

***Regional Campuses Faculty Senate***  
**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA**  
**USC Salkehatchie**  
**Friday, April 19, 2013**

Coffee .....	9:00 - 9:30 AM
Atrium	
Morning Session.....	9:30 - 10:30 AM
Atrium – Science Administration Building	
Reports from University Officers	
Standing Committees .....	10:30 - 12:00 PM
I. Rights and Responsibilities	
Science Administration Building 107	
II. Welfare	
Science Administration Building 112	
III. System Affairs	
Learning Resources Building Conference Room 120	
Special Committees.....	10:30 - 12:00 PM
I. Student Services	
Leadership Institute Building Conference Room	
Executive Committee .....	10:30 - 12:00 PM
Library Conference Room	
Deans Meeting.....	10:30 - 12:00 PM
Atrium Conference Room	
Luncheon .....	12:00 - 1:00 PM
The Grove	
Executive Committee .....	12:45 - 1:00 PM
Library Conference Room	
Afternoon Session .....	1:00 - 2:45 PM
Atrium – Science Administration Building	

# AGENDA

- I. Call To Order
- II. Correction/Approval of Minutes: February 15, 2013 USC Columbia
- III. Reports from University Officers
  - A. Vice Provost and Executive Dean, Dr. Chris Plyler
  - B. Assistant Vice Provost for Extended University, Dr. Sally Boyd
  - C. Reports from the Regional Campus Deans
    - Dean Walt Collins, USC Lancaster
    - Dean Ann Carmichael, USC Salkehatchie
    - Interim Dean Lynwood Watts, USC Sumter
    - Interim Dean Steve Lowe, USC Union
- IV. Reports from Standing Committees
  - A. Rights and Responsibilities – Professor Lisa Hammond
  - B. Welfare – Professor Fernanda Burke
  - C. System Affairs – Professor Andy Kunka
- V. Executive Committee
  - A. Secretary – Professor Jolie Fontenot
  - B. Regional Campuses Faculty Manual Liaison Officer – Professor Lisa Hammond
- VI. Reports from Special Committees
  - A. Committee on Libraries - Professor Maureen Anderson
  - B. Committee on Curricula and Courses - Professor Robert Castleberry
  - C. Committee on Faculty Welfare – Professor Janet Hudson
  - D. Faculty-Board of Trustees Liaison Committee – Professor Bruce Nims
  - E. Regional Campuses Research and Productive Scholarship Committee – Professor Kajal Ghoshroy
  - F. Regional Campuses Academic Advisory Council – Professor Bruce Nims
  - G. Other Committees
    - 1. Conflict of Interest Committee – Professor Noni Bohonak
- VII. Unfinished Business
- VIII. New Business
- IX. Announcements
- X. Adjournment

## **Regional Campus Faculty Senate April Minutes**

Meeting began at 9:37

**Bruce Nims:** Regional Campus Faculty Senate will now come to order. I want to thank Dean Carmichael and her staff at USC Salkahatchie for our delicious refreshments this morning. And I can't exactly thank her for the good weather but am we are certainly thankful we have some before the storms move in later today. So before we start business this morning, I'd like to introduce Dean Carmichael and she has a welcome for us and a few logistical details to mention.

**Dean Carmichael:** Thank you. Good morning. And on behalf of all of us here at USC Salkahatchie do welcome you. We are delighted to host the faculty senate spring meeting. Just a couple of housekeeping items. I think you already found the restrooms here. My office is to the right if you need telephones or if you need anything from us, please feel free to go there. As far as lunch we are still hoping the good weather will continue. But if it weather holds and it's pretty, and we won't chance it I don't want you to have to make a mad dash across campus to get to dry part. If the weather

holds and it's pretty, we tentatively plan on eating out at the grove which is across the way. Bubba Dorman, who is our baseball coach, is also our chief chef and he's cooking hamburgers and hotdogs and chili out there. So we would really like to eat out there and he's bringing his own brand of baseball music. So, again, I think it will have a nice ambiance if we can eat there. If not, again, we'll just move it here. But again, welcome. We are glad to have you on campus.

**Bruce Nims:** Thank you. We are going to have the reports from the University officers this morning. Our first report is from Dr. Chris Plyler.

**Chris Plyler:** Good morning everyone. Thank you Bruce and Dean Carmichael. It's always a pleasure to come to Allendale Salkahatchie campus and I beg your forgiveness for not wearing a tie today. I just felt like it was an open collar kind of day. Legislatively, and my report will be brief, on behalf of the University System, Dr. Pastides appealed to the Senate higher education committee earlier this week. His primary appeals have to do with the annualization of the remainder of the Palmetto College appropriations, \$2.1 million dollars in non-recurring funds which from all indications will be annualized, and Palmetto College will realize it's full \$5

million dollars effective July 1st. Other appeals had to do with the \$41 million dollars in deferred maintenance across the system. Every campus gets an amount. There's some variance there, but hopefully that will meet with Senate approvals. Many of you were present yesterday for the Palmetto College official launch which took place in the State House, a very impressive event, a culmination of a lot of work by you and colleagues across the system. A realization that has taken quite a while, frankly. I feel personally that it was a wholesale success. We had in addition to students from all of our campuses, President Pastides, Chancellor Susan Elkins, Senator John Courson, Speaker Bob Harrell, Representative Phil Owens, a lot of our colleagues across the system and the greater Columbia community. Our student speaker, DJ Braun, did us proud. He delivered a personal account of his need for access to our campuses and now through Palmetto College he has a way to earn his bachelor's degree online or every other kind of delivery mode that we offer and I thought that all in all it was just a spectacular day. We got a lot of news coverage. We will continue to get that. You will notice in the weeks to come there will be quite a bit of publicity associated with the quality at USC online that has been tailored. We are trying to keep the Regional Campuses as the primary focal point for feeding the Palmetto College. In this material, I think we had a little glitch in

the first batch, but we understand what happened, I think, and colleagues in the Office of Communications I think now better understand the structure. At any rate, it's exciting and it's something that began with us. We the regional campuses are the undergirding of the entire initiative and that's been what it's about. It gives students an opportunity to earn the full degree onsite at a regional campus or wherever they are. The marketing site is again, going to be very apparent to you. The web site is up and live. It's just that right now, a marketing site, and we are going to be spending an inordinate amount of time very soon trying to upgrade the web site to conform to the Palmetto College brand. I'd like to congratulate Walt Collins, this is his first meeting as our Dean of USC Lancaster. Walt, we know you are familiar with us in your new role we are excited to have you with us as Dean. That's quite a transition having gone through that myself, but we look forward to working with you over the months and years to come. The other two searches are very close to becoming final. Interviews are concluding, discussions with the President are happening. Hopefully, by the end of April we'll have news to report for the Sumter and Union Dean searches. And I believe that's all I have. The Criminal Justice degree has received full board of approval and is now moving to the CHE so it will be going up in front of ACAT shortly to present this opportunity to the other 3 campuses outside of

Lancaster that offer a criminal justice degree which will prepare our students for Upstate degrees. Any questions for me?

**Lisa Hammond:** (Inaudible) At the last Executive Committee meeting we got copies about peer institutions. Is that a final list?

**Chris Plyler:** No, no. That always dynamic. That was research by David Hunter and some research he was doing to make sure our peers are compatible with what we are and what our structure is. That's for consideration and faculty input and comment so we are inviting feedback.

**Lisa Hammond:** (Inaudible)

**Chris Plyler:** Unless there are other objections it can certainly fulfill that need.

**Bruce Nims:** You mentioned a glitch about Palmetto College. Could you clarify that?

**Chris Plyler:** Well the marketing and the brochure came out – a hastily put together brochure I might add – the first time I saw it was when it came off the press – and it is about the quality of USC online and explains the degree programs. And the owners of those degrees, the senior campuses, but nowhere on the brochure is there a mention of the regional campuses.

Dr. Elkins, I should have said this at the outset, is at a meeting at Fort Jackson a collaborative meeting among our higher ed partners. She wishes she could be here. I'm sure she will be joining us next fall. Thank you.

**Bruce Nims:** Thank you, Dr. Plyler. Assistant Vice Provost for Extended University. Dr. Sally Boyd.

**Sally Boyd:** Good morning everybody. One week from today next Friday we will be having a reception to honor the Ft. Jackson Stephen L. Dalton distinguished teaching award this year. The recipient this year is Wesley Ambercrombie who teaches sociology in the Ft. Jackson program and in a first for this particular teaching award, the course is taught online. Also wanted to let you know that we are saying goodbye at the end of this semester to Dr. Jessica Sheffield who is leaving us to take a position at University of South Alabama Mobile which is her home and where her



family lives. We have really enjoyed having Jessica with us these past three years. We will really miss her and we wish her well in her future endeavors. A search is underway to hire someone to teach – not to take Jessica’s place – but to teach speech for Extended University. Thank you.

**Bruce Nims:** We are pleased to introduce for the first time Dean Walt Collins, USC Lancaster.

**Walt Collins:** Good morning. Thank you, Ann, and your staff for offering us a beautiful place to meet today. This report will be submitted to the secretary, but I just wanted to get some highlights today. USC Lancaster’s enrollment is down just a little bit this spring semester 2.5% in headcount and 4.17% in FTE for spring as compared to last spring. Our preregistration for the coming terms that would be Maymester/Summer I, Summer II, and Fall are as follows: 169 students registered this past Monday for Fall 2013, 96 students for Maymester/SummerI, and 59 students for Summer II. This is about five days late. Figures are down a little bit. We started pre-registration about two weeks later this spring than we did last spring. I’m excited to find out who our distinguished teacher of the year is, and we do that on campus Tuesday April 23<sup>rd</sup> during Spring Fling. I want to say congratulations to the

three finalists that were chosen Dr. Sarah Hunt Sellhorst, Dr. Nick Guittar, and Professor Darris Hassel. Congratulations to some students who were elected to SGA also President: Ty Reeves, Vice President: Brandon Newton, Secretary/Treasurer: Brooke Watts. They'll be serving next year. We continue to do faculty searches for August 2013.

A tenure track search continues in Astronomy/Physics. We have another candidate coming in this week. We made an offer to an exercise science candidate last week and are happy to report that she has given a verbal affirmative response. We are grateful for that. We are also searching for an Instructor of Sociology. These positions will begin in August 2013.

