



UNIVERSITY OF  
**SOUTH CAROLINA**

**Regional Campuses Faculty Senate  
USC Union**

Friday, November 19, 2010

Coffee ..... 9:00 - 9:30 AM  
Main Building, Lobby

Morning Session ..... 9:30 - 10:00 AM

Welcome

Dr. Chris Plyler – Huron Group Study?  
Main Building, Auditorium

Standing Committees ..... 10:00 - 12:00 PM

I. Rights and Responsibilities  
Room M201

II. Welfare  
Room M209

III. System Affairs  
Room M307

Special Committees ..... 10:00 - 12:00 PM

I. Grievance Committee  
Room M303

Executive Committee ..... 10:00 - 12:00 PM  
Room M202

Deans Meeting ..... 10:00 - 12:00 PM  
Central Building, Commission Conference Room

Luncheon ..... 12:00 - 12:45 PM  
Truluck Gym

Afternoon Session ..... 12:45 - 2:45 PM  
Main Building, Auditorium



## Regional Campus Faculty Senate

### Minutes

November 19, 2010

### Morning Session

Regional Campuses Faculty Senate Chair Steve Bishoff was attending a meeting of the Board of Trustees Faculty Liaison Committee, so **Vice-Chair and Chair-Elect Dr. Sarah Miller** of Salkehatchie presided.

In the verbatim remarks recorded from this meeting, brief emendations and paraphrases have been inserted in brackets, strictly for coherence and clarity.

**Sarah Miller:** Good Morning. Welcome to Union. Thank you to Dr. Lowe and his staff here for the wonderful breakfast. I really needed it. I don't know about the rest of you. This morning we have Dr. Plyler is going to talk to us about the Huron Group Study and then we will adjourn into our standing committees.

**Vice Provost Plyler:** Well, this little sermon will take the place of my report after lunch. I know that Chairman Bishoff might object to that because of the protocol of the faculty senate but [this adjustment to the agenda is] in the interest of time. I think we're still waiting on the Sumter delegation to get here, but I can catch them up later.

We don't have any word yet on any of the higher education initiatives from a legislative perspective. The state budget is projected to incur more than a \$700 million dollar shortage for the next fiscal year. It was reported earlier this week that we don't expect any mid-year budget cuts, which is good to hear and I hope that indeed is the way it's going to eventuate. Our president has been visiting each of the regional campus delegations during the fall semester. He's got another to go in Lancaster. Those have been very productive in communicating the university's agenda and explaining to them how difficult it is to operate the university these days with the massive cuts that we have undertaken.

You will recall that the Huron Group has been involved with a study within the university since August and they presented most of their findings, which are not final, last Tuesday morning. The purpose of that study was to revamp the hub and spoke model of the USC system with the idea of improving coordination, reducing costs and defining services. [Recommendations concerning] areas [such as] procurement, business education system governance, facilities management and resources, general education requirements and enrollment management were presented. And I'm just here to give you a very brief summary of each of those areas.

In procurement the recommendation to the president and the board is to execute optimal enhancements, to improve direction and lower cost, to implement e-procurement, reduce the demand for manual processes that we currently use, and to implement strategic sourcing to maximize more cost savings. A lot of that is procurement speak. I think the most important recommendation of this is e-procurement. We do many hard-copy, paper transaction that get bogged down, lost, which slows things up. This will save considerable monies. Making a transition over to e-procurement makes sense.

As I remember, and John Catalano, Steve Lowe and Ann Carmichael were there; they didn't put a cost to that; if you will remember a cost, it was huge, I'm sure.

In distance education, [there were] recommendations to create a centralized structure to serve the system, streamline the technology used, provide incentives for faculty to contribute, explore program expansion and revenue enhancement opportunities. Distance education on a campus perspective has been in decline now for twenty years. You may recall that the provost recently hired another vice provost who deals specifically with distance education, so these recommendations sort of parallel what Lacey Fort is doing in trying to get a handle on where the university is on distance education and where we want to go.

That's in process. This will be a three or four year endeavor. I think in the end the regional campuses will benefit greatly. I think the emphasis is going to be on trying to decrease or limit physical capacity in Columbia, extend more programs perhaps through distance education, more blended programs and try to stay current with the cutting edge technology that's changing every week. Again the cost may be prohibitive right now. That's why we're looking at a three, four or five year block of time and will begin to develop a blueprint to build a distance education infrastructure, particularly now that we are off satellite transmission.

With concern to system governance, you'll recall that the president and the vice president for business and finance were emphatic that it not about closing campuses and [that wasn't] mentioned, but there is a system governance recommendation which is to consider a phased in restructuring, of the president's reports in particular. They feel that, compared to comparable institutions, the Office of the President has far too many reports. The idea would be shift at least two of those reports to the provost to increase academic control in two areas, student affairs [and] information technology; then, shift two other reports to the key financial officer.

We keep hearing that there's going to be a re-organization, restructuring at the senior level leadership. To this point there has been no specifics given as to what those may be.

With concern to facilities management, [there were] recommendation to restructure the facilities core, to improve service and [to] lower cost. For those of us who have been involved in projects and have been trying to work with project directors through Columbia, it's a nightmare. It's slow; it's cumbersome; it's bureaucratic. There's way too much regulation. I think the university imposes too much bureaucracy and process and that's what I think they mean by improving service, and hopefully to lower cost.

With concern to system wide planning, it's an expensive regulatory oversight burden.

Human resources is another area where much attention is needed. [There were] recommendations to realign the central organization and define service levels offered to the system, to execute succession and to acknowledge transfer plans. There are a number of senior level administrators in human services who are long past retirement. They have post-TERI status. When they go, a lot of institutional memory goes.

We need to execute better succession plans there, document and streamline processes there, push to decrease state regulations for human resources statewide.

We are searching now for a new vice president for human resources. These recommendations get more specific and I think we will be given this to the new VP when he or she comes into that office. We interviewed the first candidate this week and I think within a three week period, all will have been interviewed. That is an area that touches all of us hourly. We all have resources contacts on our campuses. We all have those responsibilities along with other responsibilities. We have many hats. I think the Huron people mentioned more than 200 individuals across the university system that touch or are responsible for some portion of [HR]. So some streamlining or communicating while lowering costs again, is going to be looked at very closely in that area.

