is whether we're going to amend it to change from 5% to 10%.

SENATOR CZABARKA – It is related to the issue that she mentioned earlier.

CHAIR COOPER – Okay, these are also issues that the committee talked about extensively. So there is this language in the policy that says instructors may refuse to grant a request for an excused absence or for makeup work that would result in a fundamental alteration of the essential academic requirements of the course. In such instances, you should tell them about the policy, including the policy regarding withdrawals and hardship withdrawals. That paragraph is in the policy precisely to deal with those concerns. It is going to be the instructor's legal obligation to keep track of absences and to produce makeup work when those absences have to be excused. There's just no way around that, legally. So, we're, we're kind of stuck with that arrangement, I think, in terms of our General Counsel's opinion. Other discussion of the amendment to change five to 10%?

SENATOR CHRIS YENKEY (International Business) - I circulated all three to my full unit. Had direct conversations with at least half of my colleagues. They were unanimously opposed to the third option. Unanimously in favor to number two. I recognize we're talking about number one, so to speak directly to five versus 10, nothing in any of these inhibits a faculty member from excusing all kinds of

things, right? I mean if you want to, you know, tell students that if you oversleep for an eight o'clock section or two, that's okay. You can still do that, right?

What the five versus 10% does is it tells you what you can't do, and I don't understand why we would limit any of our faculty to a certain extent. It seems like we would adopt one over two if we don't trust our colleagues to be reasonable instructors. Is that saying that we've got a bunch of unreasonable, you know, iron-fisted colleagues around here that's making life difficult for all of us. And therefore they cannot do anything until it's at least five and now maybe 10%. I don't feel that way. And so I would come out opposed to the amendment to go from five to 10. I also plan to vote no on option one for 5%, uh, and hopefully defeat that in favor of option two, which allows all of us the discretion to be reasonable instructors who listened to our students and determine right for wrong without having central give us a threshold that we have to follow in that regard.

CHAIR COOPER - Thank you. Further discussion of the amendment.

SENATOR ANDREW RAJCA (Languages, Literatures and Cultures) - I also want us to just add that people in our department are against this amendment of changing it from 5 to 10% for the exact reason he just mentioned that does not prohibit instructors from giving grace to students who have a car accident or coming late to class, et cetera., it's setting a baseline minimum for attendance. In our department this is very important for languages, you need to be in class to learn the language. And so this is actually very important in our department. And so just to add, I am against the proposed amendment to changing this to 10%. I believe that having at that 5% and then having your structures have leeway for any unexcused absence is the way to go in this.

CHAIR COOPER - Thank you very much. Other discussion?

SENATOR MARK MACAUDA (Health Promotion, Education and Behavior) - Could the committee sort of explain why they went with 5% in the first place? Cause I'm sure 10% was discussed. What was the rationale for five?

CHAIR COOPER - Sure. I started out as 10%. I'm going to look around at my colleagues and if they want to correct my account, they can. The discussion went like, well the 10% was supposed to allow for covering excused and unexcused absences both. Now that we're required to excuse certain classes of absences it would it be a good idea to maybe lower the number precisely because some colleagues might want to have a stronger lever to encourage attendance. That point carried the day in the committee.

SENATOR TRACI TESTERMAN (School of Medicine) - So I have to admit, I'm kind of on the fence about this and I'm not worried about faculty being unreasonable, but what I'm worried about is if you leave too much up to the discretion, you have students claiming it was unfair, you know, they accepted this excuse but not that excuse. And if faculty accept a particular excuse one year and then they change their mind about whether that's reasonable. That's the kind of thing I'm worried about because these days people are (inaudible). And so I guess that would be my main concern. Other than that leaving it up to the discretion I think is okay. I just wonder if it's going to open up potential problems.

SENATOR ABSHIRE - For reasons you just articulated, I think the 10% I'm in favor of because it eliminates this issue of discretion. It's 10% sort of no questions asked. That's how I frame it in my class. So if there is this, you know, you don't, it, it takes certain absences out of the equation. It makes it easier for faculty and the students. There's my 2 cents on that.

CHAIR COOPER - Very good. Thank you, Senator. I think we'll go here. Everybody gets to speak once before people get a second shot. Yes. Senator.

SENATOR ANDRÉ MERGERDICHIAN (Theatre and Dance) - Speaking primarily of the performing arts and perhaps there is a bleed over into other disciplines. The Cardinal rule is you show up and the learning and the experiential activities happen, if you're not at the party, you weren't there. And so I think the 5% at least set a standard. And what we're saying is you have to be here. The 10% has always felt, at least in the performing arts, really watery. And we're saying, well you know, it's cool. Come if you want to, but you know, it's not that important. So I think that, you know, this having listened to this body now for the past year, the intelligence and discretion that I've experienced has been really great. And I think that we as a faculty have the capability to have those conversations to say what's fair and what's not fair. And that's part of what the education is, is having the conversation. So I think we set the standard you have to show up and then we have the conversation what's happening in your life. And I think everyone in the room is capable of doing that. So a 10%, it's way too much. Let's do five, and deal with it.

CHAIR COOPER - Okay. Thank you. I do want to call everyone's attention to this exception, which we have to have for clinical courses and laboratory courses and certain other special kinds of courses. Dance wasn't particularly contemplated there, but it could arguably be contemplated. There's a recognition in the policy that there are some types of work that just can't be made up.

SENATOR ARI STREISFELD (School of Music)- I'm not sure how I feel about the 5% or 10% rule. I'm still on the fence about all this in general, but I did, I am thinking about it and most of what I do and my colleagues do, we give applied lessons one-on-one to students and each student gets 14 lessons a semester, one hour a week and 5%, they miss one lesson, they're up there at 7%. So I'm not sure if I agree with that. I mean, I don't want my students missing any lessons obviously and I often make up those lessons anyways because they need them. But, and that's my discretion. I understand all of these policies kind of allow me that, however, the 5% rule wouldn't even work if any of my colleagues wanted to use that as their policy. So I'm wondering if that is what everyone wants, if there's some sort of exception that can be made for this situation.

CHAIR COOPER - Yes. Right here, "clinical courses, practicum courses, laboratory courses and certain other special kinds of courses may have allowable percentage shorter than 5% of class."

SENATOR STREISFELD - This would be larger, right? Am I reading that wrong?

CHAIR COOPER - Allowable percentages shorter than 5% of class time. So you could say in

practicum course, which is what you're describing as well as somebody teaching a clinical course. Right. The 5% rule can't apply.

SENATOR STRESIFELD – I got it wrong. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR COOPER - And also, just to be clear, if one of your students has a pregnancy, military service, jury service, any of those legally binding kind of things, you're going to have to allow makeup work. I'm sure you do anyway.

SENATOR ALANNA BREEN (Languages, Literatures and Cultures) - I would like to echo what Andy Rajca said that attendance is essential in our language courses. Beyond that it seems that this new policy gives a lot more specific, too many more excused absences. So we in Languages have students who can get up to eight or so excused absences to then allow them to have four unexcused is allowing 12 or more. I feel that this great expansive and fair and understanding comprehensive list of excused absences along with 5% is the minimum and then giving us the freedom to use our discernment in other situations such as a student being stuck in traffic or, or somehow, you know, needing to take your roommate to the hospital or something--I feel it's definitely sufficient and I'm strongly opposed to the 10% on top of this extra list, on top of giving us discretion.

CHAIR COOPER -Thank you. Anybody else for the first time? Okay, Senator.

SENATOR CZABARKA -I just want to point out one thing that I got from my colleague that, except for the case that was just mentioned before for all classes, which I think are typical in the university, the class setting 5% actually means 7% so we are not talking about as bigger difference in most of the cases as it sounds,

CHAIR COOPER - 5% actually means 7% for math. You're going to have explain that to me.

SENATOR CZABARKA - I mean in the sense that the exact outcome of how many courses you can miss would be the same if one replaces 5% with 7%.

CHAIR COOPER - So here's our attempt and maybe we didn't do the math right, but here's our attempt to explain it. It would be one class for a class meeting two times a week or two classes for a class meeting three times a week for 50 minutes. Brett, are you coming to use the microphone?