Congratulations to Dr. Suzanne Penuel, Assistant Professor of English, for being selected to attend the Summer Literary Studies Institute entitled "Versions of *The Winter's Tale*: Theater, Literature, Film and Philosophy" at the National Humanities Center.

Congratulations to Professor Karen Worthy, Nursing, who was recently named the USC College of Education-PhD Recipient of the 2012-2013 Charles and Grace Sloan Fellowship.

Founders hall continues in the heart of campus. We hope to occupy about a year from now around Maymester/Summer I 2014. And then a couple of other notes here. We are happy to host the Carolina Emerging Scholars on our campus May

18<sup>th</sup>. We hope to see some of you there to hear regional campus students present their research and to be a part of a professional conference like that. Dr. Nick Lawrence is one of the board members from our campus and he will be glad to share some information on that conference coming up. And finally, we want to extend our congratulations to USC Lancaster golf team and coach Rick Walters for winning the NJCAA Region X championship this past week. They have qualified to go to the National Championship in Lubbock, TX in May 2013.

Thank you. Any questions?

**Bruce Nims:** Dean Ann Carmichael.

**Dean Carmichael:** On March 22<sup>nd</sup>, the Carolina Mathematics Association spring meeting was held on our campus in Walterboro and presenters included representatives from The Citadel, California University of Pennsylvania – I don't know who that is - and Furman University, as well as our own Dr. Bryan Lai and Dr. Fidele Ngwane and student, Robbie Bacon. So we were pleased to host that event. Dr. Eran Kilpatrick traveled to Santa Barbara, California with one of our students, Chris Bates on April 5<sup>th</sup> to present at the National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis Conference. And as a side note, Chris has also been selected for an internship at Savannah Riverside this summer which is really significant because it's the first time I

think they have given an award to a 2-year degree granting institution – give them an internship, and it was one of 35 and there were 750 applicants. So we were really excited to be included in that and have Chris receive that honor and opportunity. We are in process of hiring some additional faculty. We have made offers to professors in accounting and computer science. We made a tentative offer to someone in mathematics, and I will give you a report on those at our next meeting.

April 11<sup>th</sup> we hosted our annual scholarship ceremony for the disciplines, awarding over \$55,000 in scholarship money. And Mr. Eugene Warr, chairman of the USC Board of Trustees, was the keynote speaker. In the sports arena, I guess I want to share with you – you probably already know this because we've gotten high mileage publicity about it. For the first time in 48 years, our basketball team qualified for the NJCAA Region X national tournament. I will accompany them as well as our coaching staff to Hutchinson, Kansas. While we were not successful there, at least we made national headlines for our program and our team. And, you know, sometimes you don't realize what athletics can do for academics – I mean I know what our priorities are, but we have gotten such good exposure and I think that is going to really help us in attracting even more high quality students here. And last but certainly not least, I want to mention that Joe Siren is our

students' choice for the USC Salkahatchie Distinguished teaching award. If you know Joe, I had to share this, I don't think he'll mind, he said, "You know, I've been selected for this award, once a decade for the last 40 years." So I thought, well, that's a testament to his enthusiasm for teaching.

**Bruce Nims:** Interim Dean Lyn Watts from Sumter. Dr. Castleberry will speak in his stead.

**Dr. Castleberry:** Interim Dean Watts deeply regrets not being able to be with you here today. We would like to thank Salkahatchie for a wonderful reception today. He did ask me to give a report and asked that it be as short as possible. Therefore, in keeping with that spirit I will say that the Sumter campus is looking forward to having a new dean and we are all excited about that possibility, although I don't think anyone is as excited as Interim Dean Lyn Watts. That concludes our report. Thank you.

**Bruce Nims:** Interim Dean, Steve Lowe from Union.

**Steve Lowe:** Good morning everybody. Despite the fact that we are relatively late in the academic hiring cycle, we are seeking two hires, a

sociology professor and a criminal justice professor and we are doing so, it's a two for one deal. My congratulations and admiration goes to Dr. Sam Hauptman who is going to a little college up the road from USC Union. I don't mean Clemson. She will be at USC Upstate starting in the fall and will still be a major part of the Palmetto College. So we look forward to continuing to work with her. We are also looking for a Palmetto College Student Services Coordinator. We hope this person will start in June or July, and this person is going to have a very steep learning curve indeed.

Enrollment numbers for spring – headcount is 496 FTE is 332. Those are both down quite a bit primarily due to a reduction in the number of classes that we have at one of our high schools, so most of that is concurrent enrollment. Our new bookstore and student center is on track to be opened in fall. So we are very happy about that. In athletics, I am very happy to report that our club baseball team in the first year of competition won the National Club Baseball competition District IV East Conference and are the #1 seed in the playoffs, May 3-5 in Clemson. Their overall record was 11-1. We have a lot of good athletes and good students in that program. We are very proud of them. We had our third Upcountry Literary Festival back on March 22-23<sup>rd</sup>. That was a rousing for the third year in a row and keeps getting bigger and bigger. At our awards night earlier this

month, we awarded over \$47,000 in scholarships and presented our teacher of the year award to Professor Randy Ivey who seems to win perennially whenever he is eligible which is perfectly fine because he is well loved by the students and his colleagues. We are preparing for commencement on May 4<sup>th</sup> at 6:30PM. We have 56 degree candidates participating: 38 AA, 36 AS. Thirteen of our degree candidates will receive both of those and two of our candidates will be receiving their AA/AS and BLS. And one of them will get an AA and a BOL.

Our speaker this year is Dr. Curtis Rogers, who is the communications director for the State Library. He's also the son of an employee of USC Union, and he's also the son of Mary Jo Rogers, a longtime employee and until recently a volunteer – we hope she will be again a volunteer for the campus. Anybody have any questions? Thank you.

**Bruce Nims:** This concludes our reports from officers. It's now time to move to standing committees. Rights and Responsibilities is to meet in this building in Room 107. Welfare in room 112 in this building and system affairs will meet in the learning resources building conference room. We will come back for lunch and depending on the weather here in the grove or auditorium.

Session ends at 10:01

### **Afternoon Session**

**Bruce Nims:** The afternoon session of the faculty senate will now come to order. First item is the approval of the minutes. The November and February minutes have been posted. Are there any corrections? Hearing none, the minutes are approved. We'll now move to standing committees: Rights and Responsibilities, Prof. Lisa Hammond.

**Lisa Hammond:** Good afternoon, we have a number of items of unfinished business to bring to your attention which I will just mention here and then review when we get to unfinished business. One I will talk about in a little more detail now.

As you know, our committee has been asked to consider moving the tenure and promotion process online. Since the February meeting, Rights and Responsibilities has met twice for about four and a half to five hours of additional meeting time. I'm bragging on my awesome committee. We have also met with Dr. Plyler and Dr. Elkins about our work and what we found. At this point we've been able to identify the issues involved in the transfer.



We've identified a template of information that Columbia candidates have access to that our candidates don't. So we would be looking at a process to create parallel documents for supporting candidates in preparing their electronic files and for helping reviewers for transmitting the file where it needs to go. So we've kind of identified the stages in the process, where does the file have to go, who gets it at what level. The nice thing is that the tenure and promotion process itself is not going to change but since it is different in some cases from campus to campus reviews happen in different ways, we are trying to figure out some of the bugs in the system.

We met with Dr. Plyler and Elkins and sent forth three possible paths. One is that we could move forward with electronic submission just for external review. We felt like we could get that done before the end of the year, but we didn't feel that we could get the full process ready. The second option was to do a trial version with candidates from the Lancaster campus that I personally asked if they would be willing to participate in such a trial and also spoke with the T&P committee members. And the candidates agreed they would be fine with it. I thought this was going to be so great for the candidates because you are not having to photocopying and bind them and what not. But we just didn't feel like we could get everything ready for a full

version. So we thought a trial might work particularly if we were working during the summer. And the third option was to defer the external, excuse me, online process to the 2014-15 year which as you know sounds far away but really is like five minutes in Senate Time.

So I met with the Chancellor and the Vice Provost and their consensus was postpone the trial so that all the candidates would go through in the same way. The notion of a trial was you know some candidates are going up one way, others are going up another way – they weren't totally comfortable with that. So we are going to defer the online T&P process to implement in 2014-2015. The committee feels pretty comfortable that we can actually get everything ready and in place. We've had excellent support from Summer Yaraborough, Randy Rollings and Mitchell West in trying to get this process ready and we felt as a committee much more comfortable with the idea of deferring because so much is happening right now. A lot of things are coming down. It felt like it would be better for us to move in a deliberate way to make sure that we have a process that we are all comfortable with as much as anybody can be comfortable with tenure and promotion. So that's the status of our first bit of unfinished business.

We have three motions that will come up under unfinished business.

- One is to approve the revised regional campus and extended university faculty manual liaison officer position which we talked about at the last meeting. It was presented to you formally as a motion then so we will be able to vote on it today. I will put that document up when we get to that point.
- The second is the motion to ask the Executive Committee to update the new senator's handbook with descriptions of individual Executive Committee member's duties and to include the verbiage from the original Faculty Manual Liaison Officer position in the handbook as well.
- The third motion that will come up under unfinished business is the very exciting motion to revise the tenure and promotion forms. We have tried to break it down in a way that will get us through the documents in some reasonable period of time so we will be voting on each document individually and although it won't make sense until we get to them, not in the order that they were proposed.

So we are going to start with the least controversial forms and move up to the really exciting ones. I believe that concludes my committee's report.

**Bruce Nims:** Welfare, Professor Fernanda Burke

**Fernanda Burke:** Good afternoon, I'm going to defer today's report from the Welfare Committee to Nick Guittar who was responsible for the salary study that was distributed today. So hopefully all of you have had a chance to look at that. That will be available to all the campuses, so if you did not get a copy today you'll have access to that. If you need a copy and can't get it, just contact me or Nick and we'll certainly get it to you. I'd also like to announce the Nick will be our chair in the coming year for the Welfare Committee. So I believe he's coming up and has some notes to give you.

