

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, June 2, 2021

This session was held entirely online.

PRESIDING Chair Mark Cooper

Corrections to and Approval of Minutes

SENATOR REBECCA STERN stated that her motion was not properly worded as stated in the chat.

CHAIR COOPER reminded the Senate that the chat is not the official record.

SENATOR STERN stated that she understands this fact but wishes the motion to be worded identically to that in the chat. Senator Stern moved that an amendment be made that Carolina Online immediately cease and desist advertising and enrollment in all online degree programs that have not been approved by the Senate for online delivery. Further, she requested that all online degree programs be submitted through the APPS system and C&C in keeping with the University Policy Faculty Manual.

The minutes were amended and approved.

Invited Guests

MR. THAD WESTBROOK, Vice-Chair Board of Trustees, and Chair, Presidential Search Committee thanked Chair Cooper for his teaching, research, and service. Mr. Westbrook also mentioned Chair Cooper's efforts on shared governance. He addressed the need for changes in the forthcoming Presidential search process. There was diminished confidence in the Board. Mistakes were made in the last presidential search and the university is committed to rectify these mistakes in the upcoming search. Reform was required; as a result, the Board during 2020 rewrote bylaws, policies, and committees. One new committee is the Governance Committee. The Board now has additional training, including diversity, equity, and inclusion which includes bringing in a third party for diversity and inclusion training. The Board is also being trained on shared governance for South Carolina and national issues by outside consultants. Faculty members, including the incoming Faculty Chair Korsgaard, and each chair of Faculty Senate were participants in this effort.

Trustee Westbrook spoke to the AAUP chapter. Another policy being reviewed is that of influence from external constituencies (e.g., public officials, donors) (Policy 1.19). Policy 3.01, adopted August 2020, was presented to SACSCOC. In September 2020, SACSCOC reviewed the process which included two university presidents. It is a joint effort in reworking Policies 1.19 and 3.01.

The Board chair, President Pastides, and Trustee Westbrook met with SACSCOC to discuss the search process steps. This group affirmed the commitment to a new search process, which SACSCOC has approved. These are ongoing efforts to address governance issues.

The new Presidential candidate search policy is more robust and structured than the prior policy. It is structured and faculty representation is greater in number and proportion. The committee consists of 14 voting members plus advisory members. This breakdown of members include: eight trustees, five faculty members (i.e., Faculty Senate Chairs throughout the system and a student member), Robin Roberts representing the Alumni Association, James Bennett representing Foundations, Lauren Smith representing staff, Lou Kennedy representing pharmaceuticals, David Seaton representing capital campaign, Hossein Haj-Hariri representing the deans, and Gloria Boutte representing the faculty as an advisory member.

The first meeting takes place on June 1, 2021. The composition of committee in size and structure is comparable to searches conducted recently at Ohio State University, George Mason University, Georgia Tech University, and University of Iowa.

There is an explicit delineation of the role of a chair (i.e., what a chair can and cannot do). The committee makes all the major decisions. There are four parts of orientation detailed in the policy. There is a detailed charge for the chair. There is detailed description of Policy 1.9. If the chair does not follow the policy, the chair can be removed. This is true with any board member or member of the committee (e.g., maintaining confidentiality). There are also guidelines for reference checks.

A solicitation will be forthcoming for input for qualifications for the new president. The committee will be asking stakeholders for input regarding personal and professional qualifications needed in the incoming president.

The committee will work to build trust with one another. Their job is to do what is in the best interest of the university.

CHAIR COOPER asked about the Presidential search timetable.

TRUSTEE WESTBROOK mentioned that the policy provides that the Committee sets the timetable. However, it is appropriate for him as Chair to get the process started.

INTERIM PRESIDENT HARRIS PASTIDES thanked Chair Cooper for the opportunity to speak. President Pastides began by discussing how he spent the last 20 months since he was President of the UofSC system and how he plans to move forward.

Mrs. Pastides and the President transitioned easily after his retirement from the University. President Pastides is currently working on three books. The topics include: 1) communicating with college students, 2) stepping away, as opposed to retiring, and 3) the pandemic in relation to epidemiology.

President Pastides serves as the Chair on the Council on International Exchange of Scholars. He is concerned for our international scholars and students' ability to come to Carolina and to travel abroad. In addition, he served as an informal advisor to President Caslen. He also worked with faculty members on the University's Anne Frank Center. This Center has not yet been formally announced. President Pastides also co-chaired the University History effort with Elizabeth West and Professor Val Littlefield.

Mrs. and President Pastides returned to the University for one year out of a sense of duty and love for UofSC. The university needs a good year to attract diverse and good candidates. This means a need to calm the waters, which is the job of President Pastides. His job is not to change the strategic plan although he is becoming familiar with the plan. He is also not planning to change positions although if this needs to happen, he will be open to making decisions.

It won't be a boring or stagnant year; it will be a year of progress. President Pastides reiterated his respect for shared governance and the faculty's role in shared governance. He served as a faculty senator at his former university (University of Massachusetts-Amherst) and was an active participant as president for 11 years at UofSC. He did not often miss Faculty Senate meetings and served under six Faculty Senate chairs. Starting in academia as an assistant professor and leaving as a president, President Pastides stated that he understands and respects Faculty Senate and the general faculty.