PROFESSOR BRETT ALTSCHUL (Physics and Astronomy) - I'm not a Senator, but I am the chair of the Committee on the Scholastic, Standards and Petitions where this was first raised and I want to point out something. I'm sure the General Counsel's office is giving advice with the idea to minimize the university's possible legal exposure. However, when the committee was first considering this, I consulted with a senior attorney in the US Department of Education Civil Rights Division and he told me that there are, that it is not standard policy that they expect that all, kinds of excused absences for illnesses, even military service, pregnancy, that those kinds of things are not necessarily expected to be excused nor that there not be some kind of employment or civil rights violation.

CHAIR COOPER - So the question of civil rights and employment violations wasn't really at the

forefront of our discussion. I am very sure that what you say is correct that one could find attorneys who disagree with the interpretation of our General Counsel's Office. That is what attorneys are paid to do. But the attorneys in our General Counsel's Office are the ones who would defend us in the university in a case of student complaints about violations of attendance policy. So please consider that in your deliberations. Other thoughts about the amendment?

SENATOR BELL -I just wanted to correct somebody said that it would allow students to miss four classes and that's not correct. It would be allowing students to miss two, if they meet twice a week. So if it's a Monday, Wednesday class as the original person propose, somebody could miss two Mondays or two Wednesdays or Monday, Wednesday. But if right now they could only miss one single class if it's unexcused. So the saying that going up to 10% would increase it to four classes is not mathematically correct if it's three times a week, but if it's two times a week, it's allowing to know if it's two times a week it goes up to two classes from one to two.

CHAIR COOPER -Okay. Anybody other, yes. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR – Mark, could we get a clarification? So I guess this is for the committee. As we're thinking about going from five to 10 percent for the amendment, my understanding, and let's make sure this is clear, is that if you go 5% or 10% either one, what you're doing is you are mandating to every instructor on campus that they have no recourse whatsoever until a student breaches whatever threshold we put on there. That is correct?

CHAIR COOPER - That is correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - But there is nothing in any of these that says that any of us as an autonomous instructor can't make a accommodation for whatever we consider to be a reasonable excuse to not be in class.

CHAIR COOPER - Correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - So I would like for us to be very careful, right? To know what you would be voting for if you vote for anything over zero, you are mandating to all of your colleagues across campus that they can do nothing for their students who choose to sleep in or et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

If you vote for zero, you can still accommodate any excuse you want and you have complete discretion. You just give that to your colleagues too. So there is a lot of research out there, whether it's risk management and finance or other areas of life that says you set a benchmark for what's acceptable versus not. Everybody goes right up to that line. And I'd be willing to bet dollars to donuts based on the research we have from multiple disciplines that you set this limit or at 5%, 10% wherever you want, right? On average across campuses at this university, you're going to have students not showing up for that percentage of classes because now they're following the rules and it's a legitimate thing to do.

So by voting for anything other than zero, you are creating a burden on your colleagues. If you vote for zero, you're able to do what you think is fair and let them do the same and decide what is appropriate for their classroom.

CHAIR COOPER - Thank you. While we are talking about faculty discretion, I did want to point out that every version of the policy contains language like this as well. Which emphasizes and commits us all to being fair and how we apply our discretion. If you give a student an absence for a car wreck, you have to give that absence to every student who was in a car wreck, for example.

SENATOR BREEN - I just wanted to say that that is a solid point. And in Languages where we give you up to four, used to be five, there are students who see those excuse, allowed absences what we call them as vacation time and they absolutely take it like they would miss the whole last week of class. There are invested students, but that point he is making is also very valid.

There was no further discussion of the amendment to change 5% to 10% throughout version 1 of the policy. The motion failed.

CHAIR COOPER - We come back to discussion of the main motion discussion of whether to adopt this version of the policy, version one, with the 5% rule as the attendance policy of the university. One other thing I should have said up front, is this can't get into the bulletin and won't become policy officially until 2021-22. So we're going to have a lag year no matter what we do here. Time to get used to it. Any discussion of the policy? The main motion?

SENATOR DAVID FUENTE (School of Earth, Ocean and Environment) - Just a point of clarification I think goes across all the policies and I know the committee considered this carefully, but have you thought about what constitutes a religious observance or a holy day and also what constitutes too severe or contagious for the student to attend?

CHAIR COOPER – So the religious holy day issue, we talked about a lot, and I see Adam laughing in the back row because he loves for me to have to explain this rather than him. We really follow the guidance of what other institutions seem to be doing, which is accepting students' self-description of their religious affiliation, but requiring them to do that early in the semester. So we don't have students suddenly discovering they're Jewish in the middle of October. We will just accept students' self-declaration of their faith, but they have to notify us early in the semester. That's the response to that one.

Severity of illness. We can get good documentation from physicians or from the Student Health Center and every place there's a good university source or an official source to request documentation, we can request it but you shouldn't keep student medical records. Don't retain them. Look at them.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - Yeah, on that note, since we're talking about that topic, almost everything I've gotten from the Health Center recently has explicitly said on the medical explanation, this cannot be used as an excuse for not attending class, even though it lists the illness and the other issues. So it's confusing for an instructor to know whether that should be an excused absence or not when you get back kind of language.

CHAIR COOPER - Okay. So this is a request for us to tighten up our notification around medical excuses. I can certainly take that forward. I mean the committee assumed that instructors would be in a position to get documentation that was clear about whether it's an excusable medical event or not. And if we're not getting that kind of information regularly, we can use this next year to make sure there's a pathway for getting it. Other discussion on the main motion?

SENATOR JOHN LAVIGNE (Chemistry and Biochemistry) - Commenting on Wayne's comment. The Health Center clearly does not. It says don't count this as an excuse. To me that falls under the discretionary part of other students who come from the minute clinic or their primary care physician and their note letter says, do not attend class for three days or whatever. So that is how I interpret that.

My question that I had is, can someone please explain the math to me? 5% of 29 classes is 1.45 classes. 5% of a 42 class is 2.1, so two classes. If someone's six minutes late, then they're over something. I understand you have to round. Why do we choose to round down from one and a half to one?

CHAIR COOPER - It's once you get to six classes, you would be over. Once you get to two classes you'll be over 5%, right?

SENATOR LAVIGNE -No. Well, once you get to two classes, 5% of the Monday, Wednesday, Friday is 2.1 classes. So two classes in five minutes. The numbers that are in the statement do not line up perfectly with the math and then math faculty here who can.

CHAIR COOPER - We had such people on the committee.

SENATOR LAVIGNE - I'm just asking. I broke out my calculator here. I'm looking for some clarification.

INAUDIBLE COMMENTS -

CHAIR COOPER - Do you think we need to amend this language here or...

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR -(Inaudible) ... one and half, I round down to one

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - (Inaudible)

CHAIR COOPER - So you're saying it should be two here?

INAUDIBLE COMMENTS

CHAIR COOPER - But this should, this is okay at two when you, when you use your calculator, it's only this one?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER - Mark, maybe I can offer this bit of clarification.

CHAIR COOPER - My STEM colleague on the committee.

SENATOR STONE - I mean we did discuss this. The be all end all is 5% so however many minutes that is the number of classes, the whole numbers were just put in there as guidance. If you're just looking and don't want to get out your calculator and figure it out for yourself, that's the ballpark. But the 5% is the actual, so if you want to yourself calculate half classes and fractions of classes, that's fine. We just have that whole numbers there as just a guide to help you out. I believe that's what we discussed. Mark, you can correct me I'm wrong.

CHAIR COOPER - That was a discussion of the committee. But then the question becomes whether this clarifying language is sufficiently clarifying or just makes matters muddier.

I'm happy to entertain an amendment to this language if people think that's necessary. I thought I saw something pop on up on the Adobe connect. Do you have something Yvonne?

YVONNE DUDLEY (Faculty Senate Office) - This is from Michelle Reese in Sumter, but she's having trouble with the keyboard. The question is, should we be excusing one through six that are legally required? Now, can you explain why requiring other absences?