General education requirements – a recommendation was made to determine system-wide general education requirements, create short term improvements and partial acceptance of general education requirements system-wide, and establish a long term action plan. Generally that means that if you're a University of South Carolina campus and a student has completed the general education requirement at another campus, and wants to change campuses, that that core will be accepted on the campus where the student wants to transfer. Easier said than done. I think that's wonderful in theory. It was pretty much aimed at the senior campuses. I think they mentioned 216 students [who] had some transfer confusion and where service to the student was impeded. They didn't feel like an overhaul has necessarily necessary at this time although [the] Carolina Core [is] ongoing.

So stay tuned on that one. I think what the president wants, and what the Board will eventually demand, is much more articulation among campuses, particularly with concern to the senior campuses. We get a new student coming to our institutions and we need to ask them very quickly, "Where do you plan to change schools? What program are you interested in?" And if we can't keep them in one of the Palmetto programs or cooperative baccalaureate programs, if they are going to Columbia, if they're going to Aiken or Upstate, maybe even Beaufort, how can we advise them so that they don't fall between the cracks when time comes for them to move on.

Enrollment management – improve system-wide collaboration and admissions processes and consider centralizing enrollment processes, determine the Banner strategy and design configuration to enhance system enrollment function. There is great interest in a central admissions procedure for all campuses where the mechanics of admissions would be handled centrally while the student, the faculty member, or the administrator wouldn't necessarily know that. If the student applies to Union, most of the acceptance would happen automatically in Columbia. This would be seamless. Again, the student wouldn't know the difference. We probably wouldn't know the difference and it was just really to maximize on processing and save money so we're not doing it eight times across the system as we are now.

In a nutshell, that's what Huron was about. I'd be happy to answer any questions or colleagues who were at that meeting could answer any questions. We don't know a great deal more than that right now. A couple of things will be finalized. A report will be available for reading once it is finalized but the presentation is planned for the president and for the Board of Trustees within the next month. So after that we'll know what we have. I'm very optimistic that, at least based on the funding challenges that we face, that some of the key processes and procedures will be streamlined again just to save money and to do the most efficient thing in getting the work of the university done.

Any questions?

**Bruce Nims, Lancaster:** In going over the recommendations, have you received any word from the Governor's office?

**Dr. Plyler:** Well you know part of the reason for this study was political. So we were confident, we were sure that we had the validation from an outside group of professionals that could validate our processes and make recommendations that made sense, that we could go back to the Legislature and say we are doing this, we are tightening up, we're being good stewards, we are watching what little state appropriation we get. But we're not closing campuses. Not that that's what the legislators wanted. It might be what one or two legislators recommended. Maybe [that is] what the new Governor-elect may want in a couple of cases. We don't know but we will be prepared to respond when those questions come up. The more positive spin would be that Columbia [has reached] capacity physically, and there's about a half a billion dollars in deferred maintenance on the Columbia campus now. There are also huge research needs on the Columbia campus now.

The thought with this enrollment management strategy is to make better use of the potential we have on our regional campuses. In other words, guide the student back to a regional campus to complete the first 30 to 60 hours. Hopefully some of those students will want to stay within the Palmetto Programs or some other baccalaureate program as they are introduced and as they mature.

I felt pretty good that they are going to take that to heart. A number of you might want to comment on this but I've been preaching this for years. Now for an out of state student that applies to Columbia that is not accepted, how eager are they going to want to come to one of the other non-Columbia campuses? I don't know.

One of the impediments for us is housing. As we all know and some of us rely on private housing, others have projects planned for private housing but we think that we need to encourage the president to change his mind and allow, at least in the beginning, some small projects that would be university owned, [such as] housing and food servicing. I think you're going to begin to see some improvement in that area.

So my sense of this is positive. We've got this wonderful system; let's develop and use it to its potential and give the campuses a little autonomy, a little more license to offer more upper division courses, some more degree programs that are needed if we can document the need. But you've also got to be able to support them, have the academic student support. Infrastructures obviously have to be in place. So I think it's a positive sign for the university.

Any other questions about Huron?

Dean search update: For the dean of the Honors College, 65 candidates are currently being screened. You may not know that dean of the College of Education has resigned and a search is underway for a new dean. That committee is now being formed. Advertisement is going out. Law applications are few and far between for a new dean of the Law School. They've got six applications, six finalists that they will give consideration to.

SACS: The preliminary report has been considered, it's been read; apparently, if there are any recommendations we will know those fairly quickly. We are awaiting results of the

SACS preliminary report and then corrections will be made, revisions will be made and they will be submitted back to the visitation committee coming in in March.

We are not prepared to talk about new degree programs being introduced but Sally Boyd and I are having visits with deans on the Columbia campus about extending their degrees to our campuses and we are guardedly optimistic in a couple of areas so hopefully we will have some good news to report as time goes on in that area.

Any questions? Thank you and Happy Thanksgiving and we will look forward to a productive day today.

**Sarah Miller:** Thank you Dr. Plyler. Okay, we're going to standing committees. Rights and responsibilities is in Room M201. Welfare committee will be in M209. They are both downstairs in the rooms off where the refreshments were. Systems affairs will meet in M307 which is right out back here. Is the grievance committee meeting? Anyone know? Then I'm going to go with No. The Executive Committee meeting will be in room M202. The deans will meet in the central building. And the information we've all been waiting for, the luncheon which is at noon, will be across the road here in the gym. See you all at lunch.

### Afternoon Session

**Sarah Miller:** Good afternoon. Thank you again to Union for providing an excellent lunch for us. The first thing is to call the meeting to order and ask for corrections and approval of the minutes. Do I have any corrections? Do I have a motion to accept the minutes? The minutes are approved as submitted.

Chris Plyler gave his report this morning. So we'll move on to the reports of regional campus deans.

### Reports of Regional Campuses Deans (submitted electronically)

#### **Dean John Catalano, USC Lancaster:**

**Students:** Spring Summer enrollment was up by nearly 30%. Fall enrollment is up by 5.85% (total numbers are attached; student profile is attached). Women's softball has been added this Fall Semester. We are exploring the addition of food service on campus, in response to student demand. The Scholarship luncheon this year will be held on Tuesday, November 23. President Pastides will be our featured guest.