In the year ahead, there is a lot of time that will be spent on COVID, although Carolina did better than most universities. The University will continue to review and respond to the situation and examine how the university can do better.

President Pastides co-chairs the North and South Carolina task force on Pandemic Response. The UofSC system received an email from Dr. Beck regarding the summer and encouraging vaccinations. Masks are no longer required from those who have been vaccinated with the exception in select locations (e.g., Health Center and Health and Wellbeing, shuttle buses). Persons who have not been vaccinated are required to wear a mask in indoor settings. We are relying on the Carolinian Creed for compliance.

Carolina Online is a large and complex initiative that he needs additional time to examine. He will appoint a broad-based committee to plan and advise relative to the initiative. He recognizes the issues raised by Faculty Senate in Columbia including INDEV, Chancellors, and the academic deans. More time will be spent looking at administrative and governance issues raised and a final recommendation and hopefully an approval of the online concept will be provided.

Specific considerations President Pastides will ask the committee include to: 1) Better define the relationship between Carolina Online and Palmetto College online programs; 2) Ensure duplication is avoided; 3) Implement target cash flow, breakeven, and profitability points; 4) Identify appropriate institutional control points including formal agreement with Chancellors and Deans; 5) Authorization by the instructional development committee; 6) Approval of proposed budgets and business plans; 7) Development and concurrence of enrollment; 8) Practices including admissions; 9) Identification of non-financial performance metrics including quality; and 10) Implementing a plan for quality assurance and comprehensive evaluation.

Interim Provost Stephen Cutler will be asked to convene and lead this group which will include the chair of Faculty Senate.

The existing nine programs on the Carolina Online website will go forward; only these programs at this time. There is a record of collaboration and approval of these nine programs. We do not yet have concurrence from faculty in the College of Arts & Sciences and elsewhere. There are opportunities to enroll students who are upper division and do not need courses (i.e., in the College of Arts & Sciences) or they can take courses provided by our peer institutions. The advantage of moving forward with these nine programs is that we can prove the concept. We will be well served to see how the programs move forward in an experimental basis.

This is an important summer relative to the Title IX task force that was convened by President Caslen. An internal group and external consultant was appointed for this effort. The report will be finalized soon. President Pastides stated his commitment to the health and wellbeing of the University community. He stated that there cannot be a community of learning if there is no culture of safety, protection, and respect for the vulnerable, survivors, and for our entire community. He is confident the recommendations will make our Title IX practices and entire culture of the university better than it is today.

The Commission on the University History will issue its report in July. President Pastides reiterated his utmost respect for the individuals on the Commission for their willingness to conduct research, identify best practices around the country in peer universities, and willingness to listen to individuals within our beloved communities and outside the university.

The budget for the next year is forthcoming. President Pastides asked the financial officer to direct extra money back to the academic units. This action is consistent with the 2019 budget model; this is where the money belongs. 2021-2022 will be a better year regarding resources at the academic level.

We need to look at the needs in the IT area, the Office of Research, and the Development Office as the next president will need to think of the next capital campaign.

President Pastides affirmed Faculty Senate has his great respect. Summer is not a vacation for Faculty Senate. He encouraged Faculty Senate members to recharge; take time to be with family, friends, and loved ones; travel when possible; and return refreshed.

SENATOR JOSHUA STONE inquired about the plan should cases of COVID begin to increase during the fall semester.

INTERIM PRESIDENT PASTIDES responded that a plan for the fall should cases increase is not yet in place but will be in place by mid-summer. He stated that the pandemic is not “in the rear-view mirror”. We are making progress but must continue to be vigilant. We will return the mask requirement if the need arises.

INTERIM PROVOST STEPHEN CUTLER thanked President Pastides for his support. He was appointed by President Caslen. President Pastides recruited and hired Provost Cutler five years ago to be dean of the College of Pharmacy.

Provost Cutler stated that he is not trying to fill Provost Bill Tate's shoes. Provost Tate did a remarkable job and he is sad that he is leaving UofSC, but he is also pleased for Provost Tate's new position at LSU.

Provost Cutler has been a pharmacy educator for 30 years. He is a scientist, conducting both collaborative and independent research. His research profile consists of over 125 peer refereed publications, three books, 21 book chapters, 50 patents, and 200 scientific presentations. In addition, he has secured \$35 million in extra-mural funding from six different federal institutions. Professional colleagues say that he is an international expert on natural products. He admits that he is an international expert on marijuana.

Provost Cutler stated that the most exciting aspect of his career is teaching. He received 10 teaching awards from 10 different courses. His interest in education began when he taught a few lectures for a professor during his graduate school days.

His academic career took a traditional trajectory. He completed a post-doc in natural product research. He worked at four universities, two were private and two were public, and received tenure at three different universities.

Provost Cutler stated that tenure is one of the most sacrosanct events at academia. Shared governance and tenure are two of the most important components at any university. Shared governance is a dynamic partnership that strengthens a relationship for collaboration. This allows a program to grow and develop in a much healthier manner than a top-down governance model. Shared governance is used by the College of Pharmacy since Provost Cutler's arrival, and it created an outstanding culture of trust among all faculty and staff.