CHAIR COOPER - I think she's referring to this set of absences that are not in the legal requirements but had been added as university, requirements. And the short answer is they've already always been in our list of absences. Faculty should consider, if you go back and look at the other policy. In some areas there was confusion particularly about the athletic events, varsity athletic events, their competing policies that needed to be sorted out. So the committee had a great deal of discussion about adding these items and agreed that it was appropriate to excuse these absences, which are in line, we would also say, with other SEC school policies.

SENATOR ABSHIRE - So I do agree with the principle about faculty being reasonable, but if someone raised the issue earlier, I think of what happens if a student's roommate passes out and they take them to the hospital. And I don't think that certainly doesn't fit as I interpret it under one of the automatically excusable. But I mean, I guess I'm less hopeful than you are that some instructors would indeed say that's not excusable. And then, so I guess I'm worried about, you know, inner departmental conflict and a think allowing the 5% would at least potentially help mitigate some of that. But I do also see the other side and that the requirement that we all abide by this is problematic. But you know, I'd be happy to share personal conversations about this. Off the record. There's where we've had this conflict and it's created a bit of tension.

CHAIR COOPER - Oh good. I was glad that you were not proceeding to say the off-the-record remark.

All right. If there's no other discussion from the Faculty Senate...

SENATOR NOAH GARDINER (Religious Studies) - I'm on the other end of this in terms of the required excuses. I know there's the language in there about the possibility of refusing to grant excuses

at some point and then offering course withdrawal and whatnot. Is there anything in here that would prevent me from putting something in my syllabus that says if you miss more than 50% of classes or 30% or whatever, you must withdraw from the course?

CHAIR COOPER - I'm going to say, I don't think there would because of the provision that says, fundamental alteration of essential academic requirements of the course.

SENATOR GARDINER - Okay. I was just looking at how far that stretches essentially, because I mean, I've had students with issues with students who are ill who literally missed three quarters of a semester and tried to, wanted to get credit for makeup work and in a discussion-heavy class that's simply not feasible. It's not out of any lack of sympathy for the student. It's just about the class is what it is.

CHAIR COOPER - Yeah. That's a perfect kind of situation where our student ombuds would get involved.

SENATOR GARDINER - Which is exactly what I did.

CHAIR COOPER - Okay. Thank you.

SENATOR CZABARKA - Another issue that was brought forward for my colleagues, many of us, we are required according to this policy, pretty much all the languages include to provide makeup for excused absences. Most of us, or not most of us, many of us, there'll be the situation. So many of us deal with this situation in such a way that, for example, we give quizzes and certain percentage, the quizzes including the zeroes for missed automatically dropped or a number one or two homework sets are dropped. And I would like to point out that homeworks are usually not due the next class, so the students should not be not working on it just because they have happened to miss the last class. They can send it in and we don't allow makeup work because of this reason. And there is a very good reason to do that because if we allow makeup work, especially in the large class, it puts on new burden on the instructor. There is simply not enough hours in the week. The current policy seems to exclude this possibility.

CHAIR COOPER - We talked extensively about this. So depending on how that type of thing is structured, yes, the policy would exclude the possibility. I mean, if the absence is legally excusable, there has to be an opportunity for makeup work. But we talked with General Counsel about a lot of for instances. So, for example, a grading policy that has 15 quizzes, but drops the lower five scores, maybe that's a reasonable situation, which to say, there are sufficient opportunities for you to do well if you're missing class, so I don't have to provide you an opportunity to make up one of the five quizzes you missed during absence.

So the test here is really the reasonableness of the accommodation in the case where you're required to provide makeup work. You're not required to provide makeup work for an absence that occurred at the beginning of the semester and the student shows up with documentation on the last day, for example. But if your student becomes pregnant, you're going to have to provide an opportunity for that student to make up missed work due to the pregnancy. And I'm just going to drop your zero quiz is probably

not sufficient for the term of that pregnancy.

SENATOR CZABARKA - So if I may add, some of our colleagues are actually uncomfortable by the fact that it's very specifically detailed what we must do to accommodate.

CHAIR COOPER -Okay. Thank you. All right. Is there any further discussion of the main motion from the Senate?

SENATOR LIZ RAVLIN (Moore School of Business) - I had a question about this issue of makeup work from my department. All of these proposals I believe talk about you must work with the student to come up with appropriate makeup work. And that was regarded as somewhat burdensome for the instructor and it was unclear why we would work again based on what my colleague said, why we would work with the students on this if we would not do it on the front end in devising the syllabus and creating the assignments to begin with.

CHAIR COOPER - That the comment is well taken. There's a distinction clearly made in the policy between those kinds of absences that can be anticipated and those that can't. If the student can anticipate the absence it should be worked out on the front end. But there are certain types of absences including legally required ones like jury service that the student cannot anticipate and where the legal standard, we are told, is that in any kind of a litigation over this they're going to look to see if the instructors made a reasonable effort to accommodate makeup work for the student. So you need to be able to demonstrate that that effort was made.

CHAIR COOPER - All right. Uh, one more, great. Two more. You're new so you have priority.

SENATOR MONICA BARRA (Anthropology) -Thank you. In our department, at least when we were talking about this, a lot of us favored option three, but part of that discussion was around the feasibility of using kind of class participation as part of a grade as opposed to having an attendance policy that works the other way around. And whether or not that's too burdensome on faculty in different departments or whether or not that that's something that might be realistic. Considering that many faculty are already taking attendance in some form or another, which is implied by the first two policies. So I don't know if anybody in their departments had discussions about that or something they wanted to say in regards to that question.

CHAIR COOPER - Very good. I mean I will point out that either this option or option two would not prevent you from creating a policy that looks like option three if you thought that was appropriate for your class or your or your unit.

Okay. One more remark over here.

SENATOR BREEN – Sorry to talk again. I just want to say that as a lower division required language instructor, I'm speaking on behalf of many of my colleagues and myself. We are always juggling the excuses and the reasons the students are missing class. And a lot of it is that they do not want to be in class. And so having a certain number of allowed excuses, that allowed absences, this 5% allows them to do the misses and then the excuses we have to receive the emails and talk about them. I absolutely

agree with and understand what Chris says about the 0% and giving us discretion. Absolutely. It's just in courses of lower division, Spanish, English, French students miss so many. And they contacted us about so many so that we have lists for tracking every absence and every excused absence and kids have missed 12 already this semester. So my first comment was misunderstood by Bethany when I said four because that had been our policy and kids would just miss them all and more.

And my second comment about a student taking a roommate to the hospital was misunderstood. We do have the discretion to excuse those. I'm just saying we've heard so many things and us in languages deal with a lot of it, so we just, I think we want, my colleagues want the allowed absences that don't affect the grade as well as all of these specific reasons for excused absences so that we can avoid a couple of those emails. That's what it is. That's all.

CHAIR COOPER - Thank you. Email avoidance. All right. Any other discussion from senators?

CHAIR COOPER - Okay. I told you that we had a student representative on the committee, and I summarized his remarks in my cover letter, but I want to ask him if he'd like to speak about this policy briefly and the student point of view so the Senate can be informed. Patrick Green.

PATRICK GREEN – (Student Representative) - Thank you so much. Yes, my name is Patrick Green. I'm a junior in the Darla Moore School of Business, and I currently serve as the chairman of the Judiciary committee in the student Senate. So the attendance policy is obviously something that students are very passionate about. Is it something that affects their grades and how exactly they learn. So I took it upon myself. I've interviewed and I've sent out surveys to hundreds of different students in all sorts of different colleges around the university, all different ages and classes. And they're almost universal in that they do not want any sort of attendance policy whatsoever, so option three.

That's obviously unreasonable so I don't expect that to be adopted. But I do think that option one would be a perfect compromise between the discretion that faculty needs to be able to say, Hey, we need you in class for X, Y, and Z reasons, you know, the different types of courses. My eyes were opened when I was on the committee as to the different types of class meeting times, the different types of courses that are offered. I thought it was absolutely extraordinary. And so I recognize that, you know, you may not be able to make the one-on-one professor times cause there are 14 classes or something like that. But there are extenuating circumstances such as mental health problems, you know, you get caught behind a train, whatever it may be that students do need some sort of protection from, for these different types of classes that a professor may say, well that doesn't really work for my schedule, but the students do need a little bit of discretion for things like that. I think so, I think this 5% rule is an excellent balance between the two options. And I would implore you to adopt this option. Thank you.