**Faculty:** This year we have hired five faculty members in new positions (2 English, political science, math, and art). We anticipate five new faculty hires next year (Tenure track hires in American History, Mathematics, and Sociology; instructor hires in Criminal Justice and Chemistry).

**Facilities:** The USC BOT B&G Committee has approved the first phase of design for a new \$8 million classroom building on campus. The building will be funded by private pledges and gifts as well as an increase in Lancaster County millage. The targeted opening date is fall 2013. Work in Bradley is ongoing. Carpeting is being replaced and general painting is progressing. The student center was painted this summer. Hubbard renovations are on hold until summer 2011, mainly due to asbestos remediation that will be done over the Christmas holidays. The picnic shelter project is complete and the pond reclamation

project is going forward slowly. The new sign at the entry to campus is finished and will be added to with fencing as money is available. The new soccer field is being built during the Fall Semester.

**50<sup>th</sup>:** The anniversary fundraising efforts spearheaded by Stan Johnson are doing well with approximately \$3.1 million raised (nearly \$2.7 million raised on the new classroom project alone). The Lancaster County Council has unanimously approved a resolution to increase millage from 3.4 to 4.4 in support of the new classroom building.

**Financial:** USCL has and will continue to operate efficiently. Last year (2009-10 is the last completed fiscal year) the total amount of A fund revenue from county support, other revenue, tuition and fees, stimulus, and the state appropriation equaled \$8,878,165 (or \$8221 per full time student). In 2000-1, almost ten years ago, total A fund revenue was \$4,536,461 (or \$8382 per full time student). During the decade, USCL has expanded and improved facilities, doubled the faculty and the student body, added athletics, modernized technology, and we are doing it with less expenditures per student than a decade ago. Despite abysmal state appropriations, the campus added to last year's \$189K carry-forward and ended the fiscal year with approximately \$429K in carry-forward funds. We have already experienced a \$406K cut in state appropriations from last year's budget (the same amount as this year's stimulus grant). The tuition increase in this academic year will be less than the current state appropriation cut. As 2010-11 will be the last year of stimulus funding we need to have a healthy balance in anticipation of a lean 2111-12. Finally the \$1,528,760 state appropriation this year is equal to 26% of our mission resource requirement (MRR) as established by the SCCHE of \$5,892,034. That equals only \$1337.50 per full time student per year. This means that had the state fully funded USCL using the state's own formula, our appropriation should have been increased by \$4,363,274!

#### **Dean Ann Carmichael, USC Salkehatchie:**

Official fall enrollment shows Salkehatchie having a headcount of 1150 (a 20.17% increase over last fall), and an FTE of 764 (a 18.32% increase over last fall). This is a record enrollment for our institution.

USC Salkehatchie is in the process of working with Dr. Al Goodyear, professor of archaeology at USC and best known for his research on the Topper site, to create a display of Topper site artifacts on campus for the public to view. This project is being funded by a combination of private contributions and grants. The display will be completed by late spring. This will be the only display of its kind anywhere and will enhance the educational experience of the student but could also bring visitors to the area who are interested in the displays.

USC Salkehatchie was recently notified of a Community Facilities grant award from USDA Rural Development. The \$297,000 award will be used for completion of Phase II of the Carolina Theatre renovation project. The theatre will be used for arts events, including the Salkehatchie Stew performances, which are also funded through USDA Rural Development grant monies. USDA provided a total of \$654,000 for the theatre renovation project.

Not only do our faculty members share their talents in the classroom at USC Salkehatchie but with the lowcountry community as well. Dr. David Hatch, Assistant Professor of English, recently starred in a sci-fi version of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* at the James F. Dean

Theatre in Summerville. David, who auditioned at the urging of his daughter, ended up landing the lead role. Assistant Professor of Math, Dr. Bryan Lai, who serves as an advisor for international students, also performs with Charleston Symphony Chorus.

Author and journalist, Ken Burger, a native of Allendale, recently signed copies of his new book, "Sister Santee" at the holiday open house at the Salkehatchie Arts Center.

Dr. Carmela Gottesman, Dr. Bryan Love, Dr. Maureen Anderson, and Dr. Thep Ayudhya did character activations for the Walterboro Mystery Walk in November, which was part of the Salkehatchie Stew arts initiative. The event was designed to increase sales in the downtown area.

Six USC Salkehatchie soccer players have been named to the 2010 NJCAA All-Region X team. They are Jessica Marchant, and Ashur Eden-Amai, Zaf Papanikitas, Tearra Green, David Williams, and John Luka Joseph.

USC Salkehatchie students take great pride in giving to the local communities. The Student Government Association this semester has sponsored a food drive and an angel tree for local needy. SGA also sponsored a Halloween Haunted Hayride and Carnival with proceeds being donated to United Way. Athletes participated in a drive to raise money to provide turkeys for Thanksgiving to needy families and will carol at a local nursing home in December. A group of 16 students will spend a part of their Christmas break in Washington, DC, serving breakfast and lunch at a homeless shelter. University 101 classes are required to have a volunteer service component and have responded by working with local hospice, recreation departments to work in youth sports concessions stands, and many individual projects in their own home communities.

### **Dean Les Carpenter, USC Sumter**

Since my last report to the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate on September 24, 2010, the economic news from the state of South Carolina has continued to be grim, but there have been a number of notable events and activities at USC Sumter.

**Budget:** USC Sumter, and all public institutions of higher education in South Carolina, is managing a 21% cut to our state appropriation for FY 11. The 21% cut at USC Sumter translates into \$642,876 in cuts that must be managed in our FY 11 budget. USC Sumter's Year 2 Federal Stimulus Funds Projects have been approved and are now underway. USC's Board of Trustees recently voted to roll back USC Sumter's tuition increase effective with the 2011 Spring Semester, which translates into a loss of \$14,000 in USC Sumter's current budget. Indications for FY 12 continue to include additional cuts to state appropriations of as much as 20%, so USC Sumter already has begun the process of building budget scenarios for accommodation of additional cuts in FY 12 and beyond.