Before the pandemic, the university surveys revealed that the College of Pharmacy ranked among the highest in job satisfaction at the university and Provost Cutler attributes the satisfaction to the shared governance in the college. Provost Cutler stated that a single person may have a great idea or initiative. When you bring in groups of people and begin to massage the idea into an amalgamation of ideas, the concept will be much better.

Provost Cutler stated that he also loves mentoring faculty and staff. These mentoring efforts are both formal and informal.

Tenure, shared governance, and mentoring are the key tenants of Provost Cutler's career, and it is his desire to enhance these tenants at South Carolina as his new role as Interim Provost.

CHAIR COOPER mentioned that he met Provost Cutler when Chair Cooper was Faculty Senate Chair elect and he was impressed that while it is possible in pharmacy to move directly to a Ph.D. without getting a bachelor degree, Provost Cutler insisted that students credentialed

themselves with a baccalaureate degree first. This speaks to a core education and the values of the university.

PROVOST CUTLER responded by stating when he arrived at UofSC, there was a pathway where students would complete two years of pre-pharmacy and four years of pharmacy. This meant students could come straight from high school without completing a baccalaureate degree, assuming the students can pass the national licensing exam. When Provost Cutler arrived at UofSC, the percent of pharmacy students earning a baccalaureate degree was 40%. Approximately 65% of the students are in-state; 45% are out-of-state (sic). Provost Cutler encourages students to work on the Carolina Core and earn a baccalaureate degree as they work toward their professional degree. Now 92-93% of the pharmacy students earn a baccalaureate degree. This also helps with On Time graduation.

CHAIR COOPER commented that Provost Tate made tremendous contributions to the University. He was appreciated for his candor, sober judgement, keen intelligence, and his great compassion. He had the capacity to tell the truth about our priorities and direction in the context when that really matter.

Reports of Faculty Committees

CHAIR-ELECT AUDREY KORSGAARD gave the Senate Steering Committee report in the absence of Professor Spencer Platt. Vacancies to fill are as follows: The Grievance Committee has two positions. Nominees include Professor Kathleen Robinson and Professor Andrew Martin. Faculty Senate Secretary nominee is Professor Marianne Bickle. Nominations for are needed for the Professional Conduct Committee. One nomination is needed to serve a one-year term. Another nomination is needed to serve a three-year term.

PROFESSOR BRANDON BOOKSTAVER, Chair, Committee on Admissions, presented two proposals from the Admissions Committee. The first proposal is to amend the UofSC “transfer admission” section to include a provision to afford opportunity to conduct holistic review on transfer applications. This change simplifies the process for transfer admissions significantly. The proposal change directs readers to the Admissions website.

This change is in consideration of the University’s holistic view of admissions. The change will only impact 1% of the transfer students. There is a holistic review in admission of students but not in transfer students. In addition, this proposal is being forwarded to Faculty Senate with 100% approval of the Committee.

The motion carries.

PROFESSOR BRANDON BOOKSTAVER presented the second proposal to amend the UofSC Columbia undergraduate bulletin “International Admissions” section to simplify reference to international admissions requirements. The proposed change directs readers to UofSC admissions website access full policy detail for Columbia Undergraduate Admissions. This simplifies the way the language is worded, and it is also in line with every other undergraduate admissions related policy.

The motion carries without objections.

PROFESSOR MARIANNE BICKLE, Chair, Committee on Curricula and Courses provided a report. Eighty-two proposals were presented for a vote. Of these proposals, 44 were from the College of Arts and Sciences, one from the Darla Moore College of Business, eight from the College of Education, 12 from the College of Engineering & Computing, 10 from the College of Hospitality, Retail, & Sport Management, two from College of Information & Communication, three from the College of Music, and two from Undergraduate Studies.

The motion carries.

PROFESSOR BICKLE presented three proposals of Experiential Learning Opportunity (ELO) Courses.

The motion carries.

PROFESSOR RAMY HARIK, Chair, Committee on Instructional Development (INDEV), provided a report of the online courses processed. The 86 courses for approval is the largest group of proposals processed through INDEV to date.

SENATOR REBECCA STERN stated that many of these courses are designed for 100% asynchronous delivery and because we are going to be discussing Carolina Online, which seems to be vacuuming these classes in, and also because what Carolina Online would do to is put these asynchronous classes into an asynchronous program for which we have no proposals, she ask we table this decision for the moment. There seem to be classes that do not have the full thorough review that the committee is normally performs.

The motion to table was seconded by SENATOR MCGILL.

SENATOR BICKLE stated that if we make a generalization that any or all these courses are for Carolina Online, it is an error in judgement. We are penalizing all our colleges. Think about it in terms of research. In a research article, we cannot make assumptions. Maybe she heard the motion incorrectly, but it was an assumption that all these courses are for the Carolina Online as opposed to any form of online delivery. She hesitates and strongly objects to making any form of assumption. We have learned over that past year that we need to be flexible in case, for example of a pandemic. If we do go forward with this motion, we are penalizing these Colleges for looking forward and saying online delivery is wrong, when it's not wrong. Online delivery is giving learners opportunities. We need to be judicious in making assumptions. That is, not make assumptions.

SENATOR BRIAN MIHALIK stated that the College of HRSM voted on the Carolina Online initiative. The INDEV courses presented today is more a COVID-related issue and not a Carolina Online issue. The online courses today were in development far earlier than Carolina Online was known by HRSM faculty.