CHAIR COOPER - We ready to vote on option one? If you don't like this one, you vote no. And then somebody introduces a motion to adopt another one. Thank you Robert's rules.

There was no further discussion and option 1 was approved.

#### **4. Reports of Officers**

## **Report of the President**

PRESIDENT ROBERT CASLEN – Good afternoon. First of all, Tayloe is going to talk about the Coronavirus after I get done. So I'll leave that to him. I'll give you an update on the strategic offsite that we had last week and where we are with our strategic plan. A quick update on the climate survey, which was made accessible today down to the unit level and next week we're going to be talking to the Senate Finance Committee for our budget recommendations or requests and I'll just want to give you an update on that. And then just a couple other minor things at the very end of that and open up to any questions you would have.

So last week we had the deans and above, total 65 people, at the next step of the strategic plan. And that was to lock in our strategic priorities and then to have a discussion on goals and objectives for each one of those priorities. You know, that we had a distributed leadership to each one of those goals and objectives. I mean, each one of those strategic priorities to come up with goals and objectives. They were presented and we had some very excellent discussions, a lot of good strategic level discussions as well to include enrollment in state, out of state diversity and things like that. Got some great feedback on what the goals and objectives would be. We are now in the process of refining that. What I'm really looking for in goals and objectives is how do I know that I have gotten there? And when there's a goal or objective that says something, how do I know that I am there?

And then we're going to pull the metrics together as well. All right, so a strategy as you know, as ends ways and means goals and objectives and strategic priorities are the ends. Those are the outcomes. That's what makes the difference. Now we have to look at the ways to get there. Those are programs and then you have to look at the means, which is really resources and finances to pay for the programs. So for each objective, there's going to be a program that achieves that objective. Most of those objectives. I mean, most of those programs are already in place and we'll look at them to make sure that they're doing all the right things to accomplish the goal and the objective. We may have to make some adjustments and in some cases we're going to have to create a new program altogether. And then you have to, once you get all your programs in place, you go back to the resources, the means to accomplish the ways which is the program to accomplish the ends, which are the goals and objectives of the priorities. So access and affordability becomes important to this, but first we want to inspire them to do that and we're looking at programs on how to make that happen. Here's another, another interesting piece of the demographic in state that we found at a Commission Higher Education meeting that we went to earlier this week. There are 50,000 students in the state of, or 50,000 residents in the state of South Carolina. They went to college but never got a degree, either a technical college or two year regional or even a comprehensive that did not get their degree. These are nonstandard or nontraditional students that are not necessarily thinking about going back to a resident four year bachelor program or a model and they would be very receptive to some of the other opportunities that are out there, principally an online program. And so we're going to look at seeing where some of the demographics of higher education are moving towards this being one of those type of markets and see how we can meet their needs or their educational needs.

Last, I would just say before taking any questions that you have is you probably heard about our cyber tabletop exercise with the Army Cyber Institute that came down here. We had 65, a corporate level,

from the Midlands, from city government, state government and people from Fort Gordon that were there to go through this cyber. We had the tabletop exercise just talked about some cyber issues that would occur here in the Midlands, like the collapse of Dominion power for whatever reason, and then how would you manage your consequences and then had discussions on how would you prevent this in the future and how would you bring some public private partnerships together. It was really a great opportunity to have everybody in the room to have those types of discussions. Out of that we will, we will create a South Carolina Cyber Institute affiliated with our university to start addressing not only consequence management but also economic development in the cyber and the cyber corridor between Fort Gordon and us over here.

The other thing I would tell you is that I probably have seen some of you on some of the college visits that I've been to. I'm really excited about visiting all the different colleges and I have learned a lot. I'm just amazed just to being around your students, your faculty to see some of the resources you're doing and I'm enjoying those. And last on Friday, we will recommend to the board who the next provost will be and we are hoping the board will approve it on Friday. And then with that we'll make the public announcement. So let me stop there and take any questions that you have.

As you know, on resources, I think that I had mentioned to you last time that I was very fortunate to inherit a strategic initiative fund for the President which total \$29 million. We had already made the decision and the board approved at the last board meeting to take 7.4 million of that 29 million for an important strategic objective, which was, I mean, strategic priority, which was our first one, I'm sorry, the second one, world-class faculty. And we wanted to address the issues of compression and merit within that and that was the \$7.4 million that the board had approved. So 29 minus 7.4 brings us down to 21.6 and that's the money that I have available to either create new programs or make adjustments to existing programs. I'm sure I won't have enough. We'll figure out where the priority is and what the cut line is and then, and then we'll go from there. But I'm very pleased that now we have goals and objectives. We'll refine that over the next couple of weeks and then for the month of the rest of March, the month of April, I'm really going to look hard at programs and then we'll make sure that we have the right resources to accomplish that at the end of April and May timeframe. I really would like to wrap this up before the end of the academic year. I'm not sure I'll get there. If not, we'll go into the summer to finish that up. Okay, open any questions at the end if you have any questions on any of them.

As you know, we did the climate survey. I talked to you last time about the climate survey that we did and the results that were distributed at the university level and those results. This is something I told you that I wanted to do and have done anytime I've taken over a new organization, I want to understand where we are at this particular time.

We know that the survey when we finally got a contractor to put it together was taken in the first week of November. There was a lot of drama that was going on in the university at that time with SACS and board. Where the board was with all this and understand that had an impact on strategic leadership. But nevertheless, there were some issues that really I think that we've got to take a look at and address.

For example, in every single category of the survey, we are below average with our one Carnegie equivalent universities, in every category. And we are, if you compare us with regional universities, we are below average in every category. So there's some things we really have to look at. But I wanted to

see what, where this university is coming in as new president.

I am going to take the Chief of Staff and put him in charge of a committee, a diverse committee from across the entire university to look at some of these climate issues at the university level and then to address them and to find out where, what we have to do to do that.

Then we took now where we are right now is we wanted to distribute the results for each academic unit in each one of the staffs. And those were made available to the public today. If you saw that on, on today's Gamecock, you can click on it. You can see that the deans already had that information. The staff leadership already had that information. And my guidance to them was to do the same thing that I did as the president, was to be transparent with this, to have a good, good, solid, open, candid discussion with the members of your organization. And then if there are things that have to be addressed, then go ahead and to do that, I'll monitor how well they are doing that and if I need to intervene or if the provost needs to intervenes, we're prepared to do that to make sure that that open candid discussion and deans and staff members addressed issues that need to be addressed.

Okay. Third is the finance budget that we're going to present. We've already presented this to the House Ways and Means now we're presenting it to the Senate. We got some feedback already from the House Ways and Means as their recommendation of the budget goes, now forward to the Senate And what we are recommending and I'll just give you the Columbia campus, not necessarily the system-wide, as you know, the first one addresses tuition.

And if you just look at tuition prices alone, we're in the bottom seven in the entire nation of all flagship universities. If you compare our tuition rates with our per capita income, we're 50 out of 50. Said another way, 34% of an average per capita income family's annual salary will go for tuition for their son and daughter, just tuition alone. So we really have extremely high tuition rates.

Of course, a lot of that had to do with a drop of appropriations during the recession. My predecessor, I talked to him the other day and what he did to deal with that, he increased enrollment principally from out of state because out of state brings an extra \$10,000 for out of state students every year. So, that's kind of as we look at that. So what we want to do is, again, we want to freeze tuition and by freezing tuition to mitigate that we've asked the state for \$9,358,000 of which the House Ways and Means committee has approved. It's going over to the Senate and that'll be my request next Tuesday when I talked to them.

In addition, we are requesting reoccurring of the \$2 million that goes to the School of Medicine for rural health initiative, the \$826,000 that goes to the School of Law, public Law Library, which is not only the Law School's library, it's a state of South Carolina's Law Library and on the non-recurring side we are requesting \$35 million for the School of Medicine relocation, which is the medical campus. house ways and means only took 25 of the 35 and that's what they're sending over to the Senate. So I anticipate it will not be the full 35 they were asking for, just the 25.