**Human Resources:** As you already know, the General Assembly has not provided a pay raise for faculty or staff for the past two fiscal years. As previously announced, three retirements have recently been announced, effective at the end of the 2011 Spring Semester. They are Professor of Sociology Richard Bell, who also serves as the Chair of the Division of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education; Associate Professor of French and Spanish Bernard F. Fitzgerald; and Associate Professor of Management Christine Borycki. Two of these positions will be filled as one-year term Instructor positions due to budgetary cuts, and the third position is still being

evaluated. An internal search was recently conducted, and Dr. John Safford, Professor of Philosophy and Political Science has been appointed as Chair of the Division of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education, replacing Dr. Richard Bell, effective July 1, 2011. Since the inception of the TERI program, 32 USC Sumter employees have opted into the program. Of those 32, 26 have already retired, two are scheduled to retire in FY 12, two in FY 14, and one in FY 15.

**Student Enrollments:** Final official enrollment figures for the 2010 Fall Semester indicate a 1.16% headcount enrollment decrease compared to last year, and a 1.14% FTE enrollment increase compared to last year. In spite of these very modest headcount and FTE enrollment decreases, USC Sumter is still very committed to growing our enrollment over the next several years.

**Student Activities:** Fire Ants teams in men's and women's Soccer have completed their fall seasons, with the women's team making it into the Region 10 Tournament before bowing out in the second round of tournament play, and the men's team also making it into the Region 10 Tournament before losing their first round game. Soccer player Sarah Eades was named Co-player of the Year in Regional 10, and four other women's Soccer players were named to the All Region first and second teams. One men's Soccer player was named to the All Region second team. USC Sumter's Baseball and Softball teams both begin play in February of 2011. All of USC Sumter's intercollegiate athletic teams look forward to the friendly but spirited rivalries with teams from other USC Regional Campuses. The planned addition of a third intercollegiate sport for men and women in the 2011 Fall Semester is progressing.

**Faculty Workload Adjustments:** Following the adoption of a Faculty Workload Adjustment Plan for USC Sumter, the 2008 Fall Semester marked the implementation of the first phase of this Plan for all junior tenure-track faculty, as well as selected senior tenured faculty identified as "productive scholars." The second phase of adjusted teaching loads for these two groups of faculty was originally scheduled to be implemented during the 2009-10 academic year, but instead has been delayed for at least two years due to budget cuts. In light of the anticipated continuing bad budget news for FY 12 mentioned above, it is possible that the second phase of this Plan could be delayed even further.

**Professional Travel:** At USC Sumter, during the current fiscal year, another strategic decision was to protect professional travel funds as "mission critical" for faculty who are either presenting papers, serving on panels, or whose presence is expected as an elected officer in the professional association. All other professional faculty travel must be approved on a case-by-case basis against the "mission critical" standard. We will seek to continue to protect professional travel in the FY 12 budget, but in light of the anticipated continued bad budget news for FY 12 mentioned above, it is possible that all professional travel could be eliminated as part of the FY 12 budget cuts.

**Capital Improvements:** A new Instructional Laboratories Building continues to be the top priority for new buildings for USC Sumter, and currently is ranked #14 on the state-wide list of capital projects for higher education. 2010 is the tenth year since the General Assembly passed the last capital construction bond bill – the longest span without a capital bond bill in anyone's memory. In light of the extremely bad budget news for FY 11 mentioned above, and the anticipated continuing bad budget news for FY 12, it is very unlikely that a capital construction bond bill will be passed during the 2011 Session of the General Assembly.

### **Interim Dean Steve Lowe, USC Union**

- I. Enrollment
  - A. Final report, pending CHE approval: 530 students (+4.54%), 359 FTE (+8.21%)
- II. Master Plan
  - A. Having Faith Lane by Truluck in process given to USCU (or the Commission) is in process
  - B. This is the first step to closing the road and starting the conversion to Patron's Park, or whatever it comes be known as
  - C. We are starting the process for environmental and structural studies of new Main St. building
  - D. We will be working with a firm to build distinct (and distinctive) entrances ways to the campus
- III. Continuing Education
  - A. USCU is in the process of developing a new Continuing Education program
  - B. Small Business focus for Continuing Ed is still a consideration
- IV. Campus Nurse
  - A. We have engaged, through DHEC, a nurse to be on campus one day per week starting as soon as the contract clears DHEC
- V. Other happenings
  - A. Update from last report
    - 1. Security cameras in the gym and Central Building have been installed
    - 2. Tech upgrades in Main Building are on schedule, given the difficulty of dealing with the historic nature of the building
    - 3. Crosswalks have been installed where possible; sidewalks will be altered with handicapper access where additional crosswalks are needed
  - B. Literary Festival
    - 1. USC Union is sponsoring a Literary Festival on March 11 and 12, 2011
    - 2. Regional authors will be on campus for talks, signings, and a "Dinner with the Authors" on Friday evening
    - 3. More details will be coming soon

### **Dr. Sally Boyd, Assistant Vice Provost for Extended University:**

Thirty-one Palmetto students are scheduled to graduate in December, thirty BLS and one BOL. The number of enrolled students is expected to be replenished by new applications for Spring 2011.

By Fall 2011 there will be two Palmetto classrooms at each site, making it possible to expand course offerings. Currently we are limited to one course per time slot, and the schedule is filled to capacity.

The search is progressing for the second faculty member to teach the required Palmetto courses, with expectations to have the position filled before winter break.

**Sarah Miller:** Thank you. We will move on to reports from standing committees--Rights and Responsibilities, Professor Hammond.

**Dr. Lisa Hammond, USC Lancaster, Chair of Rights and Responsibilities Committee:**

As I reported to you last time we have an extensive list of possible charges. I have chosen to prioritize those and deal with them both in order of importance and the committee's ability to expedite some matters. So at our meeting today we discussed additions to the regional campuses faculty manual specifically regarding the policies ACF 3.31 and 1.05 which refer to the extension of the tenure clock and third year review. We looked at some dates throughout the manual. We've been asked by Senior Vice Provost Christine Curtis to look at some issues with dates in the manual. We're working on that but we don't have anything to report to you finally at this point right now. We're considering a resolution to bring forward to you in February but that is also still up in the air.