PARLIAMENTARIAN BILL SUDDUTH stated that the motion to is not debatable. The Senate needs to vote.

SENATOR STERN stated that her intention was not to hold the matter up but to move it down the agenda because Carolina Online will be discussed later. She was not trying to be obstructionist.

The motion to table the issue failed. The motion carries regarding the courses presented.

PROFESSOR HARIK gave his sincere regards to the INDEV Committee. This was the first time INDEV processed more courses than C&C. The Committee did not anticipate such a large number of proposals.

CHAIR COOPER acknowledged the enormous amount of work accomplished by INDEV.

PROFESSOR HARIK reported on a new charge for INDEV. Course approval process is migrating to C&C. INDEV is trying to think and analyze on instructional matters. Two questions are posed in relations to Carolina Core: 1) Do we need to revise the Carolina Core and if so; 2) How do we go about it? Meetings were held to this charge. Members across the university who are involved with Carolina Core were invited to these discussions. The committee voted unanimously to revise the Carolina Core. Reasons include: 1) The Core is complicated and not transfer friendly; 2) Some syllabi might be problematic regarding Learning Outcomes; and 3) The Core is 10 years old.

In relation to how to restructure the core, a sub-committee was developed consisting of five members from INDEV. This committee will work over summer 2021. to identify the process to which we revise the Core. The process will be brought to the Senate for discussion to make sure everyone agrees to the changes.

Professor Harik discussed the program modality changes. INDEV has been given direction from President Pastides to use some of these programs for tryout. We will convene a Development Committee. Professor Harik is supportive of this direction as it will provide form discussion and understanding. Professor Harik has been involved in discussions with faculty and he understands there are fundamental disagreements, but everyone wants education and learning to succeed for the students. INDEV is trying to identify the right way of moving forward with Carolina Online with shared governance.

The question to INDEV was regarding program modality. INDEV thinks whereas the quality of education is within the courses, they believe the academic department as a body is the owner of the decision if they want to offer courses online. The academic department needs to be responsible from advising, pre-requisites, concurrence agreements, to other departments where reside with the ownership of a department. At the end of the day, they all want the same thing, a successful university with shared governance. Professor Harik stated that INDEV wants to be integrated into assessment.

Professor Harik is very thankful to the INDEV committee. The Committee is willing to work this summer to help the Carolina community.

SENATOR MINETT thanked INDEV for all the hard work. He asked who has the responsibility whether a shift in modality of a program requires approval of Faculty Senate. Senator Minett believes C&C is responsible based on the Committee's description.

PROFESSOR HARIK stated that since 2017 programs with a change of modality, an information letter is required. No approval through Faculty Senate is required. INDEV continues to believe that departments are the owners of programs, and the departments are held to meeting the requirements of the program.

CHAIR COOPER stated changes to programs goes through C&C. INDEV examined online courses. Now, C&C will examine all courses including online courses. INDEV is a policy guidance and advice committee historically. The Senate has amplified this charge. INDEV was asked for recommendations to the Senate about how we should go about completing this charge. The authority to change programs in the C&C pile. Quality of education, regardless of modality, is in the INDEV pile.

SENATOR STERN inquired what research, data, and scholarship were used to form the committee's decision (i.e., best practices).

PROFESSOR HARIK stated that the decision was based on the committee's discussions. The members have a lot of experience on the issue. Professor Harik believes there is no better owner for a program than the faculty of the program. They are the best stewards. The Committee tried to think for the betterment of the University, Colleges, and Departments. Departments can develop plan and policies and INDEV can make recommendations. INDEV does not want to step over boundaries and tell departments what they must do. INDEV can make checklists for guidance. Faculty are the most zealous about their programs. They need to make the decision regarding modality change.

Professor Harik stated that the founding bricks for any course is Assessment of Learning Outcomes. He invited everyone to be involved in the discussion regarding how INDEV will assess course outcomes, using the appropriate metrics with Blooms Taxonomy.

SENATOR KAREN EDWARDS asked for verification that INDEV's recommendation is based on the fact that INDEV approved all the courses in a program, then no additional revision is needed if you place the program online. The other element is the research-based inquiry. INDEV uses Quality Matters checklist, which is a quality standard rubric used by the University. Professor Harik confirmed that Senator Edwards statements were correct. In addition, the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) is a great resource. Some members of CTE are also on INDEV. INDEV invite faculty members to go to CTE for training before a course is submitted for review by INDEV.

SENATOR STERN stated that with all due respect, to the extreme care taken to the courses reviewed by INDEV, an entire online program may impact many units across the college.

Senator Stern does not wish to limit having authority under its own classes and curriculum. When discussing online degrees, we need to think more holistically. All best practices say that it is extremely different to set up an online program than a face-to-face program. Fully asynchronous students need a lot more services.

PROFESSOR HARIK agreed with Professor Harik regarding online programs. INDEV is saying it is up to the department to conduct its due diligence in consultation with CTE.

SENATOR MINETT asked how does INDEV reconcile the notion that individual courses deserve all this attention but programs, that have systemic implications, do not need Faculty Senate review?