**Nick Guittar:** Hello, basically what we are going to cover is just a very brief executive summary of what you see the 2012-2013 faculty salary study. I'll give you the brief information, hopefully it's the nugget that you need to dive in and read through the whole thing. I made I think 27 copies, it looks like we may have more in attendance than copies. If you don't get a copy rest assured that it's going to be distributed among all the campuses and hopefully you'll have the opportunity to post it somewhere that can be shared on your campus such as a shared drive. The study this year is quite a bit different. We took a little bit more time in identifying peer institutions

that matched up well with what our responsibilities are. So what I'm going to read essentially is on page 13 if you and to flip over to that. Again, it's just going to be brief bullet points. We have lots of other business, but hopefully this gives you an idea of what we're talking about. Verbatim from the summary and recommendations section. The average salaries of the faculty that make up the four USC Regional campuses and Extended University fall substantially short of the average salaries of ten peer institutions at all levels Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor and Instructor. Each of these peer institutions are two-year State universities. That's a big change. There are no two-year technical schools in our list. There are no community colleges. All ten are two-year state public universities that are similar in form and function to the four regional campuses. Thus they provide a viable benchmark for against which to measure our equity in terms of 9-month contract salaries. Reflecting on the findings of the 2012-2013 faculty salary study we the Welfare Committee of the Regional Campus Faculty Senate make the following brief recommendations (of course although we would like to collectively agree on other recommendations down the road that we can talk about and hopefully pursue avenues to improve.) The first bullet point says the most direct recommendation is for the Regional Campus Faculty Senate to push for

improvements in pay across all ranks in order to keep us competitive and help us attract and retain talented faculty. In the future we could provide numbers on how expensive it is to replace positions. Those of you that have been in roles to look at the financials know it's not cheap to continue plugging in new positions. So that's an important element of maintaining faculty and giving them a sense of financial equity. Entertain ways in which the Regional Campus Faculty Senate can promote salary equity and push for greater parity with our peers particularly as we move into new responsibilities associated with Palmetto College. A little bit more on that in just a moment. We must continue to hire tenure-track faculty and refrain from turning tenure-track lines into instructor lines. Next part, identify current instructors that have a research trajectory that would make them a solid fit for tenure-track positions, and ascertain faculty votes to move them to a tenure-track position if that is what the person desires. And finally, conduct a companion piece for this study which looks at race and gender. There are some elements that need to be gathered in order to look at that thoroughly, and that's not a part of this current study. I'd be happy to entertain individual questions later on if you have time to look through this more specifically. There's a lot of information here and we tried to be as thorough as we could. And there is a piece of this that you don't currently

have and that's the list of information about the ten peers that we have. There's an appendix A and B that go with this. The electronic copy will have that. I'm just trying to save USC a little bit of money by not having all those appendices. Final point of contact I wanted to point out about the ten peers, there are four peers in here that are peers to Palmetto College. Just wanted to let you know that are doing much of what we are moving in the direction of doing. That's they are two-year institutions, but they are offering their students the opportunity to complete four year degrees that are being offered through their regional systems. So they provide a great benchmark for where Palmetto College is going. That's why you'll see separate statistics on those, and unfortunately a greater degree of disparity. I guess that would be it unless anyone has any immediate questions regarding the 2012-2013 Faculty Salary study. Thank you.

**Bruce Nims:** Ah-

**Patrick Saucier:** - from Extended University. I just have a question. What is that dollar comparison price for price?

**Nick Guittar:** I know. I know. I choked under the moment. But I could say for those of you that haven't looked at faculty salary equity – particularly, let's just talk to the full professors in the room. Do you feel comfortable knowing the peers in this study are making \$1.34 for every dollar you're making. Just a thought.

**Bruce Nims:** Before I call up Professor Sheffield, I should mention the Welfare Committee will return to give the John Duffy Award. Now for System Affairs, Professor Jessica Sheffield who is standing in for Andrew Kunka.

**Jessica Sheffield:** System Affairs is working on three standing charges right now, one of which is quite new dealing with the creation of a Criminal Justice Associates Degree for Salkahatchie, Union, and Sumter. One with which I'm sure you all are intimately acquainted which is the proposed revisions to the AA/AS degrees across all the campuses, including the creation of the Bachelareate Degree prep track. And then the third which deals with the summaries of the teaching evaluations we're going to be bringing five motions related to these three topics. And I can discuss them now or I can wait. Whatever is more appropriate. Bruce?



**Bruce Nims:** Inaudible

**Jessica Sheffield:** Okay, the first motion we're bringing dealing with the Criminal Justice AS degree requirements. Basically, this degree already exists on the Lancaster campus and we will be asking that you approve the same degree requirements for the Salkahatchie, Sumter, and Union campuses. So the creation of new CRJ associate degrees on each of those campuses. That will be motion number one. Motion number two, three, and four all deal with the proposed common associates degree curricula across all of the campuses. We asked the faculty organizations to vote on approving these or not. Some campuses did approve. Some campuses did not. Some did with certain reservations and so motion number two will be asking to approve revisions to the Associates of science and Associate of arts degrees plus the Pre-Bachelaureate track on the Extended University, Salkahatchie and USC Union campuses to bring those into line with the common requirements. Motion number three will be to approve a new Pre-Bachelaureate associate's degree track on the Sumter campus as they have already approved the AA/AS degrees or that we approved those for them last time. And then motion number four will be asking them to clarify the name

of the Pre-Bachelaureate track. It came up in our discussions of these degree requirements that it's not exactly clear in the handout that was circulated to all the campuses that that is, in fact, a degree program, not just a track or a major and we also had some issues with the term Pre-Bachelaureate because it could be taken to imply that the other two degrees are not Bachelaureate preparatory tracks. And so we will be bringing them to your attention to ask that that particular track be renamed to something that clarifies that. Our fifth motion will deal with the tenure and promotion files summary of teaching evaluation summary. This is something that we brought up at the last meeting. Just to re-iterate what's going on with that. The Provost's office has asked that candidates going up for tenure and promotion, or rather the compilers for each campus include in each summary of the teaching evaluations of the files not just comparison of that candidate's teaching evaluation scores to their campus average, but to other instructors and faculty teaching the same course on that campus. If that data is unavailable, then to other courses within the discipline at the same level. So another 100 level course in that field for example if you are teaching a 100 level and also to other campuses. So a candidate teaching a 200 level math class in one campus would need to have that data compared to 200 level classes in math at other regional campuses. And so we have a motion to ask the Provost to

delay this requirement. We are concerned that our current data collection techniques are in no way adequate for this task. Also, it is entirely inconsistent with the requirements of the faculty manual which only require that that candidate's average be presented in comparison to that campus' average. So we are basically presenting a motion to ask the Provost's office for more time to reconcile that inconsistency and also to develop a better data collection techniques. And that's System Affairs.

**Bruce Nims:** Executive Committee – Professor Jolie Fontenot

**Jolie Fontenot:** The Executive Committee is in the process of appointing an ad hoc curriculum committee that will meet beginning this summer and throughout next year. People who have agreed to serve are Janet Hudson Extended University, Fran Gardner USC Lancaster, Brian Love USC Salkahatchie, Kajal Bose Goshroy USC Sumter and tentatively Denise Shaw from USC Union. Outgoing chair Bruce Nims and Incoming chair Chris Nesmith will also be meeting next Friday with Palmetto College Chancellor Susan Elkins and Vice Provost Chris Plyler to discuss faculty governance issues for Palmetto College. Any questions?

**Bruce Nims:** Faculty Manual Liaison Officer Lisa Hammond

**Lisa Hammond:** Just a brief report to let you know – you should already know this really – that the 2012 Regional campus and Extended University Faculty Manual was published shortly after the February meeting. We are anticipating that we can get the materials from Senate to Dr. Plyler’s office so that it can go through the appropriate levels of review which are I guess the Chancellor’s Office, Legal, the Provost, and the President before it goes to the Board of Trustees in June. So it’s a fairly short deadline given how long legal takes with everything. We plan on getting that together for the 2013 edition in June. If that does not go smoothly we will be shooting for December edition.

**Bruce Nims:** Report for Special Committees. Committee on Libraries, Professor Sarah Miller will give the report for Professor Maureen Anderson.

**Sarah Miller:** The faculty committee on libraries met on March 8<sup>th</sup> at 12PM in the moving image research collection in Columbia. The Dean of Libraries conveyed the progress of the libraries in Columbia. Some items worth mentioning are: libraries continually moving towards electronic resources

over paper. In 20 years we see libraries as being almost totally electronic. We would like to see the number of paper journals subscribed reduced as many are not being currently used. In the future we see the library donating journals to other libraries to make space. The annex is currently 90% full. The fourth floor is currently being remodeled to include a new career center which is currently on the 6<sup>th</sup> floor of the Business Administration building. The group study rooms have become very popular with students so the library will be adding more to accommodate them. Since collecting fines costs more than receiving fines, by fall 2013 will no longer have fines for late materials. And a search for Associate Dean of Libraries is coming to a close.

**Bruce Nims:** Committee on Curricula and Courses – Professor Robert Castleberry.

**Robert Castleberry:** There's really nothing new in my report today. What I have told you in the past still holds true. That being said let me quickly get to the core.

The Committee continues to act on curricular changes as departments and schools alter their degree requirements to conform to the Carolina Core. We also continue to act on courses that have been proposed to satisfy specific Core requirements (e.g., ARP and GSS courses). Please check the Provost's website for the evolving look of the Core.

While this has nothing to do with Courses & Curriculum, I would like to briefly mention one more matter. This does relate to us and to the Core, especially as we develop associate degrees that meet the new requirements. Please consider two actions – 1) look at the Core approved courses; there may be a course that you do not normally teach that you could consider teaching since it specifically fills a Core requirement (especially one of the overlay courses or the VSR course), and 2) if you teach a course that currently is not approved as a Core course, but you think it should be, consider submitting the paperwork to get your course approved. Don't expect Columbia to do this (it is a hassle, and they may not want to bother with it), but clearly work closely with Columbia to make sure they can support the action. Any questions? Thank you.