We do have two motions for you today. Briefly, you are getting a handout now, both regarding changes to the regional campus faculty manual. The first one is titled Calculation of Probationary Period, Motion One. There are four pages in there. The first three pages refer to Motion One. Specifically there are two new policies that are family friendly policies. This is not all of them, but this is all we could get to today. There are several family friendly policies regarding extension of tenure clock for a faculty member who has a child or a death in the family or serious illness. There are a number of circumstances. Some of those extensions are automatic. Some of them are where you may request an extension. These policies and procedures are already extant and they already apply to regional campus faculty but they have not been put in the manual.

So the first motion is to incorporate language from the extension of the tenure clock and third year review from ACAF 1.31 and 1.05. This is kind of confusing because we brought in some language from the Columbia faculty manual but we also wanted to retain some of our faculty's language. So you have two copies of the manual's verbiage at this point. The first one will show the marked changes on it. Things that are marked out or inserted should be pretty clear. If it's inserted, it's underlined. If it's marked through, it's deleted. In every case but one, anything that's marked through has been moved to a different section. So we did some reorganization. In one place we did eliminate a passage and replaced it with something. And I'll show just where that is in one second.

So what we did, there was a section in the *Regional Campuses Faculty Manual*, beginning at the bottom of page 18 and moving forward to the top of page 19, that is currently called Additional Considerations. We pulled a couple of sections from that into a new section entitled Calculation of Probationary Period. This refers to how long a faculty member is in the probationary period when they are hired as an assistant professor or as an associate or professor. It refers to the length of service they have to have in the rank before they can go up. It refers to policies regarding leave. In other words if a faculty member is on leave, paid or unpaid, that leave period is not counted as part of their probationary period.

Most of these policies are already extant in the manual.

On the first page: Non-tenured faculty members will already be granted an extension of the probationary period all the way down through third year review may be extended. . . that entire

paragraph is new. We pulled that from the Columbia faculty manual and it reflects the current policy ACF 1.3 and 1.05 that are already in place for regional campus faculty. So that is new. We deleted a section that summarized that policy but not very fully. It didn't give a very full description of how the policy was applied or who was eligible to go up under it.

That is the deleted section that you see at the bottom of the page number 2. We added number 6 on the second page of your handout in cases where faculty member who had been on probationary status they shall be evaluated as if he or she had been on probationary status for the normal probationary period, not longer. This is also part of the extant policy that already applies to regional campus and Columbia faculty, and basically it just says that if a faculty member who stops the tenure clock because a child is born or because of a death in the family or illness is not penalized for stopping the tenure clock. He or she is evaluated as if that period did not happen.

They are not expected to perform any more activity during that time. We then went back to the section of additional considerations. That material is all the same. We had just pulled a couple of bullets out and moved them to "Calculation of Probationary Period."

So in sum, there is now a new section called "Calculation of Probationary Period" that has a lot of the language that is already in the manual plus the new family friendly policies; then you move to "Additional Considerations." We are bringing you a copy that shows the changes incorporated in there as if we had already accepted the changes, so you will know exactly what it looks like. So you'll see exactly what you're voting on. Because we realize that you might find that it's hard to tell when things are moved around. Are there any questions?

**Bruce Nims, Lancaster:** How much of this is really new and how much of it is simply bringing our manual into conformity with the Columbia manual?

**Lisa Hammond:** None of it is new. It's already policy that already exists in the university and already applies to us and several of our faculty members are already taking advantage of it.

Okay so that's motion one. That again in summary is incorporation of the extension of the tenure clock and third year review policies. We'll have an easier page for you to look at.

On page 3 we also inserted the information about the tenure clock that can be stopped for third year review as well so that the candidate that is referring to the third year review information sees that there as well.

The second motion that we are bringing forward to you also represents a change to the faculty manual. At the request of Christine Curtis, we have removed a single date from the T&P procedures. This is in your faculty manual in the section called "Procedures of the Regional Campus Tenure and Promotion Committee." Currently the manual reads "The files will be reviewed by the Vice Provost for System Affairs and Executive Dean for Extended University and the Vice Provost by March 31. By March 31 the files with any recommendations will be transmitted from the Provost to the President. "

The language we are suggested instead is "The files will be reviewed by the Vice Provost for System Affairs and Executive Dean for Extended University and Vice Provost and the President." This takes out the date by which the file has to be transmitted to the President because it is my understanding that that date is not a feasible date, that the Provost review is

not able to take place within the time frame that's listed here and the Provost's office is concerned that there would be a problem if the file is not reviewed in a timely manner. They asked for this date to be removed because once the file is in the Vice Provost's office there is no candidate notification at that point anyway. So the last letter the candidate gets before the final letter is from the Regional Campus T&P Committee. So from that point on the file is moving through the Vice Provost's office, the Provost's office, the President's office and the candidate doesn't really know where it is at any given time and it's not critical for the candidate to know that as far as we could tell.

So since we had been requested to consider removing that date, was it a problem to remove it, we did not feel it was because it does not affect any procedure that happens on our end of the process. It's at the Administrative review level. As long as they complete the administrative review in a timely manner and notify the candidate by May 15, when they do that should be up to them, was the feeling of the committee.

So our motion is to delete the sentence, "By March 31 the files with any recommendations will be transmitted through the Provost to the President." And amend that section to read, "The files will be reviewed by the Vice Provost of System Affairs and Executive Dean for Extended University, the Provost and the President."

Okay, these are our two motions for consideration of new business. Thank you.

**Sarah Miller:** Report from the Welfare Committee--Professor Golonka.

**Dr. Annette Golonka, USC Lancaster, Co-chair of Welfare Committee:** It's pretty short. We just have a few reminders about dates and deadlines. For the John J. Duffy Teaching and Excellence Award, the first deadline is coming up December 1<sup>st</sup>. On December 1<sup>st</sup> the nominee names will be submitted to myself and on December 15<sup>th</sup> I will send emails out to those nominees requesting their files and letting them know that the date of January 31<sup>st</sup>, which is when their files are due. Each of the campuses, I believe, have already started the nomination process.