PROFESSOR HARIK stated that INDEV examined the history. First, for the past 4-5 years, not one single program that changed modality went through Faculty Senate. Second, the Commission for Higher Education needs only a documented memo. INDEV believes it should reside at the department level. Third, a checklist should be developed.

CHAIR COOPER stated that he has conducted research on this topic. There has been no approval of modality change only for programs through Faculty Senate since 2017. The few programs that went through Faculty Senate had bulletin changes. As such, these changes went through C&C; they are not in jeopardy of being invalidated. In addition, CHE approval happens after the Senate. It also happens independently.

PROFESSOR HARIK gave an open invitation to all senators and faculty members to discuss this issue at length at a time convenient to all.

PROFESSOR HUNTER GARDNER, Chair, Scholastic Standards and Petitions, provided a report regarding a proposal offer for 2022-2023 bulletin which offers new guidelines on achieving double majors versus dual degrees. It has been thoroughly revised since it was introduced in fall 2020. This proposal allows for more consistent degree auditing which is a benefit from the registrar's perspective. From the student's perspective, it outlines clearer rules how courses are being counted and what each course can fulfill. It clarifies when courses can be counted twice and when they can't be counted twice. It allows some double majors to come from different Colleges. It codifies what is being done in practice now but by making the rules more transparent; it is easier for advisers, students, and the Registrar's office.

SENATOR FRANK THORNE states that he is glad that Computer Science majors will be allowed to earn an additional major in Math. He strongly supports this proposal. He would also like other Engineering majors to have this opportunity. The question was raised if this will be made possible.

PROFESSOR GARDNER stated that she did not know if there is a mechanism to accomplish this in the proposal. When you obtain degrees from two different majors you need two very different sets of core requirements to fulfill. What this proposal accomplishes it that it outlines what is already being done in practice.

There has been some discretion in the past where advisers could say “let the course A count for X instead of Y or X and Y”. Now some of that will be limited and other valid possible combinations may be possible in the future. This is a template.

CHAIR COOPER stated that we need to come to this throughout the same pathway of Standards and Petitions and propose bulletin language.

PROFESSOR HUNTER GARDNER thanked Jenn Tillford, Aaron Marterer and the entire Committee for their work on this proposal.

The motion carried.

PROFESSOR ERIC ROBINSON, Chair, Intellectual Property Committee, provided a report on Copyright Policy (ACAF 1.35). This policy is in regard to copyright. In summary, faculty own what they create with limited exception. The Committee also developed an FAQ that will be attached to the policy. The Committee will serve to solve any problems that arise. It was a collective effort that took five year. Professor Robinson thanked the committee for its efforts.

SENATOR VANCE KORNGAY requested clarification of the process of this policy, specifically when will the vote occur.

CHAIR COOPER stated that there will be no more votes on this issue. It was approved by FAC. It was also approved by the Policy Advisory Committee. It then went out for open comments. Now the President Pastides will sign off on it and it will become policy.

PROFESSORS CHARLEY ADAMS AND LIAM HEIN, Co-Chairs of the Faculty Advisor Committee, presented proposed changes to the Faculty Bylaws. These changes were specifically related to Article V: How it is comprised; How they are elected; and What do they do.

CHAIR COOPER reminded the Senate that the Faculty Manual part of this was approved by Faculty Senate. This is the second reading of Bylaws change.

SENATOR STERN stated that given the many issues regarding everything over the past year and no one has made sure that program revisions come to the Senate, she would like to recommend that we do not recommend this proposal at this time.

CHAIR COOPER stated that he was not sure what program revisions have to do with this change which has been before the Senate several times but he is happy to entertain the motion.

SENATOR STERN stated that she believes it cedes oversight to a small number of people. Chair Cooper stated that this proposal absolutely does not cede oversight. It is very explicit that there is no instance with which the Council will usurp authority previously delegated to campus faculty by the Board of Trustees.

SENATOR STERN stated that Council members represent the Senate. Perhaps greater clarification would make more sense.

PROFESSOR HEIN stated that Chair Cooper is referring to Sentence 4 under #1.

SENATOR STERN requested a change to the statement that says Council members represent the Senate. The motion to strike the sentence Council Members represent the Senate was made. It was seconded by SENATOR MIHALIK.

CHAIR COOPER stated that the language was intended to enhance the authority of the Senate by making clear that the Senate's preferences direct the representation on the Faculty Leadership Council. That is the intent. Chair Cooper believes it is clear because of the relationship between Section 1 and Section 2. It is just a question of who elects and represents by the system Faculty Leadership Counsel.

SENATOR STERN stated that this does seem to delegate authority to a small committee. She asked if her understanding is incorrect.

CHAIR COOPER stated that her understanding is incorrect. The UofSC Faculty Leadership Counsel has no authority except in its ability to represent the individual faculty bodies whose activities it would coordinate. There is no decision making power whatsoever. It is a coordinating and communicating committee. The purpose of which is to allow to all the system to act in concert in system matters. The sentence under discussion is to make clear the Senate is the decision making body representing in the Leadership Counsel. The Counsel would never usurp power of the Senate or Board of Trustees.

SENATOR LINDERMAN stated that it seems as if the term "represent" is where perhaps Senator Stern may be concerned about the statement.

The motion failed. The sentences remains.

The motion for the proposal is approved.