We have asked, we are putting forward as a university this year, \$14 million for deferred maintenance. We have asked the state to match that. The House has agreed to do that and that's what's going over to the Senate would be \$14 million and that's our request that they match our 14 million for a total of \$28

million for deferred maintenance. I'll be glad and happy to give you the rest of the systems if you'd like, or I can show you that afterwards after we're all done.

So that's the financial information. I think in that committee meeting I'm told we'll probably have some discussion on affordability and that's one of the huge issues, not only access but affordability. Students that can go to higher education but just can't afford to do it. And whether they just dismiss that opportunity altogether because they know they can't afford it or those that want to come, have applied to come and are not, are unable to come because they can't afford it.

Case in point, last year for this current freshman class, there were 500 African American students that were offered enrollment into this freshman class that elected not to come. I asked why and the principal reason was they couldn't afford to come. You could just imagine if even 10% or 20% of that 500 did come as part of our class, how that would have been had a very strong and positive impact on our diversity. So this is something that we have to address. What we have proposed this year is legislation that would modify institution level dollars of which state statute says I'm authorized 4% of institution dollars to be used for need-based scholarships.

We are proposing legislation to increase that 4% to 8% and mind you that 4% to 8% increase are institution dollars. They're not state tax payer dollars or our dollars. And we have the strategy to find where that 4% would come from. In addition, the same legislation that we're asking because the current statute says only those who are at poverty level are authorized the 4% need-based. And we're asking that that would expand to poverty level times 2. Poverty level \$24,000 a year and then that would be increased to \$48,000. So we were not only had extra income for need-based, we also now have a wider range of applicants that we can apply it to.

So this is one of the things that we're also asking with the legislation and we think there's a strong support. I know there's strong support on the house side. We think there's good support on the Senate side and the governor actually mentioned it in the state of the state address that specific initiative, so we hope that we'll pass.

The board, when we talk to the Senate Finance Committee, we know we anticipate some questions on diversity. I'm prepared to answer all of those as well. I would just share with you one of the, not necessarily what we're going to talk about, although we can talk about it with the state finance. I mean with the State Finance Committee and that is the more I understand the dynamics and the demographics of the K through 12 system in the state of South Carolina and as a flagship university for the state of South Carolina that serves the people of South Carolina, I pay close attention to these numbers. I was just told the other day and we are going back to do a fact check and to validate this, but if you look at high school students for the last couple of years that go through the K through 12 system, only 40% will go to higher education. I'm sorry, 60% will go to higher education, 40% will not go.

Of the 60% that go to higher education, 30% go out of state and only 30% stay in the state of South Carolina. So that's kind of a current constraint, believe it or not, for in-state applicants. And we're starting to experience some of these challenges this year. And let me explain. Midlands, we have a program with Midlands Technical is called the Midlands Gateway program. And we'll take 300 students that will stay on our campus, but will spend one year at Midlands Tech and their tuition

dollars go right straight to Midlands Tech. Right now we're unable to find 300 instate students to fill that 300 capacity. We're about 100 short and the president of Midlands is very concerned about that.

So why are we 100 short? Interestingly enough, Clemson decided to increase their instate enrollment this year by 300. There were 1200 fewer K through 12 graduates and it's kind of like we shot ourselves in the foot. We decided to increase our Palmetto Pathway from 50 to 100 and that contributed as well. My point is that there is a constraint number of students that go to higher education in the state of South Carolina and all of our universities, both public and private are competing for them.

My thought on all of this is not necessarily that we ought to be competitive and try to make the size of our pie bigger, but I think there's a way that we can try to get the entire pie bigger or larger. There are different programs and different ways to do this, but wouldn't it be great to inspire more high school students to want to go to higher education? Wouldn't it be great to not only inspire them but that they're committed to their high school curriculums to get the grade point average and the standardized test scores they can to get admitted and, and we find ways to be able to make it affordable that they can come. So access and affordable becomes important to this, but first we want to inspire them to do that and we're looking at programs on how to make that happen.

Here's another, another interesting piece of the demographic in state and we found this out at a Commission on Higher Education meeting that we went to earlier this week. There are 50,000 50,000 residents in the state of South Carolina that went to college but never got a degree, either a technical college or two year regional or even a comprehensive. That did not get their degree. These are nonstandard or nontraditional students that are not necessarily thinking about going back to a resident four-year bachelor program or a model and they would be very receptive to some of the other opportunities that are out there, principally an online program. And so we're going to look at seeing where some of the demographics of higher education are moving towards this being one of those type of markets and see how we can meet their needs or their educational needs.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - First thank you. Just a comment in a question. I think cause the narrative about affordability of college is a national issue but I think, you know, especially when it comes up in the newspapers, it's not really tacked on with data about decreasing investment from the states in higher education. And those two trends flow in parallel to some extent. So I just maybe a little bit of information on your strategy to kind of reinforce the importance of the state investing in higher ed to help stem the flow of tuition increases because there's a clear causal pathway between state disinvestment in higher ed and increasing tuition, but the public who doesn't spend as much time thinking about these institutions as we do, isn't getting that message clearly. So I think as a university it's important that we reinforce that message when we interact with state institutions.

PREIDENT CASLEN – Well, we are, funny you should say that we are actually going to put a briefing together for legislators for that purpose to educate and to try to create an understanding and a common understanding on some of the demographics and dynamics of higher education. They need to know that the K through 12 system is ranked 44 out of 50 in the nation. They need to know that 40% of our high school graduates do not go to higher education. That's, you know, that's a kind of a surprise. And then why do 30% of our graduates go out of state? Why don't they stay in state? What are some of the

incentives and they can help us on some of these incentives and stuff like that, that can help us. Is our tuition too high? It's, you know, you look regionally, it's way, way too high in my opinion.

We're 50 out of 50 when you look at per capita income. So in some of these surrounding states, like Tennessee are now offering the residents from the state of South Carolina and the state of Georgia and North Carolina's resident tuition to go to Tennessee. So all of these universities are going to start being in competition with each other and we're going to have to understand those sorts of dynamics to really understand that. You know, not only that contributing in the next five years is going to be the drop off of high school students altogether because of the birth rate has dropped significantly and so how do we address that? And if we're going to be competitive, it starts with tuition money, first of all, because people have got to be able to afford higher education.

If you drop your appropriations down to 12% of your budget, that's where we are. That's one of the lowest of all state appropriations in the entire nation, then then they need to understand that the consequences and the consequences are easy to describe from enrollment purposes. But what I want to do is I want to make the consequences and explain that in terms of economic impact. Because if I can make the consequences and understand the results as with related to economic impact, then I think it will get their attention more than anything else. And that's so we are actually preparing that briefing, that very briefing to try to make that case. Whether they listen to it or not and might just think it's more whining or complaining but we'll see. But it's something they need to understand.

SENATOR TAVAKOLI - I was wondering about the survey. What is the next step? Because some of those benchmarks were very, very low compared to our five university and (unintelligible) in terms of benefit healthcare classroom, all of those is the, that would be shared with our legislative to get more funding from them or what is the next step?

PRESIDENT CASLEN – Well, issues related to capital expenditures are really going to be handled in the discussions that we have with our Strategic Plan because one of our strategic priorities is a 21st century capital or our construction infrastructure that includes a virtual infrastructure, not a 20th century one. Ideally, we'd love to have a 22nd century infrastructure.

Another one priority number five has to do with research so that we can improve our research capacity to be AAU eligible. So each one of those has an impact on what that infrastructure is going to look like and then how we're going to compete for it. So you know, the deferred maintenance is all very helpful, but there's also going to be I think a requirement and increased demand on research, research laboratories and the infrastructure that's going to support some of that. And I think that's one of the ways we're going to look at it.

The medical campus is going to help significantly because coupled with the medical campus, they're not just academic building but a research center and that can assist as well. So that's how we want to address it there.

But in terms of climate and how people feel about leadership or how people feel about the facilities that they have, that's a separate issue altogether. And that's something they'll also, we have to address. That's why I want to put the Chief of Staff with an interdisciplinary committee together to really

understand what the survey is saying at the university level and then what do we need to address some of those concerns.