**Bruce Nims:** We do not have a report from the Committee of Faculty Welfare. So I'll move on to the Faculty Board of Trustee Liaison Committee which I attended on Friday, March 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2013. The committee met for executive session as it always does. In open session, the College of Mass Communication and Information Studies gave a presentation on the good works that faculty and students from that college are doing to promote literacy in HIV awareness across the state in children. Copies of Reading Express and a new children's book which was actually put together with young people themselves about the dangers of HIV and AIDS in educating them about these matters. It was also a discussion of adjusting the academic dashboard because of the sequestration of funds that has gone on in the Federal level. The National Institute of Health and National Science Foundation are both looking at cuts of over 5% which can result in decreased funding for grants across the University. And so the Provost wanted to let the Board of Trustees know that the Academic Dashboard would be adjusted accordingly. Program proposals were approved by the Academic Affairs Committee to be sent forward to the full board. These are the Masters of Science in System Design for the College of Engineering and Computing. A Ph.D. in Sports and Entertainment Management and Hospitality, Retail and Sports Management. And a Masters of Science in

Nursing with a clinical nurse leader from USC Upstate. And that concludes the Board of Trustees Liaison Committee Report. Now are there any questions?

The Committee of Research and Productive Scholarship Committee Kajal Goshroy.

**Kajal Goshroy:** The Research and Productive Scholarship Committee met online and had several productive e-mail exchanges. We did a survey and we also looked at BPR and Provost's funding information online. And we compiled a report that will be attached to the minutes. We found that individual campuses had several external grants and many of them had applied for internal grants. Salkahatchie had a total of 18 grants totaling \$100,400. Extended University had 11 total grants totaling \$53,816. Union had four internal grants for \$17,000 total and for external grants for \$21,300. Lancaster a whopping 48 total for internal grants totaling \$264,750 and 14 external grants totaling \$21,900. Sumter 21 internal grants totaling \$131,196 and 8 external grants totaling \$190,320 some of which are shared by other campuses as well. You can find the details of the report attached to the minutes. Any questions? Thank you.



**Bruce Nims:** The Regional Campuses Academic Advisory Council has not met. The conflict of interest committee report will be attached to the minutes. We will now move to Unfinished Business and I believe Rights and Responsibilities has some.

**Lisa Hammond:** I hope you all will bear with me. I'm going to move in for a few minutes. You know, I drive a lot as many of you do, and when I'm thinking about work on the way a lot of times I'll make notes on my phone. But my phone thinks that the tenure and promotion process is the ten year or promotion process or alternately, the T&T promotion process. My husband says, "I hope that R&R Armageddon goes well today." I should have mentioned in my earlier report that we elected Betty Johnson as the chair of the Rights and Responsibility committee for next year.

Okay, first we have the motion to approve the revised Regional Campus Faculty Liaison officer position. I have about 20 documents for us to look at. So I'm going to try to pull them up a few at a time, and please bear with me. I'll do the best I can to make sure you can see things. As you may recall, briefly as we reviewed this in more detail last time, this was approved last year and was sent back by Dr. Curtis with some suggestions for recommendation. We addressed those. So this is the original motion which we are going to look at today. This is the motion that was presented in

February that we are voting on today. It creates the Regional Campus Faculty Liaison officer position. “This officer shall be nominated and elected at the last meeting of the Senate for the year. The Liaison officer need not be a current senator and is eligible for election for up to three consecutive terms. A brief description of the officer’s responsibilities which are keeping the faculty manual up to date, communicating with Rights and Responsibilities, making sure there is communication with various levels of administration and faculty committees that are important to this process.” So the Rights and Responsibilities for our first motion moves that the Faculty Senate adopt this change to the faculty manual creating the Faculty Manual Liaison Officer position.

**Bruce Nims:** (Inaudible) Discussion? Hearing no discussion let’s move to a vote. All in favor say aye.

**Faculty Senate:** Aye.

**Bruce Nims:** All opposed? The motion passes.

Lisa Hammond: Thank you. Can somebody help me by writing down what passes okay? The second motion relevant to this same issue is that there was a lengthy description of the duties of this officer who I don't think is going to be able to do all of them but will do all of them. But will do our best, I hope. So here is that list of duties that we originally passed. "The Rights and Responsibility committee moves that the Senate Executive Committee revise and expand the description of officers in the information for new senators handbook including the following detailed description of the duties for the Liaison Officer and adding appropriate parallel descriptions for all Executive Committee officers." This document hasn't been updated in a while. There are descriptions in the by-laws of the Faculty Manual, but they are not very detailed and I think this will help new officers coming in have a better idea of what their responsibilities are.

**Bruce Nims:** Is there any discussion? Hearing none let's move for a vote.

All in favor say aye.

**Faculty Senate:** Aye.

**Bruce Nims:** Motion passes.

**Lisa Hammond:** Here's where it gets fun. So, as you know, the Rights and Responsibilities Committee has been reviewing for some time revisions to the tenure and promotion forms. The brief history of this is that last summer, a committee of volunteers of tenured and untenured faculty got together and drafted proposed revisions to our tenure and promotions forms which had not been updated in over a decade and possibly longer than that. The intent was to kind of streamline the presentation of information and to some extent standardize some of that presentation and also to clarify for candidates what type of information is needed in different parts of the file. There's information in the manual about that but people don't always put that together with the forms so there is a general kind of feeling that the forms could be tightened up a little bit. We made the motion last time that you're not going to be able to see real well here, but I'm going to go through it with you pretty thoroughly – that goes through the different forms as they existed and talks about what we did to each one of them. There's a lot of old forms and we changed around the order of some things and added some description to things and took some things out of others. So in order to kind of facilitate the review process what Rights and Responsibilities committee members discussed is reviewing each form individually, and approving each form as a

separate motion. Also, we're going to give you the simpler forms first, and then go through those possibly as a group and then move to individual forms that need more discussion. It's a lot to keep up with, so I hope my committee will help me by making sure I don't leave anything out. So I'm going to start – let me pause for a second and see if anyone has any questions so far.

We've talked about this a good bit so I don't want to oversimplify. Okay, so far so good. Alright. We divided these up into forms that are not that problematic and could possibly be approved as a group. There are six of those forms. I'm going to call them by the numbers that they originally had in the T&P forms. We will approve the order of these forms at the end of the process. So we are going to be looking at things out of order, so just go ahead and know that from the beginning. So, first, these will actually be in order for a few minutes, the cover sheet for the file the only change here is that the campus name for Extended University was an old name and was not accurate and we've updated it to their correct name. This is the same change that was happening on the voting form which is RCTP3 currently so these are the only changes to these two forms. These are obviously not substantive. In several of the forms, there is language at the beginning of the forms that specifically identifies what should be included in that section but there were several forms that did not have that parallel language. Most

people were able to find what they needed but for the sake of simplicity and consistency, we went through those forms that did not have those and added descriptions at the beginning. So for evidence of scholarship, this just refers candidates to the appropriate pages in the Faculty Manual for suggested evidence. Now you will notice here that the date is for the old manual, because that is what we had when we presented these forms in February. So the Faculty Manual Liaison Officer's responsibility when the manual changes will also be to update changes in pagination. This is a non-substantive change. Once the Senate approves changes to the manual, then just changing page numbers is not controversial. The date here will be updated and the page will be updated to the current version of the manual each time a manual is approved. I didn't do this for this because I just got really tired, but I will do it for the real thing. So this form again just kind of says where to look for scholarship. Same thing for service. Tells the candidate where to look to get suggestions for evidence. Same thing for other items. This takes a passage that was in the Faculty Manual that describes what can be included in other items and just we literally just dropped it right in there and finally, the same thing with the addendum. This is the Faculty Manual existent language describing what can be included in the addendum. So these six forms, let me make sure I went through them all,

are not non-substantive, because obviously these are substantive changes but they are not of great consequence in my opinion. Is there a motion to consider these as a group or would you like to go through them individually?

**Bruce Nims:** Motion to consider them as a group. Any seconds? Any discussion? Hearing none, move to a vote. All in favor say aye?

**Faculty Senate:** Aye.

**Bruce Nims:** All opposed? Motion passes.

**Lisa Hammond:** We just approved forms one, three, eight, nine, ten, and eleven. Those are the original numbers. This next batch are forms that we felt needed to be discussed individually because they had more complicated matters involved with them. Again, we are going to start with the simple ones and work our way up to the more fun ones. So we'll start with the criteria RCTP2. What we did in this form was lift the criteria from the Faculty Manual, formerly this document was only the top section from the title to (Inaudible). We added after that a description of what the criteria for tenure and promotion are that are applicable to all candidates, then we included blank spaces for the candidate to include appropriate criteria for

their action. So if you were seeking promotion to associate professor and Tenure, you would copy the criteria for rank of associate professor. You would copy the criteria for effective teaching at that rank. This form is applicable for any candidate going up for tenure at any rank. They just plug their rank in from the manual and add the dates here so you insert here from Regional Campus Faculty Manual 2012 so this would be updated to the most current version of the manual. So the first version of this that is approved will use the pagination of the 2012 manual. The 2013 won't be approved for some time. Also, the general description of scholarship, the specific place for the candidate to insert the criteria for effective or highly effective scholarship depending on the rank they are seeking and the description of service which is the same for any rank. So basically what this does is it makes it a little simpler on the candidate to see what the criteria should be included. One thing we have seen with a lot of candidates going up they just copied this section here, or they copied the description for highly effective and/or effective teaching even though they are only applying for one rank or the other. So we are hoping that by providing spaces to fill in the appropriate information that would minimize any problems with the criteria being accurate in the file.



**Bruce Nims:** (Inaudible) Any seconds? Second. Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor say aye.

**Faculty Senate:** Aye.

**Bruce Nims:** All opposed? Motion passes.

**Lisa Hammond:** So we just approved RCTP2 Criteria. Next is the personal statement. Let me close a couple of documents out here. Again, we're not going in order but we'll get to all of them. Alright, the personal statement the original verbiage that you see at the bottom of this document struck in red this is what was originally on this form. So candidate's personal statement in this section candidate will describe how the criteria for the action sought in this application have been successfully addressed allowing. So we are moving to strike this language and to instead insert the language here. The personal statement should be blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Now I'm not reading that all to you because the personal statement is taken directly from the manual. We just copied and pasted again. It comes from the section that has a chart about what goes in each tab. So here are those tabs – that's page eighteen of the current faculty manual, so we just lifted and copied that

section right here. There is a substantial addition to this form, however, that is the material in yellow. This personal statement shall normally not exceed five typed pages. So one of the things that's been going on with this form is some candidates are writing really long personal statements and including material that should properly be addressed in evidence. People have not been totally clear on the purpose of the personal statement is. Even having discussed it in committee a long time we still have different language for what we describe what the personal statement does. It might be an opening statement, or it might be an abstract. So basically the personal statement as I see it is a place where you kind of overview what your career is and how you feel you've met the criteria. The evidence for that as it says in the manual should be confined to the appropriate section. By limiting the page numbers here, we hope that will give the candidate a better feel for the range of information that they need to include. There was a range of opinion on this form. Some people said no limit here whatsoever. Some people wanted it to be two pages. This five, we felt, was a compromise that gave candidates some room to figure out how they wanted to address the personal statement in a way that was appropriate to them.