Report of Secretary

CHAIR-ELECT AUDREY KORSGAARD standing in for Secretary Platt provided the Secretary's report. Two nominees are on the slate for the Grievance Committee: Kathleen Robins (term ending 2023) and Andrew Martin (term ending 2022). The slate was approved. One nominee was on the slate for Faculty Senate Secretary: Marianne Bickle (2023). The slate was approved. A nominee is needed for the Professional Conduct Committee (one year term). Please forward names. This person must be tenured.

Report of Chair

CHAIR COOPER stated that President Caslen will be remembers for how he joined and how he left the University. It is Chair Cooper's hope we will also remember his commitment to shared governance and transparency in decision making. Chair Cooper has a number of examples of this but won't give them today. He will just say that in style and substance these efforts did not fit comfortable with established decision making habits around here. Chair Cooper thinks we have

as much to learn from the times they didn't fit as the times they did fit with current habits. In working with President Caslen over the past two years, despite the serious lapse in his presidency, Chair Cooper found him consistently to act with integrity, to act transparently and to have the best interest of the institution clearly in mind. We didn't always agree but he always heard him out and he won my respect.

It has been an eventful few years for the Senate and our Institution is healthier for it. At the General Faculty meeting Chair Cooper reported the accomplishments over the past year, thanked everyone for their efforts and thanked the committees, Marianne Bickle (Curricula & Courses), Ramy Harik (INDEV), Brandon Bookstaver (Committee on Admissions), Hunter Gardner (Chair on Scholastic Standards and Petitions) and Amber Cook (Bookstores).

Challenges for the Senate to think about include Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. We are now able to track the demographic composition of the Senate in terms of race, ethnicity, and gender. In the fall, perhaps ask then Chair Korsgaard to review these with you. Knit our committee structure and Senate deliberation committees more closely together. Introduce a tracking system that will allow you to more clearly identify various issues that are working through the various committees. He will attempt to develop a draft version over the summer; you can review it in the fall. The idea is to make Senate and committee deliberations knit more closely together.

Finally, we need to think about is the size of the Senate. Next year the senate will grow from 160 to 180 faculty. As our faculty grows it will get even bigger. There are some questions we want to ask about whether the Senate can function effectively if it gets too large. What does this mean regarding some thoughtful consideration of minimum representation of each unit should get and how seats should be apportioned?

Chair Cooper thanks Faculty Welfare Committee, College level diversity committees, Division of IT, and Julian Williams in the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion for their work on preferred names and pronouns. There was a lot of work and collaboration that made that possible. We now have the ability in my.sc.edu to identify your preferred first and last name and gender identity.

The new attendance policies, approved last year, will go into effect next year. Guidance is forthcoming from CTE.

Old Business

SENATOR STERN was asked if it is her intention to introduce her new motion. She stated that the new motion is the same as the old motion, simply with new language to "fancy it up".

CHAIR COOPER stated that the new motion is different than that emailed to the Senators. It is also different from the motion that was tabled.

PARLIMENTARIAN SUDDUTH clarified that when a Senate member pulls a motion off the table, you can only pull the motion off as it was put on the table. It was his understanding that Senator Stern was going to leave the old motion off the table and place the new motion on the

table. He reaffirmed that the new motion is different. He asked Senator Stern if she is withdrawing the original motion.

SENATOR STERN stated that both motions are the same, just worded slightly differently.

PARLIMENTARIAN SUDDUTH stated that as Parliamentarian it is his duty to recommend to the chair, it is not in order to call both documents the same motion.

SENATOR STERN stated in light of this she moves that this new document is the motion; she would like this to be an amendment. She would like to leave the original motion and have someone move to make the new information an amendment.

PARLIMENTARIAN SUDDUTH statement that the motion on the table belongs to the body. As a member of the Senate, you may ask to call it from the table.

CHAIR COOPER stated that if it is on the table we cannot debate or vote. If we take it off the table we can debate and vote.

SENATOR STERN requests to take the new motion off the table and vote on the original motion.

CHAIR COOPER confirmed that Senator Stern presented three different motions. The motions were not the same as believed by Senator Stern.

The vote is to take the original motion off the table. The motion carries. We can debate the issue as submitted.

SENATOR JUSTIN BYARS stated that he believes President Pastides addressed this issue, saying Carolina Online is being examined for processes and procedures.

CHAIR COOPER confirmed this statement.

PRESIDENT PASTIDES stated that he respects the Senate's role and autonomy and will be attentive to all issues. Carolina Online will not move forward until all policies... (the Blackboard timer ran out at this moment).

A new Blackboard Collaborate session was initiated to continue the discussion.

CHAIR COOPER stated that Faculty Senate meetings are set up for a pre-determined time. We ran out of this time on the Blackboard Collaborate. This was not intentional.

SENATOR BYARS asked whether or not the "guts" of the motion will be handled with President Pastides taking a step back.

CHAIR COOPER stated that there are programs going forward and being advertised on the Carolina Online webpage. He understands that from the College of HRSM, that some may

choose not to be advertised and don't have full supports of the faculty. If not, this would reduce the number of programs offered by Carolina Online. Carolina Online as a system will continue to advertise. Departments are able to decide on their own if they want to participate and advertise.