The second announcement is the T&P workshop is January 14<sup>th</sup>. It's a Friday. It's the first Friday of our first full week of our Spring semester. The 7<sup>th</sup> ended up being the Provost retreat. So we were not able to get Provosts until the 14<sup>th</sup>. We ask that you bring your files. There will be information from our committee members to your colleagues as well. So we will be sending out a T&P workshop handout but we ask that you start thinking about deadlines and RSVPing right away.

The only other discussion we had was a brief discussion on a salary survey and welfare workload. That's all that we had. Any questions?

[Response to Unintelligible Question:] The file? The PDF files themselves are not due until January 31<sup>st</sup>. Right now it's just the nominee names. Once we get the names, I will send out emails to all the candidates and give them the information about the PDF and what's expected of them. Any other questions? All right, thank you.

**Sarah Miller:** Report from Systems Affairs--Professor Kilpatrick.

**Dr. Eran Kilpatrick, USC Salkehatchie, Chair of the System Affairs Committee:** Good afternoon. Systems Affairs spent the entire morning session continuing our work with the

draft of summary of teaching evaluations. So we do have a motion to present under new business and Avery and Martha are currently passing out two different items. The first item is a draft of the summary with the corrections marked and then the second copy is a draft of the summary with all of the completed corrections without all the clutter of Microsoft Word editor. So we'll have both things to look at. So we spent time actually on each section in the draft. And first I want to say I really appreciate all the feedback I got from the draft that went out nearly three weeks ago from a number of faculty members across the regional campuses so I appreciate those comments because I think we really worked hard to incorporate a number of those into the new draft. **(The draft with the latest changes marked appears as Appendix 2 in these minutes.)**

And I want to thank the committee for working together really well on this new version. I think everyone should have something to look at by now. We'll start from the top.

If you're looking at the draft of the summary with the corrections on it, we started under item number one clarifying the overall purpose of this summary. So we needed to get a purpose statement in there and that was accomplished in our committee meeting today and that purpose statement went in as the second sentence under item number one. In addition to modifying the purpose statement we also modified that first sentence to clarify the wording on who is going to be submitting this actual draft and how they are going to go about selecting that person to do that.

The second paragraph under item number one is based upon sentences from our previous draft in addition to sentences added from what was item number three on the old draft. So that second paragraph is a combination of two topics that appeared in the original draft. That wording in some parts stayed the same and we changed a bit of that for clarity. Under item number two we spent most of our time with a table. One of the comments I got from faculty members was you really needed something to look at--some table to look at that's going to have quantified data on it directly from evaluations. So in committee we came up with a draft of a summary table with question numbers as columns and faculty and campus as rows. We went through a number of evolutions with this table: everything from including data sets for courses by year to data sets with an overall summary. So we settled at the least with an overall summary table for candidates' courses across the years at a given regional campus. And we added some structure to item number two that dealt directly with the questions and that dealt directly with what information could be added to the table.

So if you look at the corrected version we changed what the compiler will do. The compiler will create a table with a candidate's average scores as well as the campus' scores for each of the fifteen questions on the student evaluations excluding question sixteen that pertains to Blackboard and other technology. Additional summarized data may be required by the campus and/or academic unit for this table. So that gives an opportunity for candidates to include some additional information and relate it to their multiple courses they may teach across their time on a regional campus.

We also added some words underneath Table One. By June 1 that compiler will provide a report to the candidate, campus administration and a third party. So originally it was the candidate and we added two other levels that would receive that data, and that's campus administration and third party.

Item number three at the bottom of the first page, went through modifications with the bullet statements for clarity and to expand on evaluation data that the candidate is going to provide as it relates to written comments.

Going on over to the second page, what was item number five on the first draft is now item number four. So those candidates' materials that go to the summary writer were expanded to include some bulleted statements that the reviewer will provide versus the candidate providing. So we've moved some things around and added a few items that will be used in addition on the summary writer's list. And those primarily are bulleted statements two through five that existed in the original draft. So we didn't change those bulleted statements that much other than deleting bulleted item one.

The last paragraph in that draft did not change much except for a due date at the end of that paragraph by adding November 1<sup>st</sup>.

So those were the changes done in committee and that is the motion we will bring up in new business. Are there any questions? The question was is there a typo between question 15 and 16 on the charts? The campus scores for each of the fifteen, yes it should be 16 on the student evaluation excluding question so yes I need to change those numbers in there.

Yes, Lisa.

**Lisa Hammond:** Is question 16 excluded?

**Eran Kilpatrick:** As committee talked about the need to include that value in the data set, when it goes into an overall average, if you average all questions, it tended to skew the data because it's valued differently if Blackboard is used in the class; that's the question that we decided would not included in the overall table.

**Sarah Miller:** Thank you. Okay report from Executive Committee--Professor Nims.

**Bruce Nims, Regional Campuses Faculty Senate Secretary:** The Executive Committee met in the afternoon of October 29<sup>th</sup>. Many of the matters covered under the standing committee reports of course were discussed during that time and I won't repeat those. I will mention though that Chris did report that all of the external letters for candidates had come in and he is pleased with the way the new process is working out. He gave us an update on the upcoming SACS visit. He said that he had visited the new Greenville Center and hopes that perhaps the Palmetto Programs might be delivered through that Center. He talked about the Presidential visits with the legislative delegations which he mentioned this morning.

We also discussed the logistics for the Provost Advisory Committee, what the best meeting times might be, and again Chris was going to work on getting those meetings set up. He also mentioned that attempts to establish a cooperative four year program with Criminal Justice were moving very slowly. We also discussed the process for curricular changes in Palmetto Programs, particularly how we might increase the number of required courses available so more students can get access to them.

The meeting lasted about 2 ½ hours, from 1 o'clock to 3:30. Thank you very much.

**Sarah Miller:** Thank you Bruce. Reports from Special Committees. **Committee on Libraries?** No report? Thank you. **Committee on Curricula and Courses.** Professor Casselberry.