Bruce Nims: Inaudible. Is there a second? Any discussion? Questions?

**Robert Castleberry:** Castleberry from Sumter. By limiting this you do that because information that might have been in there goes somewhere else.

(Inaudible)

**Lisa Hammond:** It goes in the evidence section.

**Robert Castleberry** Are those statements (Inaudible).

**Lisa Hammond:** Yes, the narrative sections of the file are limited to thirty pages. Those sections are RCTP6 the personal statement that we are looking at here, RCTP7 evidence of effective teaching, RCTP8 evidence of scholarship, RCTP9 evidence of service. Those are the only sections that the page limit applies to. Those narratives. So essentially what this does is tells the candidate put your evidence – give the pages to the evidence section rather than the personal statement. Does that answer your question, you still.

**Robert Castleberry:** (Inaudible) Too limiting for someone to address.

service. Something that specifically needs to be addressed. There should be a number of pages total to allow that (Inaudible).

**Lisa Hammond:** I'm not sure about the committee because we didn't talk about it that way. It's my belief, and it does say here it should normally not exceed five typed pages which in my opinion would give a candidate who has a particular set of circumstances the option to extend it if necessary. And also, I should clarify a thing about this – this might be a separate motion. If we pass this, it is my recommendation that we pass it not only in the form, but that we also include that in the Faculty Manual in this chart. So we would add that description about the page limit to that chart. So I don't know if you want to handle that in two motions or one motion or how you want to do it. And we don't have to do that, but I think it would be clearer for the candidate and less confusing.

**Robert Castleberry:** (Inaudible) friendly amendment.

**Lisa Hammond:** Yes, a friendly amendment would be lovely.

**Robert Castleberry:** (Inaudible).

**Lisa Hammond:** The friendly amendment is that if adopted, the final sentence of the description of the personal statement, "This personal

statement should normally not exceed five typed pages,” be included in the Regional Campus’ Faculty Manual on page 18 in the description of the tab for the personal statement.

**Bruce Nims:** Any discussion of the friendly amendment? All in favor say aye.

**Faculty Senate:** Aye

**Bruce Nims:** The vote on the motion has been amended. (**Inaudible**) All in favor?

**Faculty Senate:** Aye.

**Bruce Nims:** All opposed? Motion passes as amended.

**Robert Castleberry:** Point of information. (Inaudible) What number?

**Lisa Hammond:** It was RCTP6. But it may not be that for much longer.

Okay, so we just passed RCTP6 Personal statement. I want to mention two

forms to you here, so we can talk about one. As you know, the very, very exciting tenure and promotion forms that we revised is the section of evidence of teaching effectiveness section. This one is going to take some time and a lot of documents, so please be patient with me and with this.

There are two forms that are relevant here. One is the curriculum vitae form. This is not the one that I am presenting for the motion right now. This one is just for us to see what we are about to vote on. One of the issues that has been confusing to some people is how and where do they include certain types of information. RCTP5 titled curriculum vitae has been very confusing to a lot of candidates because we see a curricular vitae as a full vitae of our entire professional careers and this form is quite dated, so it includes a section for your name, your educational history, your employment history, there's a honors and awards section and there's a section that describes teaching responsibilities. But there wasn't a section in here about scholarship. Any of our candidates that are concerned about tenure are concerned about scholarship. Nobody wants to see a vitae that doesn't have scholarship on it. So the form's title has been I would say misleading I would say as to the intent of the form. I think this was regarded originally as an abbreviated vitae and that's why it's called that, but it doesn't really serve that purpose anymore in the way that we are using it. It seemed like the

simplest way to address this was to strike the information that is kind of vitae like and move it into whatever appropriate sections that it should be in. This form has been used by the Board of Trustees as a way of briefly looking at a candidate's credentials. So they want to see where you'd get your degree from when they are tenuring you is the impression that I have. I don't know that for a fact because who knows what the board of trustees thinks – not me. But I do know that they have taken this form here, the first sheet of it and copied it and distributed it at the Board of Trustees. In the past, they've also asked people to provide a one page vitae. They call you up, you know, June 1<sup>st</sup> and say we need a one page vitae day after tomorrow. And so we're glad they aren't doing that any more. So what we've done here is rename the document Education and Employment History, left the education and employment history here, struck the honors and awards which presumably the candidates would be pursuing in the actual sections themselves, and then here's the kicker. Teaching responsibilities. Report courses taught, minimum three years indicating contact hours, type of course, lecture, lab, etc., credit hours, enrollment, elective versus required and site. There was a lot of discussion about what should be here how it should be included, where it should go, ultimately the two committees that reviewed this document concluded that it made the most sense to cut it from

the curriculum vitae section and add it to the evidence section. So I want to clarify here that this language – teaching responsibilities – this is the exciting language in the form except that we have added these last kinds of teaching: online, two-way video, that were not kinds of teaching that you did when these forms were originally written. So I'm telling you about the curriculum vitae form so you can understand whatever we do with the teaching document, if we end up striking that for example we're going to have to revisit the curriculum vitae form. So we're going to talk about effective teaching first so we know what we need to do with the curriculum form if anything. This is where I have to practice my yoga breathing for a few minutes. So, in overview, the changes to RCTP7 evidence of effective teaching that are proposed are the addition of this sentence at the top, referring the candidate to the criteria in the manual. It includes the same language that was originally on the form. So everything here that is in black – this is the original form – we just added a sentence to the beginning of it. Let me call to your attention included in the documentation submitted here must be a numerical summary of student evaluations. We lifted the language from RCTP5, the description of teaching responsibilities, and included it directly below the introduction to the form. Then we have the chart. The famed proverbial chart. This chart requires the candidate to report the



courses - that is required already but it gives them a format for recording it. This has been very controversial. Some people have said, "I don't want to be told how to report my information." Other people have said, "I don't like how this chart is put together." It's hard for me to tell whether the chart is the issue so much as the overall global index column. This is the column that is the greatest source of potential controversy and the thing that we really have to think about how we want to handle. The thinking of the committee was that since it is required that the candidates put student evaluation information in this section anyway. And since the candidate is listing every individual course that they taught, anyway, it made the most sense to put the numbers with the listing of these courses. So here is the mock up that I showed you last time for the candidate for tenure and promotion at Hogwarts who has been teaching transfiguration and defense against the dark arts. Here are the global overall indexes, so this is what this form would actually look like if it were completed. Now one thing I want to call your attention to in this mock up. This language is what we just showed you is what is proposed. This section right here is the context that a potential candidate might include here. So this is not part of the form, this is just a way to show you how a candidate might introduce the chart. For example, the form then continues to list specifically each of the criteria that the candidate is –

**(end first disc)**

**Lisa Hammond:** The discussion here has primarily focused around I don't like the idea of being told I have to handle the information in my file in a particular way. I want to be able to address the criteria in whatever way I choose to. Obviously I'm telling you the comments that people have had where they've had concerns about the file because nobody has called me to say, "I think they are all super awesome let's go with them right this minute." I don't know if that's because they are not super awesome or if everybody is just happy with where they are in their lives right now. So what I'm telling you are some of the criticism and comments just so that you can understand what are the issues. So, essentially as the committee and I think it works out, we have three kinds of issues in this form. One is the global index which I want to talk about in some depth. One is the format of the chart that might be included here and we're going to talk about that with the global index, and the last is the section at the end with the criteria. So I think that the best way maybe to handle this motion is to deal with each section – I'm not sure – I can walk you through all the issues and then you can tell me how you want to handle it.

**Bruce Nims:** (Inaudible) And we'll see how it goes.

**Lisa Hammond:** I see. Let's talk about the global index. There's a couple of issues here. One is I'm so sorry to have to tell the Provost that our global index, our student evaluation numbers are not comparable across campuses. And I'm telling you my personal opinion on this. For example, in the process of trying to understand what is the global index – because several people said to me, “where is the global index? What am I supposed to put in that column? Clarify that for me.” So I sent to a couple of different people one of my student evaluation scores. These are the global indicators that are included in the Class Climate Report. Different campuses as far as I can tell may include different indexes here. I know this for a fact because of a Lancaster report and how a Sumter report was run. I got this from Becky Hillman, but I don't have her permission to put that up there, so I'm not going to. But at Sumter there is a global index that is part five, and that section includes questions for online delivery of classes. So for example were you comfortable with your ability to interact with the students? Were you comfortable with the technological support that you had for the class? Robert, am I stating those kind of questions accurately? So there's a number of sections I am not completely familiar with them, but it's a section that is completely not excitant in the Lancaster forms. Yes.

**Robert Castleberry:** I was told that those questions were mandated by the Provost's office to be included in all student evaluations.