All right, well you all have my email address, bobcaslen@sc.edu. And if you have a question, please, I welcome your email and let me turn it over to our Provost Tayloe. He'll give us an update on Corona.

### **Report of the Provost**

INTERIM PROVOST TAYLOE HARDING - So I'm going to say a word first about the \$7.4 million pay package and then I'm going to let Allen Miller handle the Coronavirus. I have a phone call, I'm already late for so, and Allen is expert on all things academic as it relates to Covid19 to begin with and so, he's going to handle that now for me.

As the president mentioned and as you've probably seen in the paper and the Gamecock and heard around town, the thing that I've been talking about in every Senate meeting of the year, the \$7.4 million pay package for faculty tenure track faculty, specifically on the compression side, all full time faculty is considered by units on the merit and retention side was approved by the Board at last, the week ago, Friday's meeting February 21st.

So, Cheryl Addy, in my office and others are working really hard on getting the compression numbers out and getting the dollars loaded into college budgets and then directly into salaries for those that are affected by compression before the end of the fiscal year, hopefully in the next few pay periods. April 15<sup>th</sup> payroll is what we're aiming for. Please do not storm Osborne with pitchforks if it ends up April 30<sup>th</sup>, because it will ultimately be what it's supposed to be. We're just trying to get it out as quickly as we can.

That's the compression side. It's all done, all calculated. The calculations were based upon all of the data that we collected on Carnegie One institutions that's collected in the Oklahoma State survey. We went to 95%, used a formula. It has fringe built in, comes to \$3.7ish million, which is about half of the 7.4. The other 3.7, as I've mentioned numerous times, is devoted to merit and retention. The deans met this morning and considered the Faculty Welfare Committee of the Senate proposed methodology for the awarding of that money. I'm considering the \$3.7 million of merit in two ways.

We have to both, (1) allocate it to the academic units that will determine how to then number (2) award it. And the academic units will use procedures developed in their units between their administrators and their faculty to determine how best to do this, one time. It's recurring money but is only one exercise. That in the old days with merit increases from the state, we get multiple years in a row. So, even though they were recurring, we also got additional exercises. That's not the case here. Right now until the university comes up with its own internal plan for long-term salary increase as a part of the budget, we're only gonna do this merit one time with these dollars that were committed, um, by the board and with the president's passion for this particular program.

So administrators and faculty in each unit determining their methodology based upon a few basic principles that we've been discussing and here for a while to award merit and to award merit over the course of two years beginning on July 1st. So it may very well be that some people will find merit increases in their checks by August 16th or it may be that because the deans have with their colleges until the end of the academic year to come up with their methodologies and run them through my office by the time they execute them we might be into next fiscal year and then the dollars begin being awarded in merit during that year. But I want to make sure that there are two years available there because that's the way we get merit to as many faculty as we can over time. And if we're holding some money centrally for retention, I want to be able to give out that money in retention over a two-year period rather than just a one-year period. So that's my report at this point on the \$7.4 million pay package. Thank you to the President and to the Board for acting on this unanimous board approval. Took very little conversation, had very few questions. I was very relieved. Any questions?

CHAIR COOPER - You mentioned principles. I believe two of those core principles are that the process should be transparent and that it should be grievable.

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - That's correct. Thank you.

SENATOR MARK MINETT (English) - So transparent and grievable. Were there other principles? Are they in the Faculty Welfares report. So you've adopted all of the principles in that multipage recommendations?

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - Yeah, I'm not sure I would say that principles have been adopted. There are these two that were mentioned here and the dollars have to be given out for merit, which means that once the colleges determine themselves how, what measures merit, there'll be things, there'll be individuals that don't receive these raises as a part of merit and that's a principle as well. This will not be an across the board mechanism. It will be a merit mechanism when the money is \$3.7 million spread out across the university.

In the past when we have gotten raises like that \$3.7 million for the whole university the Provost has told the deans, just give that out as a matter of across the board. That will not be the case here. A principle is that they must do this in a meritorious way. They must devise, another principle is they must devise the methodology between faculty and administrators in departments and colleges. And another principle is that, I just lost my train of thought. Oh, that they're accountable to me for them. I have to see all the, well I have to see the proposal, all of the college proposals to make sure they meet all those principles.

SENATOR MINETT - Thank you.

SENATOR BETHANY BELL - Have you given any more consideration to how that 3.7 is going to be allocated? Is it going to be, because you don't know how many faculty in Arts and Sciences are meritorious will get it right. So to me it wouldn't make sense to do it ahead of time proportionally because then Arts and Sciences may get more than they need and Music or Nursing or Social Work will not.

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - When we consider what a merit is designed in each academic unit that whole concept of what's deserved is debatable in every single department. So we can't very well do it that way. We're going to have to apportion dollars to colleges and then ultimately departments with certain expectations tied and those expectations are related to the principals I just mentioned. I have not yet decided and I think it has to be my decision based upon input as to what that allocation will look like. But the deans told me this morning, they want to know their allocations before they begin their merit exercises. Make sense? So at some point we'll determine what that is. That point is coming soon, probably during spring break and after spring break we'll come to some kind of grips about what that allocation will look like and then I'll report it.

SENATOR BELL - Thank you. And one more question. Have you related to that and is that this process when you'll decide how much is being retained centrally for retention?

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - Yes. Same process at the same time, under the same consideration, right?

SENATOR BELL – Thank you.

SENATOR REBECCA STERN (English) - I just had a question regarding the deans. The ModernThink survey makes clear that people are pretty much very, very happy in their departments and not happy with their deans. And in the college of Arts and Sciences, like we're in the bottom of, you know, we like are we tagged? Has anybody thought about you know, I appreciate that you've got something where you will be overseeing the proposals, but is there any possibility of perhaps going directly to the chairs rather than going through deans if there's already some issues with trust at that level?

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - I'm afraid we can't do that because the deans are entrusted, whether they're trusted by faculty or not. They're entrusted by the institution and policy to do this work. But I have tried to ensure where I can, that deans that have department chairs and departments are working with department chairs and faculty to come up with these recommendations. I think, I don't want to speak for Faculty Welfare, but I would assume when Faculty Welfare did their work on this, the thought of how administrators would be involved was a part of their thinking. Bethany, is that true? Yeah. So, for me, I have to tell you, Rebecca, what, where I have come to grips with this is that department chairs will have as big a role in determining what the criteria for merit are as the deans will have and faculty will have in these methodologies. As much as, well, for me, that's the best we can do other than cutting off the arms off a Dean who's charged by the institution to do work just like this. Other questions?

SENATOR BELL - I would just encourage anybody that if you feel you've heard what Provost has said. If anyone feels that that's not working well, it's not going to be transparent, communicate with Tayloe directly. Bring it to Faculty Welfare. I'll bring it to Mark Cooper. Bring it to somebody. So don't just stew. So I'm just saying there are multiple places. If you don't want to go to Tayloe directly for confidentiality, bring it to myself or Mark Cooper or you know, whomever you can get it to. The three of us are deeply vested in this. And as I said before, Faculty Welfare's committed to making sure that this goes as smoothly as possible, respecting the fact that Dean do make the decisions that is their

job, but hoping that all deans followed the principles that faculty are involved in the process.

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - That's a great point and let me second that. And let me also say, this is why I had been asking since the beginning of the year, the Faculty Senate and in both provost retreats to get as much feedback from faculty as I can about the procedures we would use. And that's why this merit procedure that we will do for this one-time awarding of merit recurring dollars will be the most, will involve the most shared governance of any merit exercise ever done at the University of South Carolina. And we have the Senate and Faculty Welfare and a series of unrelated scenarios that have come together all at once that have produced that situation. Now, I will tell you that by the time most of this merit, well by the time every penny of this merit money has given out, I won't be the provost anymore. So, share with me anything you like between now and June and July 1st I'll do whatever I can.

SENATOR YENKEY - To dovetail back into President Caslen's presentation to the state legislature, I think this might be helpful as a point a given that a number one strategic objective is to recruit and retain a world class faculty. The retained, the compression raises are a little bit more statistically objective cause you've got the OSU benchmark. What would be the dollar figure required to fix the compression situation campus wide? Cause that might be a nice indicator to, to communicate to the legislator.