SENATOR BYARS asked about the approval process of online delivery.

CHAIR COOPER stated that the discussion has been clear that Faculty Senate has approval over online delivery. INDEV made recommendations. His impression is that the recommendations were not fully satisfying.

CHAIR COOPER believes there are issues that are not specifically related to the question of whether Senate has approved online delivery that are even more concerning. For example, how we are coordinating Carolina Core courses, staffing and funding in the long-term, ensure quality, etc. These are not under the purview of Faculty Senate, but they are concerns of faculty. These will be considered by the Task Force being charged by President Pastides.

SENATOR STERN provided background issue. The Core is the core of the issue. The big issue, changing program modality raises systemic issues that go beyond any individual unit. We do not have a working core. Thus, degree programs were not approved by the Senate. In 2017, when the university started using APPS, people decided to bypass the system because there was no box for online program delivery, Faculty Senate was bypassed. Meanwhile, the policy language makes clear that online program delivery must go to Faculty Senate. Language is being shown that grants change to program modality. Senator Stern believes that programs moved forward have legal issues.

CHAIR COOPER responded by saying he agreed with everything Senator Stern stated with the exception of the programs have not been approved. The modality change has not been approved and something else you said that is relevant to what we are debating. The motion we are debating suggests that the program changes must be submitted through APPS. There is no way to accomplish this; moreover, APPS will not exist after the summer. So if the Senate were to now approve your motion, it would be impossible to comply with the motion.

PARILIMENTARIAN SUDDUTH stated that it is necessary to clearly state what you are striking out and what you are adding.

SENATOR STERN amended the motion and it carried.

CHAIR COOPER read the motion: I move that Carolina Online immediately cease and desist advertising and enrollment any and all online programs that have not been approved by the Senate online delivery. Further, the Senate requests for online delivery go through C&C in keeping with the Faculty Manual.

SENATOR KORNAGAY stated Journalism and Mass Comm is one of the nine programs. We would like to continue as the pilot programs even if advertising ceases and desist. He asked for confirmation.

CHAIR COOPER stated, that no, if this motion carries, the Senate is saying to Carolina Online they should stop advertising all Carolina campus online programs. The Carolina system would continue to advertise put forward by the comprehensives. This motion applies only to the Columbia programs until the Faculty Senate identifies a way to approve the programs.

SENATOR SCHWOEBEL asked how this motion impacts the students already enrolled in Carolina Online and inquired about the timeline.

CHAIR COOPER stated that he believed Carolina Online would find other programs for the students, but he could not be sure.

The timeline would be in the fall. A process and procedure would be developed whereby online degrees are approved through C&C and the full Senate. The procedure would take some time to devise and be approved by the Senate. It would then be implemented by C&C. This would be next spring at the earliest

SENATOR MARK MACAUDA stated that he felt caught. If we stop now we could damage the University's reputation. However, he agreed with Senator Stern's point that assumptions were made about the autonomy about the units vs. the program as a whole. Parts of the issue at hand, like an online course, are the same as an online program. He is worried that if we don't do something we will be back here again. He asks why, if we do this, what are the consequences? If we don't, how do we make sure the train doesn't run away from us?

CHAIR COOPER stated that it is important to think if President Pastides plan that he outlines is sound and trustworthy; what do you need to make it trustworthy?

PRESIDENT PASTIDES stated that he respects the intention of the motion. No further programs will be mounted or advertised until due process has been executed. He has strong collaboration, approvals, the business plan, and the quality control desired. He needs to investigate whether these programs have the academic endorsement of the units and the faculty within those units. Without the endorsements of the faculty with those units these cannot be a successful program. He will look at what the document says.

If they have been approved in a collaborative manner, President Pastides does think there is something to be gained by moving forward and using these programs on an experimental / pilot program basis to see how we will accomplish this effort including advertising, modality, registering, teaching, mentoring, and controlling the quality. If we stop the programs in its tracks, we will never know if they can be successful.

President Pastides will not go forward mounting more programs. The question is, can we go forward? If Faculty Senate sends him a motion to cease and desist from advertising, marketing, admitting, and enrolling, he will respect that and he will not counteract to the Faculty Senate. However, we will lose an opportunity to test the systems to see if they work.

President Pastides is not speaking for or against the motion. That is not his role. He does, however, believe there is something to be gained those nine programs in a pilot period.

SENATOR EDWARDS stated that she does believe the College of HRSM has been collaborative. BAIS is fully ready to go. She would like to see the pilot group move forward. She agrees that the programs that have not been approved in a collaborative manner should be withdrawn from the pilot program.

SENATOR KORNAGAY stated that Journalism has similar sentiments about the pilot. This unit wishes to participate. When the unit offers face-to-face versus online delivery that students vote with their feet; students want online courses. We are in support of President Pastides' plan to experiment with the pilot and work out the kinks in the system.

SENATOR AMANDA FAIRCHILD stated appreciation for the ability to learn more about this issue and will respect the vote. It is difficult for her to understand that we will lose the ability to test out the idea when that ability to test the idea runs contrary to our standard process and violates due process. It is difficult to have the ends justify the means.