**Lisa Hammond:** Well, somebody is not in compliance then, but I have heard that as well that the Provost has required that section 5 be included but I know that it is not included in mine. So, what I'm saying here is when we are talking about student evaluations numbers and we are talking about part of System Affairs' purview is here and I'm sorry if this is going on too long but this is really important and I want to make sure everybody understands. The student evaluation numbers are not comparable. They are not comparable on campus. For example, in Lancaster, for the first year, we have the option to do our student evaluations online. Some faculty are still doing them on paper, so you can choose which medium you want. Immediately you have two different sets of evaluation numbers. They are not comparable: different students are going to respond to them – the ones that are in front of you or those who want to go to a computer lab. If the e-mail goes to the day that you give back papers and you don't have control on when it goes out, I think you can expect lower scores this year. When you have paper forms you control when you are giving them and what is going on in class. So on the Lancaster campus you have the form, but not the same

one as Sumter's we have a fundamentally different set of numbers. So the idea that we have evaluation scores that are comparable is an issue. The other issue is one that was brought up and there is a possible proposed new column, if the student evaluations scores are going to be included on here, do it have to be in this format? Could it be in a different format? So there's an alternate format proposed that is a landscape chart. This is something that the committee wanted to get away from because we were looking at paper forms, but we are going to an online form next year. So if you were reading a file online electronically you'd have a section where the file is turned this way, then it turns this way, then it turns back the normal way. So landscape is not a problem with an electronic file. It's not a huge problem with a paper one, either to tell you the truth. So there's been a proposal that we consider maybe adopting a landscape edition that includes an additional column, and this is my personal preference that if you are going to include the overall global index, you also include the number of students who evaluate the class. That way if you had 3 students out of twenty who came in and evaluated your class online, it's easy to weigh the significance of those numbers. Now, obviously Hogwarts is a residential school so the numbers here are very high. That would be different on individual campuses.

What other issue is there with online the global evaluation index that I'm forgetting about? The other issue is that at the time that the manual and these forms were written, there was no summary of teaching evaluations and so there's been a lot of confusion about the difference between what needs to be included in RCTP7 and what goes in the summary of the teaching evaluations. I'm going to give you my personal reading on this and I want to emphasize that it is my personal reading on this and I've talked to people who shared it and other people who think I'm full of it. So, understand that you are getting my version of that. First thing I want to do is share with you my assessment which is that the numbers are required in this section from the existing T&P forms that we have right now. RCTP5 requires that we report courses taught, minimum three years, including contact hours, type of course, lecture, lab, blah, blah, blah. From the existing T&P forms RCTP7 there's a statement at the top of the form that says, "Included in these forms must be a numerical summary of teaching evaluations." From the Regional Campuses Faculty Manual, there is a statement there that says, "The candidate may also prepare a reference collection of documents including student evaluations which will not be duplicated, but which would accompany the file, and instruments for mechanisms authorized by the local candidate's campus for evaluating the candidate's teaching such as peer and

student evaluations will be included in the file. Now there are a lot of ways you can interpret this. For example, if you wanted to be ornery, you could say, “Hmm, I’ve put in a blank copy of the mechanism evaluating a candidate’s teaching in my documentation and therefore I have complied with the language of the manual.” But in my opinion, that would be an overstatement, to say the least, so it is my professional judgment that what is being referenced here is a list of student evaluation data for each class. This is my judgment only, let me clarify. I think there are some people on the committee who agree with me and others that do not. The reason I am telling you that is because I was on the committee that formed them in the first place and that was the topic around which a lot of our discussion focused. So it’s my opinion, that there should be a chart like this that includes the student evaluation scores that is in addition to the average that is included in RCTP7 Summary of teaching evaluations not prepared or inserted by the candidate. That average is the average for the whole time you’ve taught. It’s one number across the road for each of your questions. It doesn’t distinguish between how your really awesome advanced transfiguration teacher, but your intro to transfiguration students hate your class and so they give you lower scores. So, that’s the global index. That’s related to the issue of how do we want to include a chart. Do we want to have a chart that looks like this

here? Or this? The motion that is formally under consideration right now is this motion here with the portrait landscape for the chart not including the column that includes the number of students who evaluated the course. So there might be a friendly amendment maybe to adopt the landscape version that includes a column for the number evaluated in the global evaluation index. The other issue, and then we'll talk I promise I'll shut up for a minute anyway is do we want to include the criteria one of our faculty asked that I bring forward to you – which I am doing now – the motion to strike this part of the form – they wanted to strike the chart and the list of criteria and leave the candidate totally free to present their information in the way they choose to in this section. So as I see it the three talking points here are do we want to include the global index at all. If we don't there's still that statement in the manual that there must include a numerical summary of student evaluations. If we do include, how do we want to format the chart. Do we want to add that other column, make it landscape, and do we want to include the criteria? So the motion right now looks like this.

Bruce Nims: I think the best way to handle this is are there – Lisa has given us a very detailed account of this particular form. She has also pointed out three different places where amendments might be offered. I think the best



way to proceed would be for you to point out each place where an amendment might be offered and ask for said amendment.

**Lisa Hammond:** Okay.

**Bruce Nims:** Okay, so just take them one at a time.

**Lisa Hammond:** So the first point is in the chart the overall global index. Two options here. One, is to strike the column entirely. One is to move to a different presentation format that allows the inclusion of the global index and the number of students that evaluate the course. Professor Castleberry?

**Robert Castleberry:** I'm still a little confused about the notion of the global index. So this is one number that we glean from a lot of other numbers and these other numbers (Inaudible) the teaching summary and the different part (Inaudible) Is that it? I just don't get it.

**Lisa Hammond:** I think that's right but let me briefly go over it again just by looking at a sample evaluation here. So where it says global index and there's a grid and an average. This is the global index number on the student

evaluations. I believe. I have not definitively seen every campus' evaluations, but I believe that every campus has this number across the top but that what is included in it may be different from campus to campus.

**Robert Castleberry:** I see the evaluations on our campus. I don't think we use that at all.

**Lisa Hammond:** I know.

**Robert Castleberry:** I'm not familiar with it.

**Lisa Hammond:** The other campuses don't have anybody that is in your position that compiles the data for them, so the data has been compiled from this kind of document as I understand it. So either way we go into this discussion, I want everybody to be absolutely clear that I'm not saying the global index that is on this chart here is the same for everybody or that it works in the same ways. I'm saying this is the only thing we know of that we all have.

**Robert Castleberry:** I'm not sure how useful that one number is. It really should be generated exactly the same. You'd have to mandate (Inaudible).

Lisa Hammond: That's done differently on different campuses, too. So the teaching summary, I've seen them and they are done in different ways. I know that's not the way it is supposed to be but I'm telling you what I'm seeing. So, um –

**Tom Powers:** In light of the questionable validity of that number in light of the fact that we need a separate global index number for every course. Could you put that form back up?

**Lisa Hammond:** Do you want to see the mock up?

**Tom Powers:** Yeah, the mock up would be what I would want to see. So there's a separate global index for each course?

**Lisa Hammond:** Yes.

**Tom Powers:** Let me just say I move to strike that column altogether.

**Bruce Nims:** There's a motion to amend to strike the overall global index column. Any seconds? Discussion of the amendment.

**Nick Lawrence:** I have a question. You know if this were done and then you go and make a file and form – you're still addressing your global index scores, right? I'm not trying to argue with you, I'm just trying to understand this a little bit. Are the people evaluating this on the T&P Committees are saying, "You know I can't trust this number, because we don't know what it means." I'm not sure that removing it from the column fixes the problem. This is not to argue with his motion. Nick Lawrence, Lancaster, by the way. Just to say that you guys have identified something that is troubling that I did not know differs from campus to campus I wanted to throw that out there. Thank you.

**Bruce Nims:** Let me just remind you that the acoustics in this room are not good so please state your name and campus clearly for the record.

**Lisa Hammond:** If I could speak to your question and I'll get to you Nick. Again, I'm telling you what *I* think. It's my judgment that there's a difference between the listing of the evaluation scores for each class. That's

been all we had up until the last couple of years. So that's one thing that reviewers are familiar with seeing in the file and expect to see. I look at a number like this and it tells me different things about your teaching. Now I'm going to say upfront, before I say any of this, I don't have a whole lot of faith in student evaluation numbers. I mean, I think we all know student evaluations numbers as long as we've had them what did they measure? You know, did you buy them pizza at the final exam. Did you grade hard? They are one indicator of teaching effectiveness. I think that they have gained a lot of prominence right now because of what we have going on with System Affairs with the teaching summary, and so there's a lot of anxiety associated with those numbers. I tend to see this as something that is helpful to the candidate, because what it does is conveys to me has a candidate's scores gone up over the years? That could be an indication of instructional improvement, which is one of our criteria. Could mean they're buying them pizza, but you know I'm inclined to think instructional improvement. Is a lower level class going to have a lower evaluation than a higher class? A smaller class tends to have higher evaluations. So to me this is a way to get a snapshot of a candidate's teaching in a way that I don't get when I look at RCTP7B. What 7B is doing is comparing your numbers to somebody else's. It doesn't give a comprehensive picture of your numbers. So in my judgment

it's good to have the column because it tells us that kind of information that's not included in 7B and in my opinion is required by the language of the form. But there's no doubt we have a problem with how this information is compiled and reported. I'm on my knees thanking God every day right now that is not my problem to fix. System Affairs, you have your work cut out for you. Right now the only thing we can do is say the manual says they're supposed to be numbers in here. The judgment of two committees says there should be numbers in here. We can strike them if you want to, but I'm telling you the history behind it. Nick?

**Nick Guittar:** The first thing I was going to ask is that I wish we had more time for discussion before we go to (Inaudible) . . . into this.

**Lisa Hammond:** Unless Professor Powers wanted to withdraw his motion for the time being.

**Nick Guittar:** I think in regards to this, System Affairs, I think that the broader issue could be (Inaudible) Summary of teaching evaluation will include data from other campuses. So obviously that motion denies (Inaudible).

**Bruce Nims:** We have an amendment on the floor.

**Lisa Hammond:** Jessica had her hand up.

**Bruce Nims:** We have an amendment on the floor for open discussion.

Please identify yourself for the minutes.

**Kajal Ghoshoy:** As far as I understand, Sumter, because there are many more questions under one, three, and four which takes into account the climate in the classroom, the technology available. That number is not a true assessment of my teaching in the classroom. Maybe Robert could explain all of that? The summary of the numbers. So it looks to me that if I teach the exact same course with the exact same students at different campuses that number would be different even if they gave me the exact same scores.

**Lisa Hammond:** That's a fact. That would be something that you as a candidate would need to address and contextualize or that your teaching summary writer would contextualize in 7B. That is true, whether we adopt this or not.

**Nick Guittar:** Sorry, Nicholas Guittar, USC Lancaster. On our campus anytime I teach a course that has a mandatory online component I have to include that section. But on the face-to-face classes because part five only relates to courses that have a mandatory online component.

Lisa Hammond: Part five is being delivered on all evaluations at USC Sumter, regardless of whether they are online or not. Is that correct?