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - That's a great question. And I think with respect you're going to give it just for tenure and tenure track faculty though, aren't you? Correct. Okay, go ahead.

VICE PROVOST AND DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL CHERYL ADDY - The 3.4 million to allocate has to include fringe. That number is I believe 2.7 million in base salary. That's using the formula we have where the 95% of target and capping at the various amounts by rank to fully meet the compression strictly on the numbers. That's compression using the 95% target, not 100% would take 6.7 million plus fringe. So we're meeting about 40% of the need by our target.

INTERIM PROVOST HARDING - For tenure track faculty. Okay. Anything else? So, I'm going to ask Allen to come up and if you have questions relative to what senators received today, which was the presidential executive summary on the Coronavirus. He's now our Vice Provost for the coronavirus.

### **Report of Vice Provost**

VICE PROVOST AND DIRECTOR OF GLOBAL CAROLINA ALLEN MILLER - Hi everyone. So let me just say a couple of things real quickly and then I want to take questions cause I know there've been a lot of questions. So yesterday, the Emergency Planning Group appointed an Incident Commander and that's Debbie Beck, she's the head of our Student Health services and we've been relying on her. She interfaces with DHEC. Everything we're doing is based on CDC recommendations and CDC levels. So a lot of us been meeting behind the scenes. We've been making determinations about study abroad. We have been calling students home from countries that are CDC level threes. We are telling students in CDC level twos, which there's only one such country that they should be prepared to change their plans. But we are continuing to move forward around the world. Right now,

we're not doing what Clemson's doing.

Clemson called all their study abroad students home from across the world regardless of CDC level. We don't think that's appropriate. We have students in many countries where there are no cases or very few cases. Bringing them home, having them go through a lot of airports and train stations on the way home doesn't actually protect them, doesn't protect us, and it, you know, has real consequences on their educational experience. So we're taking a more nuanced position than what Clemson is and we think we're actually relying on the science more. So with that, I'd like to take questions cause I'm sure there are a lot of them.

SENATOR TESTERMAN - So I saw a lot of things in there that were student-centric and protecting the students, which is great. I mean, obviously we need to do that, but I do not see anything as far as contingencies for being able to teach if we need to close a campus or a faculty can't make it because I mean, one thing to remember about this virus is that young people have been doing fairly well. It's older people and people with health problems that are faring poorly and that includes a lot of faculty. So we need to make sure that there's protection for both the students and the faculty. And that education can continue through video conferencing or what have you, as much as possible, you know, in the event that we have a stay-at-home order in this area.

VICE PROVOST MILLER -So you're right. I mean, I mean certainly people in my age group start to have to really worry and a lot of us in here. I think, you know we have a pandemic plan and in that pandemic plan it does include the possibility of closure. But we are a very long way from that. The Emergency Planning Group is looking into what the contingencies would be in that case. But you know, right now I think closure is pretty unlikely. If we start to have, you know, faculty who face illness then, then we will make plans.

But there is not at this point a policy that says universally this is what would happen in all cases where a faculty couldn't be on campus. I would say we've been working hard on this for about a week and it's going to take a little more time, but nothing like that's going to happen in the next week or two weeks. Yeah.

SENATOR BELL - Can you, you may not be able to confirm or deny this and I don't know, but do you know if any of the 13 people in South Carolina who are being monitored have been on campus?

VICE PROVOST MILLER - Not that I know of. I know a couple of those people are people that we have asked to self-quarantine and have not allowed on campus. To my knowledge, none of them have been on campus, but since I don't know who all 13 of those people are, I can't completely confirm that.

SENATOR BELL - Would you, is there an understood relationship between administration and DHEC that if someone in the future gets, is monitored or put into quarantine and they reveal that they had been on campus, is that going to be given to you all?

VICE PROVOST MILLER - We're working very closely with DHEC, I mean day by day, so we, we would know that. Yes.

SENATOR BELL - Okay. Thank you.

SENATOR TAVAKOLI - I was wondering about following on that. Do we have, are we tracking the students from those level three countries? Like China, Korea?

VICE PROVOST MILLER – Yes. We have a spreadsheet. We know have every one of those students' names. We have their travel plans and we know where they're going. Most of those students, so we had 203 in Italy. Most of them are in fact will not need to return to campus because they are able to complete their coursework online through their Italian institutions.

SENATOR TAVAKOLI - And second question regarding testing, our clinic has that or where they, if someone comes potential where they can do the testing?

VICE PROVOST MILLER – So, they should notify the Student Health Center, but right now it's happening at the Health Department.

SENATOR RAJCA - I wanted to know, is there been any guidance or discussion of guidance for faculty, staff or students who are traveling to do research or go to conferences? Has any of that under consideration in terms of any guidance for faculty or students or staff involved in those activities?

VICE PROVOST MILLER - Well, right now it's basically if you're not going to a level three country practice good hygiene. You know, wash your hands, you know, these are the standard recommendations. Now, right now we're not approving TA's for faculty who want to go to level three countries. We also don't have any requests, so people are being pretty responsible. You know, I would say if you're considering going to a level two country, my advice to you would be reconsider. Is that really necessary? You know like I said, there's only one level two country right now. It's Japan. We wouldn't stop you from going, but my advice would be to reflect on whether you really need to be there.

SENATOR RAJCA - Yet, I do have colleagues around the country who have actually have been told not to travel, even in large cities in. I just wanted to have a question if that's being talked about at all or not yet.

VICE PROVOST MILLER - We don't, no, that is not being talked about. And that would not be advice that I would give. I think, you know, if you want to go to Sao Paulo right now, there's absolutely no reason in the world why not to.

SENATOR BREEN - I was specifically asked by a colleague in our department to ask you or Tayloe what concrete things are happening on campus specifically, are we planning to make sure that the bathrooms have soap because not all do or that the antibacterial things have antibacterial and are working because some don't work. And then another idea she had was signs to wash your hand or just those basic things, making sure the cleaning staff have sufficient cleaning materials. And then her last

idea, sorry to keep you, at Clorox wipes on the podiums that us teachers work at and switched among.

VICE PROVOST MILLER - We have not talked about Clorox wipes on podiums. I can tell you that the cleaning staff is being briefed and we're making sure that they have appropriate antiseptic cleaning materials. We are looking at if we start to have cases in South Carolina the necessity for extra cleaning which would involve hiring people.

I was talking with Bill Fairchild who my former LLC colleagues know, but who runs the language laboratory where a whole lot of students come in and touch a lot of things. And one of the concerns has been the inability for departments and colleges to purchase things like tissue and hand sanitizer. And there's been some confusion on that. But what we're going to do and I just got this from Mandy Kibler actually while I was sitting here is Consolidated Supply is going to order large amounts of that. So departments and colleges should be able to go there and get it. They want to do it that way rather than having individuals purchase it because they want to track it in case we can get money from FEMA at a later date for this.

SENATOR BRANDT - Thanks Allen. I also wanted to ask about the cleaning supplies. So I'm glad that you address that. The second part is the State Health Department has developed some really great educational materials that are suitable for widespread promotion. Does the campus have any plans to adopt those materials? And put them on the TVs or use those posters around campus. We've done that in the discovery building. We felt like it was a really important reminder to people just to be cognizant of, I mean, I don't know why people aren't washing their hands anyway, but to wash their hands to be a little bit more diligent, you know, about doing that. So I had a chance to look at those materials the other day and I've been pushing them out and I think that they would be a great addition on campus.

VICE PROVOST MILLER - So, that's a really good idea. And if you want to send me the link, I'll send that to Debbie Beck and hey, count to 20 or sing Happy Birthday when you wash your hands so you know, you've done it long enough time. Oh, don't touch your face. Stay away from people who are ill.

You know, I mean it's very interesting. I was talking to a colleague who I will not name, who told me they had the flu and they were staying home. And I said, have you had a flu test? And they said, no, no, I don't need a flu test. And I said, well, how do you know it's the flu then? Oh, well I haven't been anywhere. Have you been through airports? Yes. I said, you need to have a flu test.