SENATOR MATHIEU DEFLEM stated that he agrees with moving ahead with the pilot test phase of the programs. It is also problematic; students are part of an experiment. Also problematic is how Carolina Online was set up without our input. Taking into account many of the items we need to look into, it will take time. Even with faculty on board, working it out may take a few years. Current students may be impacted.

SENATOR ED MADDEN stated the processes was quick and didn't include accurate oversight or governance. Dr. Mitchell's presentation at the last Faculty Senate meeting had major listed that were not approved by the departments. They have since taken those majors off the website. Carolina Online created an advertising program that included programs that majors had not agreed to be part of Carolina Online. What they did was with haste and without Faculty Senate oversight.

SENATOR MACAUDA asked for confirmation if we go through the experimental phase, we go with the Carolina Core courses already online.

CHAIR COOPER stated that it is his understanding there are enough Carolina Core courses approved to offer the programs. We have approved enough courses for online delivery. Whether we have had sufficient discussion in the units or who will teach the courses and the quality of the courses, is another matter.

SENATOR BYARS asked if another Faculty Senate meeting is required prior to Fall 2021.

CHAIR COOPER stated that he didn't think another Faculty Senate meeting is needed for that purpose because the approval of all the courses is not the issue. The approval of the program for fully online delivery is the issue. Another meeting could be called to discuss how long the pilot would run. It is unlikely that faculty on a 9-month contract would devise a program for modality change for approval for the fall. It could happen early fall.

SENATOR BYARS stated that between now and fall 2021, there needs to be decisions from Faculty Senate regarding processes.

CHAIR COOPER stated that if there is a vote yes on the motion, those nine programs are shelved pending the development of those processes. If we vote no, those programs move forward in a pilot phase.

We have President Pastides commitment that no additional programs will be brought forward until we have the procedures for quality control and financial matters etc. made clear.

SENATOR MIHALIK stated that six of the nine programs come from HRSM. ITEC was a program in HRSM for decades. As a former dean, he understand demographics. HRSM is not going to solve the demographics for UofSC. Unless the Colleges of Arts & Sciences and Business contribute to this initiative, we are a tiny tail wagging an huge dog. This is not really a demographic issue. This is really a major league soccer issue, which SPTE has already doubled in size in the past 10 years. Senator Mihalik is skeptical that resources will follow, similar to Shorelight. The \$16 million was generated from Shorelight yet only one faculty line came into SPTE.

Senator Mihalik continued by saying that Interim Dean Brown of HRSM had no choice. Faculty in HRSM had a vote, but no discussion. He is skeptical about revenue following the initiative. This is done without any faculty conversation. It is a perfect opportunity for BAIS.

SENATOR MINETT asked if there is a reason why Carolina Online students can't be moved to Palmetto College.

CHAIR COOPER stated that the Palmetto College asked to be removed from the Carolina Online initiative. There are two four-year programs through Palmetto College. Students would need to be interested in one of the two programs. Chair Cooper also reminded the Senate that Senator Edwards in HRSM, said BAIS is supportive of being in the pilot.

SENATOR STERN reminded the Senate that these degrees are not approved by Faculty Senate. She liked the idea of a test pilot. Regardless of the discussion, there has not been coordination or consent from departments or units. We need a process.

CHAIR COOPER stated that programs are approved. We are discussing the change in modality. The change in modality is not a new program. Our accreditation is not at risk.

SENATOR BYARS requested the motion to call the question and end the debate.

The question has been called.

The motion was made to move that Carolina Online immediately cease and desist advertising and enrollment in any and all online programs that have not been through the Faculty Senate for

online delivery. Further the Senate requests that all requirements for all online approval be submitted to C&C and the Senate be in keeping with the policy and the Faculty Manual.

The motion carries.

CHAIR COOPER STATED that President Pastides will honor this motion. The motion will apply solely to the Columbia campus which the Senate has authority over and not the whole system.

CHAIR COOPER thanked everyone for a good and thorough debate.

New Business

SENATOR THORNE presented a resolution that UofSC adopt additional safety measures if and when cases of COVID-19 rise:

1. Administration follow CDC guidelines;
2. Mask requirements in all academic buildings to come into force if a significant number of COVID-19 cases are reported on campus or through other epidemiology considerations are warranted;
3. Faculty, staff, and students in offices, living in housing and organizers may require masks;
4. Implement mandatory weekly testing for all students, staff and instructors;
5. Accommodations to safeguard health and safety of faculty and instructors;
6. Modality changes to implement the accommodations;
7. Mitigate airborne transmission in classrooms

Faculty Senate have a role in ongoing decision making regarding the pandemic.

Faculty Senate commends the University's role in making vaccinations available, convenient, and for all employees in the community. We encourage these efforts continue.

SENATOR MINETT stated that members of AUP endorse this proposal.

SENATOR BYARS asked how much of this proposal is under Faculty Senate guise. It seems much of this is under the university.

CHAIR COOPER stated that very little of this is under Faculty Senate purview. The content would hold weight to those responsible. It has moral force.

SENATOR STONE requested an amendment asking for mandatory testing for faculty, staff, and students once a month.

CHAIR COOPER reminded the Senate that time is running out of the Blackboard Collaborate timer for the virtual meeting.

SENATOR STONE withdrew the amendment.

The motion carried. It motion will be forwarded to the relevant parties.

The meeting adjourned at 6:03pm EST.