Nick Guittar: Okay, I was curious. If you are not teaching online, part three. If you are not teaching online, part three is all you need. Part five is redundant unless it's online. Fixing that fixes a lot of the problems.

Lisa Hammond: Again, we are not dealing with the larger issues of how the evaluation numbers are compared, although you are exactly right. All we are dealing with right now is are we going to have that column on this document.

**Bruce Nims:** (Inaudible) from USC Lancaster.

**Anonymous:** I feel that if we strike that column we'll be removing useful information that the reviewers need in order to effectively evaluate the candidate's teaching. And then they are going to have to look at the individual evaluations for every single course in the supporting documents.



So I don't feel we should remove that column of information because that information is useful in reviewing the candidate's teaching.

**Tom Powers:** Tom Powers, Sumter. As long as the reviewer looks at only one file and no others I really have a problem with the idea of having (Inaudible). But if the reviewer is going to be looking at files from Sumter, files from Union, files from Lancaster and unless there is something that says "this column is invalid for comparison purposes." Especially when you get beyond the committee level, I think it's misrepresenting what people might need to have included. Without anything standard for it, it seems to me that this is the one thing that we should leave. There must be some sort of numerical summary to the evaluations. Until we can have something coming out of the regional campus, we need not do it like we already have.

**Lisa Hammond:** We are already implying that we have one by asking candidates to include it in what we have now. So there's no difference in what is being asked to be included except that we are saying THIS number in this column. Up until now, candidates have had the choice of how they present that information. The information is not consistent across campuses.

**Bruce Nims:** Any further discussion of the amendment?

**Mike Bonner:** Mike Bonner, USC Lancaster. To not have some kind of summary number for our teaching is not very smart.

**Robert Castleberry:** Inaudible. Teaching summary data is already mandated presented according to the manual in a specific way that is in 7B – is that correct?

**Lisa Hammond:** That's right.

**Robert Castleberry:** So the data are there in a different format.

**Lisa Hammond:** In a greatly condensed format.

**Bruce Nims:** Any other discussion of the amendment?

**Tom Powers:** One final question. What would be the number that goes in that column, given that the way it is set up requires a global index for each individual course. (Inaudible).

**Lisa Hammond:** It would be the top line in the class climate evaluation that each faculty member has. Again, what parts are included in each campus' compilation might be different, but there is a global index in all the campuses as far as I have seen. But I – you know – you never know.

**Bruce Nims:** Any other discussion? Move to a vote. All in favor of the amendment to strike the global index number from the chart, say aye. All opposed? The nos have it. It does not pass.

**Lisa Hammond:** There was also discussion – thank you, I'm sorry.

**Bruce Nims:** The amendment does not pass so the motion goes on with the (Inaudible). There was also the issue of having the number of students that evaluated the course included. Speaking from the committee, this was something that several faculty members requested as a way of providing better context for interpreting student evaluations scores. This is something that I would really like to see us have. If we are going to have the numbers, it makes a greater sense of what the numbers mean. So the way that this data is presented because this chart here was portrait, it was very just schrunchee.

It was kind of hard to get everything in here, we were kind of doing a lot of abbreviating and making the font really teeny. So when we talked about adding an additional column, we went to a landscape column. The columns are the same except for this one right here, the number evaluated. There is a structural difference here which is this would be the first two pages probably, it might be longer, for a full professor candidate. This is a typical length of service time for faculty going up for tenure. So it would be two pages in portrait just in numbers, and then the criteria stuff after it. Now, for the example that you have here, there is a footnote that would not be included except for maybe we might want to include this for some. What I did here was provide context for understanding the evaluations, the overall global index is the average student evaluation score for each class. And then I added this that on my campus, this is the true – on Sumter the scores are converted to a five-point scale. So I think that probably the best thing to do would be to vote on the form like this without that additional contextualization. But I do want to make clear that the candidate could go in and add a little verbiage just to clarify the scale. So this form looks a little different, the information in a different format, but it's the same except for that one column. So there might be a friendly amendment to add the number evaluated column and transpose the data into a landscape.

**Bruce Nims:** Any seconds?

**Anonymous:** Second.

**Bruce Nims:** Move to second. Move to discussion to amend the number evaluated and to adjust the chart so that the full number of columns can be included.

**Robert Castleberry:** Robert Castleberry, Sumter. I think that's a great idea but I am now wondering about the layout of this. Is there a column that gives the enrollment for that class?

**Lisa Hammond:** Yes. That is the same as the original column. It is right here. Number evaluated is right next to it.

**Robert Castleberry:** Inaudible.

**Bruce Nims:** Any discussion of this amendment?

**Khajal Goshroy:** Inaudible

**Lisa Hammond:** That is a possibility, but if I thought that you were manipulating your data, I would go into your documentation and look to see in your class climate reports how many people responded. That is on the evaluation form. So right at the top it says the number of responses that were reported. It doesn't say the number of students enrolled but if I was feeling really picky about it, I would go and look it up. However, I think most of us are familiar with the smaller class that these students may be a little flaky at the end and are not there when you fill it out – give the evaluations out. Also, with the implementation of online evaluations on more campuses, we're going to see that number drop across the board, I think. So that the number of students that are completing evaluations is going to be lower everywhere. So I don't think that's a big problem, but that's easy for me to say because I have tenure. Right?

**Bruce Nims:** Any other discussion? Move to a vote. All in favor of the amendment say aye. All opposed? The ayes have it. They will vote on this motion as a committee.

**Lisa Hammond:** Okay, the last possible area for amendment is the criteria being included at the end where the candidate is compelled, to use some language that I've heard, to insert their information into a specific place. One concern has been if there's a little block for each of these things, and there's a little space for each of these things, does that mean that I have to put this same amount of information in each of these things. They are all equally important. I would say that the criteria that we have right now don't define how important each thing is, but if you are asking me, knowledge is something that for example, you can pretty well handle by saying, I have a Ph.D., and I continue to be, you know, develop myself professionally in these ways. Knowledge is frequently a very short section in these files, whereas course design and student learning I would expect to see a much more significant discussion there. Again, the reason for including this criteria is to kind of help the candidate remember don't just go in there and talk about everything you ever did in class was super awesome. Instead tell us what you did, how the students learned. There's a measure of effective course design. It does limit the candidate somewhat in that they physically have to have the criteria there to respond to, but I think that it gives them a good structure, makes it easier for the reviewer as well and makes sure that people are actively looking at the criteria from the beginning as they prepare

the file. So I guess any possible amendment here would be actually be unfriendly, which is strike the criteria and just leave the chart.

**Bruce Nims:** Is there any discussion? Hearing none, move to vote on the motion.

**Lisa Hammond:** This is RCTP7 evidence of effective teaching modified to include a chart at the beginning with the listing of the information that is required in the forms that we currently have with the addition of the number of students who evaluated course and the overall global index and with the addition of the specific criteria being included in the form itself.

**Bruce Nims:** Discussion of the motion.

**Nick Lawrence:** Nick Lawrence, Lancaster. Friendly question. Scroll back to the chart, please. In the judgment of the committee, what is the purpose and value of enumerating each type of class for each section taught.

**Lisa Hammond:** That's currently required so we just took the same language and added it to the form. There's a big difference between teaching



a lab and a lecture, for example. I think lecture is personally not very description of what I do in my English 101 classes, but when I list them, I list them as lectures. I would say they are more like hands on skills-based classes but what the forms we have right now just say is it a lecture or is it a lab? So we just came up with that verbiage.

**Bruce Nims:** Any other discussion? Hearing none, we move to vote. All in favor say aye. All opposed? Motion passes.

**Lisa Hammond:** That was the whole form, right?

**Bruce Nims:** Yeah.

**Lisa Hammond:** Okay, so we just passed RCTP7 including the landscape chart with the number evaluated and the global index, and with the criteria. It's going to go faster from here. I'm sorry, I'm doing my best. I swear. Okay. We are now considering RCTP5 formally called curriculum vitae. We've already discussed this one, so I'm going to go fast with it. Move to change the name to Education and Employment History, strike honors and awards, and we just struck this effectively by passing the last motion.

**Bruce Nims:** Is there a second? Discussion of the motion? Hearing none we vote. All in favor say aye. All opposed? The ayes have it.

**Lisa Hammond:** So we just approved RCTP5, which is now Education and Employment History. We have two new proposed forms. This one is new so you have not seen it before but it is directly related to the material that we have already looked at and I'm hoping that Dr. Nims will rule it non-substantive. When we presented the teaching chart that we just have been talking about, obviously at that point that information is not relevant or helpful for candidates for tenure who are librarians. Our faculty manual includes a section on how to achieve tenure and promotion as a librarian, effectiveness as a librarian is that section's criteria. So we have a tenured faculty member at Lancaster and two tenure-track librarian faculty members. We thought the best thing to do in trying to figure out make sure they had a place was to create a parallel RCTP7 that would be Evidence of Effectiveness as a Librarian. The language at the top here is the same except that they look at the library criteria and then we copied the library criteria from the manual and included it here. So, effectively this is a parallel form to the one we just passed. They don't get a chart. Doggone it. So they just have the criteria.

**Bruce Nims:** Since it uses language already extant in the manual, essentially transposes them into a more effective form for a librarian effectiveness, I declare this non-substantive.

**Lisa Hammond:** We want to mention here that the librarians developed this form themselves. They are also in the process of reviewing their criteria and may ask Rights and Responsibilities to make some changes to their criteria because obviously technology has changed for librarians a good bit. That is not on the form right now, but just as a context. So this had to the best of my knowledge, the full support of all of our tenured or tenure-track librarian degree candidates.

**Bruce Nims:** Moved to the floor. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, move to vote. All in favor of the Evidence for Effectiveness Librarian form say aye. All opposed. Motion passes.