**Professor Robert Casselberry, USC Sumter, Representative to the Curriculum and Course Committee, submitted electronically:**

The Committee meets on a monthly basis to consider changes to the curriculum; since my last report to you we have met twice. I usually get an electronic copy of the agenda before each meeting. I forward this agenda to contact people on each campus. If you would like to get a copy of the agenda, please email me so I can add you to my contact list.

If any of the contact people on our campuses have concerns about the proposed changes, I can bring those concerns to the attention of the Committee. Any Committee decisions are merely recommendations to the Faculty Senate, and changes are not final until the Senate approves them.

I would like to draw your attention to some specific curricular changes approved by our Committee for consideration by the Senate. What follows has been extracted from my earlier reports to the contact people on each of our campuses.

1. As you may recall, at the September meeting MATH had a number of curricular changes proposed that related to prerequisites for admission to specific MATH courses (111, 111I, etc). Those proposals were tabled so that System Affairs (including our campuses) could get involved. They are still tabled. I think it would be useful for you to ask the administration to discuss what is happening with that matter. Also, this situation reminds us that we should be developing suggestions to Columbia about how our representatives might be more actively engaged in the deliberative process at various levels in Columbia.
2. In the November meeting, the committee approved RETL 265 as an internet-based course. The committee did spend quite a bit of time talking about the integrity of such courses (not that internet-based courses are bad, but they do require special consideration). How can we insure the integrity of the course, specifically how can we trust the testing processes? The committee recommended that the Provost create an Ad Hoc Committee to suggest “Best Practices” for distance/internet courses. If anyone has strong feelings, insights, recommendations about this matter, please let someone important (or me) know.
3. Finally, (wait for the applause to taper off) quite a few changes have been approved for the Columbia nursing program, the prerequisite for Econ 222 has been changed, several courses were approved for distance delivery through the Palmetto Program, and there is at least one new 300-level Political Science course. Recall that all the recommendations by the committee go on to the Senate, and the results of the Senate’s actions can be found on their web page.

**Sarah Miller:** Thank you. **Committee of Faculty Welfare.**

**Pearl Fernandes, USC Sumter, representative to the USC Columbia Faculty Welfare Committee:** The Faculty Welfare Committee met a couple of times and worked at providing free flu shots for Columbia and regional campuses faculty. The Committee is presently working on providing a limited number of cardiovascular screenings through the School of Public Health for regional campuses and Columbia faculty. That is all my report for today. Thank you.

**Sarah Miller: Faculty Board of Trustees Liaison Committee?** Apparently that is where Steve is today so I'm saying there's no report. **Regional Campuses Research of Productive Scholarship Committee?** No report. **Regional Campuses Advisory Council?** That is also Professor Bishoff. Did he send a report with anyone? No report. **Conflict of Interest Committee?** No report. I am not aware of any unfinished business.

#### **New Business:**

**Lisa Hammond:** I apologize that you didn't get that at first, but you should now have the copy of the motion as it would read if we choose to accept these changes: the new section "Calculation of Probationary Period" and the "Additional Considerations" section for the first motion. Again this does not represent any new policy. It's just an insertion of existing policy from the Policies and Procedures Manual into the faculty manual. These are condensed versions of these policies which are each about ten pages long. But it's enough information and refers to the faculty member to the full section. **[The full, final text of this motion appears as Appendix 1 to these minutes.]**

**Sarah Miller:** [Since this motion does involve a change to the Faculty Manual, I have to rule it **substantive**. However, given Dr. Hammond's explanation that the changes simply confirm existing, approved policies, I am willing to entertain a motion to overrule my decision on this motion.]

[A motion to that effect was made and seconded.]

**Sarah Miller:** So now we need a discussion to overrule my decision to rule the motion as substantive. Okay. Any more discussion? Since we have a motion and second, then we vote on the motion to suspend the rules. All in favor say Aye. **(Aye!)** All opposed? **(No opposition)** Now we can discuss and vote [on the motion to add the "Calculation of Probationary Period" and the "Additional Considerations" sections to the *Faculty Manual*.] All in favor. **(Aye!)** All opposed. **(No opposition)** **The motion passes.**

**Lisa Hammond:** Thank you. It's possible that we could have been incorporated into the Faculty Manual by December. Is that correct, Dr. Plyler? So we could have a faculty manual 2011 2.0.—just to keep things lively.

The second motion from Regional Campuses Faculty Senate Rights and Responsibilities concerns the removal of a date from the section "Procedures" under "Regional Campus Tenure and Promotion Committee." The motion is to delete the sentence, "By March 31, the files with any recommendations will be transmitted to Provost to the President." And to amend the remaining first sentence of that section to read (this is on the final page of your handout), "The files will be reviewed by the Vice Provost of System Affairs and Executive Dean for Extended University, the Provost and the President." Essentially it just removes the

date by which the file is transmitted from the Provost to the President. It does not affect the end date by which the candidate must be notified.

**Sarah Miller:** I am going to rule [this second motion] substantive. We will vote on it in February. We will defer discussion until that time. It will come up under unfinished business. Now for the motion from Systems Affairs--Professor Kilpatrick.

**Eran Kilpatrick:** In the committee report, corrections made to our new version of the summary of the teaching evaluations were discussed and I fielded a few questions. So now the System Affairs Committee moves that the "Summary of Teaching Evaluations" be approved, including the latest corrections.] Let's open this up for discussion now for clarification.

**Sarah Miller:** I'm going to rule this motion **substantive**.

[A general discussion followed in which several participants either did not identify themselves or did not speak loudly enough to be recorded. This discussion centered on the availability of comprehensive evaluation data, the responsibilities of the candidate and the person writing the Summary of Teaching Evaluations, different student evaluation procedures on different campuses, and the clarity of items in the motion itself. Since the Chair had already ruled the motion substantive, and to be discussed at the next meeting, all of this discussion was in fact out of order and is deleted from the minutes.]

**Sarah Miller:** As I've already ruled the motion substantive, so we will discuss it and vote on it in February. This brings us to announcements. Does anybody have any announcements? Does anybody want to go home? Motion to adjourn? Second? All in favor? (**Aye**.)

Have a safe trip home.