I know you can't just go and get a Coronavirus test. But you know, people who assume they have the flu, you know, may or may not. People who assume they have a cold. So, you know, practice good hygiene. If you're not feeling well, don't come to work. Tell your students that too. I mean don't assume that it's not coronavirus Don't assume that it is, but just be prudent.

SENATOR KRISTINA SCHWOEBEL (University Libraries) - Have we talked with any of the auxiliary groups on campus? So food court staff, other things like that? Because I know frequently, especially for people that are working more kind of retail and things like that, there's not a lot of money there that they have. And so sometimes people will come in when they're not feeling well or if they're just shorthanded. So have we talked with those groups to make sure that they know that if anything is

happening, stay home or to look at sick days or other things like that?

VICE PROVOST MILLER – So Facilities, Student Services, et cetera, have been involved in all these meetings. But the only been a few of these meetings so far. That topic has been discussed. I don't know that there's been a particular plan for how we address people who are, say temporary employees who don't have accumulated sick leave, although I know the topic has come up. But I don't know that there's a particular plan to address that yet, but that came up in CAD today and it came up in our meeting at the Student Health Center today.

SENATOR DOXTADER - I just wanted to follow that up by, by just sort of underscoring the vulnerability of the cleaning staff, particularly those that don't have sick leave and who are paid very poorly and who can't necessarily stay away. I'm also concerned that they're not being provided at least there's some discussion about this, that they're not being provided with extra resources to protect themselves as they're doing cleanings in terms of protective gear. Has that been discussed? Is there a provision for that?

VICE PROVOST MILLER -So I haven't been in the room when protective gear has been discussed, but I know that training was discussed today when Facilities was represented, the Student Health Center, I would, you know. I haven't gotten to the level of detail for light gloves and stuff like that, but, but they are aware that people need to be instructed on how to do this.

SENATOR DAN BRACKMAN (Law Library) - I've kind of following up on these two because my question I was going to phrase is how does voluntary quarantine work? We have students who live in apartments who probably need income. Do they have job protection? If we put them in voluntary quarantine for 14 days? And I know when we were talking about measles, you know, it was you, if you aren't properly inoculated and, you can't be inoculated against this, then you stay home and you start losing leave. And as my colleagues had mentioned, there are people on this campus for whom that would very quickly become a financial crisis.

VICE PROVOST MILLER - So right now the number of people who are affected by voluntary quarantine would be extremely limited. So we would have students coming back from Italy, most of whom don't need to be on campus because they're completing their courses online. We don't have the ability nor does DHEC at the moment to monitor them in their apartment. We do have the ability to monitor whether they come to campus. We have a few international scholars who came, at least one who we contacted and tried to intercept but were unsuccessful who are in voluntary quarantine at this point. And they have, they are working with DHEC and DHEC is monitoring them.

Probably our biggest concern at the moment would be students who have chosen to travel to affected areas during spring break. Even though we've tried to make it clear to them not to do that. And even though we announced yesterday that they would be put in a self-quarantine for 14 days, that's, I'll be very frank, that's impossible for us to track unless they tell us. We don't know what students do on spring break, so that is actually our biggest concern, that certain people will take risks not officially connected to the university, not on a university sponsored trip, but simply personal travel and then choose to come back.

## **5. Report of Secretary**

There was no report.

## **6. Report of the Chair**

CHAIR COOPER - I have three brief items for you, three bullets. First of all, both left but I think we really need to thank the President and the Provost for prioritizing the salary package. It would have been very easy to let that get folded into all the other strategic priorities, in which case it would be competing with a long list of things for funding. And by accelerating that, they not only got us some dollars this year and next, but they also insulated those from competition with every other priority. So I think we do owe them a debt of gratitude for that one.

Secondly, with respect to strategic planning, there's a lot to say. But I will put on your radar for long-term consideration that system governance has emerged as something we really need to think about as a system. And we really need to think about shared governance as well, as a system. We've got several different faculty manuals. We have a faculty manual, each comprehensive has a faculty manual. Every Palmetto College has a faculty organization, and there's a Faculty Senate in the Palmetto college. These various documents do not knit together seamlessly. We're going to need to pay attention to how we're governing ourselves as a system. And there's a lot of shared governance issues in there with respect to things like program competition. How do we approve programs across the system? How do we allow transfer credits? All that stuff. So keep your eyes open for that developing discussion.

Last bullet is we're talking a lot about the ModernThink community insights survey results. Please do not forget that there's also the Coache Survey which was given in March of last year in March. So it proceeds our Presidential transition. Those survey results rhyme the survey results from the ModernThink Survey in a lot of areas, but not every one. Cheryl Addy has been starting to give town hall presentations, which were frankly not super well attended this last week, but I understand it's a busy week. Just please try to help your colleagues understand there are two different surveys. ModernThink went to faculty and staff. Coache went to only faculty. The results are interesting to think about in relationship to each other and please do that.

## **7. Unfinished Business**

There were no nominations from the floor and the slate of nominees was approved.

## **8. New Business**

SENATOR ADAMS - I'd like to make a motion that the Faculty Senate recommend that the Board of Trustees include in their new governance committee the current chair of the Faculty Senate.

CHAIR COOPER - Excellent. I would say they are an ad hoc Governance Committee, the committee that's planning the governance committee, but with that friendly amendment. Is there a second? All those in favor?

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - I'm absolutely in favor to flush out the details a bit. You know, especially if you weren't at last week's meeting, right. The Board of Trustees is forming a governance committee. We think that it's fair that the faculty would be represented on that as well as this governance committee is likely to then produce any number of subcommittees in the future.

The idea is that the faculty should be represented at those tables. They will obviously not be voting members, but they should be there to be not only observers, but part of the discussion. So I'm a little concerned about this strict verbiage of the motion cause one would be to have the Faculty Senate chair. The other, would, you know, another option would be to have a Faculty Senate Chair appoint a representative or does it need to be you specifically? Are we looking for one person as a chair or should we be asking for two representatives? If we might have a moment to flush out those details given whatever is best for the spirit of the motion.

CHAIR COOPER - Sure. So I would say since the subcommittee structure is just contemplated, not implemented, it would be premature to try to produce multiple faculty appointments to the subcommittees. Although a later resolution along those lines might be appropriate as a structure seems to firm up. After mentioning to the President that this recommendation might be coming from the Senate, I found myself suddenly invited to the meeting of the ad hoc Governance Committee next week. So the Board has already at least invited me to one meeting as a faculty representative. And so I would anticipate that a motion along these lines might secure further invitations.

In terms of multiple members, you know, I'm not sure how much that helps. It's not a huge committee. I don't know how much having an additional faculty voice helps you, but you're welcome to exercise your wisdom in that regard. Further discussion of the motion?

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR - How about we just add or his designee?

CHAIR COOPER – That's excellent.

UNIDENTIFIED SENATOR – In case something catastrophic happened to you.

CHAIR COOPER - Like somebody makes another motion that puts me on another committee. That's wonderful. Thank you. So the idea is to recommend to the Board of Trustees that they include on the ad hoc Governance Committee, the faculty representative to the board, who is by policy the Faculty Senate Chair, or a designee.

There was no further discussion and the motion was approved.

SENATOR DOXTADER - This also follows from the last meeting, resonating with Professor Stern's comments. There was a discussion about variations in survey results between colleges and relatively poor showing among many colleges. I'm making a motion and this was discussed at the end of the meeting last time and we'd decided to hold off. I'd like to make a motion to create an ad hoc Senate committee on college level faculty governance. The charge of this committee, more or less would be to review and compare the rules, norms and practices of college level faculty governance in light of ModernThink and Coache survey results and with an eye toward making recommendations to the Senate regarding ways of supporting and advancing faculty governance opportunities within and across colleges.

There was no discussion and the motion was approved.

### **9. Good of the Order**

CHAIR COOPER – The AAUP chapter will meet tomorrow from 4-5:00 PM in Wardlaw College, Room 110 with socializing afterwards with an after party at the Hunter Gatherer.

### **10. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn was seconded and approved. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is Wednesday, April 1, 2020, at 3 pm, in the Karen Williams Courtroom, School of Law.