## Appendix 1

Rights and Responsibilities Motion 1 as **Passed**, Showing the New Text for the *Faculty Manual***Calculation of Probationary Period**

1. Since consistency of performance over a period of time is a relevant factor in evaluating faculty for tenure, Assistant Professors normally will not be recommended for tenure until they have completed at least four years of full-time service on a Regional Campus; Associate Professors and Professors normally will not be recommended for tenure until they have completed three years of full-time service on a Regional Campus.
2. The maximum probationary period for tenure for all full-time faculty members appointed at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor shall be satisfactory service in that rank for six years on a Regional Campus; for all full-time faculty members appointed at or promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor, satisfactory service in that rank for seven years.
3. Full-time tenure-track faculty members are eligible for an extension of the maximum probationary period of up to three years. Maximum probationary period may not exceed ten years.
4. Non-tenured faculty members will be automatically granted an extension of the probationary period in the event of the birth or adoption of a child, or the death of the faculty member's spouse/partner or child if notice is provided in accordance with applicable university policy. An extension of the probationary period may also be granted upon request in the case of serious illness or death of a spouse/partner, child or close family member, the placement of a foster child or other circumstances or commitments creating a need for additional time for the faculty member to demonstrate fully his or her professional qualifications for reappointment or tenure. Notification and documentation are required for both automatic and requested extensions. Complete procedures for obtaining an extension are set forth in University Policy ACAF 1.3. Extension of Faculty Tenure-Track Probationary Period issued by the Provost's Office. Third year review may also be extended if tenure clock extension occurs in the first three years (see ACAF 1.05).
5. Time during which the faculty member is on leave, either with or without pay, will not be counted as part of the probationary period.
6. In cases where faculty members have been in probationary status for more than their normal probationary period due to an extension or extension(s) of the probationary period pursuant to University Policy ACAF 1.31 Extension of

Faculty Tenure-Track Probationary Period, they shall be evaluated as if they had been in probationary status for the normal probationary period, not longer.

7. Instructors are not eligible for tenure, but the provisions of Item 3 (below) concerning notice of termination shall be applicable to full-time appointments at that rank, except in the case of an appointment made for a specific period of time.

### Additional Considerations

To implement the application of the criteria for tenure and promotion, it is the intent of the University to follow these regulations:

1. New members of the faculty shall be informed of the tenure regulations applicable on the effective date of appointment. Changes in tenure regulations shall not be applied retroactively if detrimental to the faculty member. A faculty member who is not recommended for tenure to the Board of Trustees shall be notified in writing by the University administration. Tenure applies only on the campus on which it is earned.
2. Lecturers, armed forces personnel performing teaching assignments, and other part-time faculty members are not eligible for tenure. Service under visiting or adjunct appointments is not applicable to the acquisition of tenure.
3. a. If during the first year of an appointment not expressly temporary in nature, it is deemed in the best interest of the University to terminate the appointment at the end of the first year, notice of such termination will be given in writing by **March 1** for first-semester appointments and **July 1** for second-semester appointments.

If during the second year of such an appointment, it is deemed in the best interest of the University to terminate the appointment at the end of the second year, notice of such termination will be given in writing by **December 15 (April 15 for a second-semester appointment)**.

Thereafter, notice in writing of the termination of any appointment to which the provisions of this section apply will be given at least twelve months prior to the date of termination.

b. If notice is not given in writing by the beginning of the sixth year of the maximum probationary period in the case of Associate Professors and Professors, the appointment of the faculty member shall automatically be a continuous (or tenured) appointment.

At the unit level, all non-tenured faculty are considered for tenure, and all faculty members below the rank of professor are considered for promotion each year.

Consideration at the unit level is automatic unless the faculty member requests in writing that consideration be deferred until the following year (provided that non-tenured faculty cannot defer tenure consideration beyond the penultimate year of their maximum probationary period).

Each year of a first-semester appointment shall start with the beginning of the scheduled fall term, and each year of a second-semester appointment shall begin with the beginning of the scheduled spring term.

### Third Year Review

In the third year of appointment all untenured, tenure-track faculty will prepare a file according to the *Regional Campuses Faculty Manual* guidelines for tenure and promotion in effect at the time the faculty member entered the tenure track. The purpose of third-year review is to document the tenure-track faculty member's progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure by the penultimate year of the probationary period. The format for file preparation is found in the Tenure and Promotion Procedures for Regional Campuses. Third year review files will not be subject to external review, but all other local campus tenure and promotion procedures apply. Third year review may be extended if tenure clock extension occurs in the first three years. See Calculation of Probationary Period in the *Regional Campuses Faculty Manual* and ACAF 1.31 and 1.05.



By June 1, the compiler will provide a cumulative report of the numerical data (such as a table or chart) to the candidate, campus administration, and third-party for use in the T&P file.

3. By September 1, the compiler should provide the following material to the summary writer:

- a copy of the candidate's completed RCTP-5.5, Teaching Responsibilities (part of the Curriculum Vitae, RCTP-5), and RCTP-7A
- the cumulative report of the candidate's numerical evaluation data along with all written comments on the student evaluations
- copies of other instruments or mechanisms authorized by the local campus for evaluating a candidate's teaching, such as peer evaluations

~~The candidate may also provide contextual information that he or she deems pertinent. Examples may include the following: frequency of new courses, new preparations, and/or~~

4. Referring to the candidate's materials, the summary writer will compose a succinct overview of no more than two (2) pages. The summary should provide the context needed to interpret the evaluations fairly, enabling readers of the file outside the candidate's discipline and campus to understand his or her teaching responsibilities, including any special circumstances. The candidate summary writer may also provide contextual information that he or she deems pertinent. Examples may include the following:

- frequency of new courses, new preparations, and/or overloads
- proportion of required to elective courses or general education to upper-level courses
- student population (majors, non-majors, or mix)
- course difficulty, discipline-specific challenges
- notably small class size (which affects reliability of data pool) or large class size
- trends or changes such as improvement over time responses to patterns of student criticism, etc.

5. The writer will send the narrative summary of teaching evaluations to the local campus administrators, who will be responsible for placing it, accompanied by a copy of the cumulative report of numerical data and the student evaluation instrument, in the candidate's file (tab RCTP-7B) by November 1 before the initial campus review.