**Lisa Hammond:** Okay, so we just passed RCTP7 Evidence of Effectiveness for a librarian. The other form that I'm bringing you; this is a new form as in not in the 2009 T&P forms which were not, actually, 2009. I don't know why they are. They made some cosmetic changes to them I think. So this is a

form we brought to you last time, but our voting on to insert a new form. This is a fetchingly aesthetic form and it just says, “Insert full curriculum vitae.” When we talked about the vitae, there was a huge controversy about the vitae. The vitae is if you’ll pardon my saying so, really not critical for a tenure and promotion file. A T&P committee is interested in your service at the time that you’ve been up for tenure. But we are all very attached to our professional careers, and the idea of getting rid of them seemed to be too much for many people to bear. So that one thing that we did in looking at how to handle this was when changing the curriculum vitae form to Employment and Education History, we also then added, down at the bottom of the section after evidence of service, this blank curriculum vitae page. This allows the candidate to insert his or her full vitae and whatever format they like except we are hoping not interpretive dance. So this form is not really a form. It’s just a blank what do you call it – stub where the candidate would go in and insert the vitae.

**Bruce Nims:** (Inaudible) Any second? Move to discussion.

**Robert Castleberry:** Just a question. Sorry. Are candidate still doing the page summary at the beginning?

**Lisa Hammond:** No.

**Robert Castleberry:** Okay.

**Bruce Nims:** Any other discussion? Move to vote. All in favor say aye. All opposed.

**Lisa Hammond:** No. I can vote. I'm a senator.

**Bruce Nims:** It passes.

**Lisa Hammond:** Okay. So we just passed RCTP10 curriculum vitae. I think we are about done. The last form, the only one we haven't looked at yet is the list of supporting materials. The only change that we proposed to this is that we move it. We wanted to – and now I'm not even sure I remember why – relocated it from the beginning of the file to the end of the file. It's kind of like an index, maybe. It is more properly a table of contents for your documentation, so that your physical documentation, your notebooks, your binders those kind of things. All the stuff that goes in those is listed on this page right here. The only change is to move it to the end. So rather than vote

on this change on moving this one thing to this place, we thought in order to facilitate the voting process is to vote on the whole order of all the forms at one time. That's why we didn't present them to you in any particular order other than least to most controversial. So as we presented this in February, you can see that most of the things are in the same place. We have RCTP10 down at the bottom that's new. We moved to RCTP9 the list of supporting materials. I believe everything else is pretty much in the order we already have them. However, when we were talking about the possibility of moving the T&P process online, one of the things that became clear is that when you add in material to a candidate's file, it's a lot easier to do that at the end of the file where electronically you just merge two PDFs instead of trying to stick one in the middle in the right place. This is not to say this cannot be done without relative difficulty but just in the interest of kind of facilitating the review, the committee proposes a new order that would put the candidate's material first, and then any additional material would be appended onto the end by different levels of review. So the proposed order is the cover sheet, the criteria, the voting form, education and employment history, personal statement, teaching, scholarship and service evidence, list of supporting material, curriculum vitae, other items, addenda, and then you pick up with the teaching summary the external reviews of scholarship and

then all the normal tabs that we have for different levels of this review. So this order would – you would not have the teaching section followed by the teaching summary anymore, which I think personally is kind of a good thing. It puts it on the end and makes it clear that is an administrative kind of add on.

**Bruce Nims:** Okay, this is the motion on the change of the newly proposed order to facilitate online review. Is there a second? Discussion. (Inaudible)

**Lisa Hammond:** Any y'all have only done it once.

**Bruce Nims:** Okay, no discussion, move to a vote. All in favor say aye. All opposed. The new order passes.

**Lisa Hammond:** Okay. Clarify for me please, somebody, when we voted on the personal statement did we also vote to make that change in the faculty manual. We did, didn't we? Okay. Alright, if you'll give me just one second to verify, I think we are done but I want to make sure. The last thing I want to mention about this is that everything that just passed, changes things in the manual. As the Faculty Manual Liaison officer should I have the

misfortune of being re-elected it would be my job to make sure that what we just passed goes into the manual properly. I will be asking for help to verify that. But I want to make sure that everybody understands that what we just passed does change the manual, but it is in non-substantive ways except for the one statement about the personal statement. Am I missing anything?

Well, I thank you for your attention, and I apologize to you for the length of this report.

**Bruce Nims:** Is there any other unfinished business. Hearing none, we will move to new business and I believe System Affairs has some business for new business.

**Jessica Sheffield:** Okay, as I mentioned earlier, we have five motions. I'll try to move rapidly through them. At the same time a couple of them are very timely and will affect your degree programs and your T&P programs and so hopefully we will get some good discussion going on them. The first motion, however, is to approve the proposed criminal justice AS degree requirements for the Salkahatchie, Union, and Sumter campuses. These have all been passed by their respective faculty organizations and if we need to



discuss them further, I suppose we can but I believe this should just go through.

**Bruce Nims:** Is there any discussion. Hearing none, move to vote. All in favor. All opposed. The motion passed.

**Jessica Sheffield:** Sweet. One down. Alright. You've all seen this before. I'm just putting this up for reference. Obviously, this is something that we've discussed in our faculty organizations and it has also come up in various forms over email and at previous faculty senate meetings and I just want to remind everybody that this is what the next three motions are related to. So our second motion is to approve the revisions to the Associate's Degree requirements for the Extended University's Ft. Jackson campus, for USC Union, and for USC Salkahatchie to bring them in line with the proposed common AA and AS requirements plus the Bachelareate prep track which is all of this, and Union will have an addendum to this. Should we discuss the motion first and then the amendment.

**Bruce Nims:** Inaudible. This is for Extended University and Salkahatchie.

**Jessica Sheffield:** Yes, we can split it up that way.

**Bruce Nims:** Extended University and Salkahatchie have approved and adjusted their Bachelaureate prep track and approved the AA and AS degree requirements and this motion would be to approve Extended University and USC Salkahatchie's confirmation of these.

**Jessica Sheffield:** That is correct.

**Bruce Nims:** Any discussion. Hearing none, move to a vote. All in favor say aye. All opposed? Motion passes for USC Salkahatchie and Extended University.

**Jessica Sheffield:** Okay, USC Union also had passed this Bachelaureate track and AA and AS degrees but has an addendum to their motion that Sam is going to read.

**Sam Hauptman:** We the faculty organization approves the AA and AS common curriculum proposal but reserves the right to propose revisions if

the proposal is not approved by the other four units involved including Sumter, Lancaster, Salkahatchie and Extended University.

**Jessica Sheffield:** So basically as I understand it Union reserves the right as we all have to revise the degree requirements as they see fit.

**Bruce Nims:** This is sent from the committee. Any discussion?

**Patrick Saucier:** Patrick Saucier from Extended University. I'm not really sure if Union is accepting this.

**Jessica Sheffield:** They are. They have some specific language they wanted to include in their version of the motion. So they are accepting them but with the additional language that states that they reserve the right to revise if the other four faculty units did not also approve – which Lancaster did not. So that part goes into effect since Lancaster did not approve.

**Bruce Nims:** Any further discussion? Hearing none let's move to a vote. All in favor of the motion from Union say aye. All opposed. The ayes have it.

**Jessica Sheffield:** Thank you. Our third or fourth depending on how you are counting, motion is from Sumter and their faculty organization approved it's new Bachelaureate prep track associate degree. They, of course, had already approved and we had also approved at the last meeting the AA and AS degrees using these requirements and so they now are adding the Bachelaureate prep track degree option.

**Bruce Nims:** Inaudible. Move to a second. Move to a vote. All in favor say aye. All opposed. Motion passes.

**Jessica Sheffield:** Awesome. So our last two motions deal largely with semantics of various things the first of which is this Bachelaureate prep track label for this particular degree program that's come out of this common core proposal and in our discussions on the committee it became apparent that different faculty organizations had different understandings of what this meant. To some faculty organizations, it was not at all clear that this is, in fact, a degree. We also questioned whether the phrase Bachelaureate prep might imply that the other two the AA and AS degrees do not prepare students to pursue a Bachelaureate. And so we would like the faculty senate to pass the following resolution. We ask that the RCFS resolve the

following: one, that the term “Bachelaureate prep” is confusing in its implication that the other Associate’s degrees do not prepare students for a Bachelaureate degree program. And two, that the term “track” does not make clear that the curriculum is a degree program. Thus the Bachelaureate prep track degree should be renamed to address these concerns.

**Patrick Saucier:** Do you have a name?

**Jessica Sheffield:** Excuse me?

**Patrick Saucier:** Do you have an alternate name?

**Jessica Sheffield:** We did not propose an alternate name. We discussed whether we should and then we realized that was something that should be handled by either the RCFS at large or the various campuses or the ad hoc committee.

**Bruce Nims:** Can you run through the questions one more time?

**Jessica Sheffield:** We ask that the RCFS resolve the following: one, that the term “Bachelaureate prep” is confusing in its implication that the other Associate’s degrees do not prepare students for a Bachelaureate degree program. And two, that the term “track” does not make clear that the curriculum is a degree program. Thus the Bachelaureate prep track degree should be renamed to address these concerns.

**Bruce Nims:** Discussion of the resolution? Inaudible.

**Nick Guittar:** Inaudible.

**Jessica Sheffield:** It is a separate degree program, yes. It is not clear on this handout but on other communications that have accompanied it, it has been referred to as a third degree program.

**Bruce Nims:** Any other discussion? Hearing none, we move to a vote. All in favor of this resolution say aye. All opposed? The resolution passes.

Inaudible. It will be taken into consideration by the committee this summer.

**Jessica Sheffield:** Excellent. Thank you. Our final resolution deals with the summary of teaching evaluations for tenure and promotion files which we've already talked about. Some of the discussions and concerns that you all raised are ones that we had in committee as well. We obviously spent most of our time talking about these degree requirements. The overall issue is that the Provost's office has requested additional data from candidates going up for tenure and promotion which not only compares your global index scores to other faculty on your campus, or to the average, rather, on your campus, but provides context across campuses. So if you teach a course on one campus they would like your compiler to compare a narrative comparing your scores to other people teaching that course on other campuses. Obviously, there are some philosophical issues with this. There are a whole host of logistical problems with this which came up earlier in the discussion that the different campuses collect this information in different ways, it's input into the course climate system in different ways. English 101 has something like four or five different titles in course climate. So you can't even pull the data all at once. And so we are asking the faculty senate to pass the following resolution: "We recommend to the Provost's Office that the new requirements for cross campus comparisons in the teaching evaluations for tenure and promotion files be delayed until logistical problems in data

collection and inconsistencies between the Regional Campus Faculty Manual tenure and promotion criteria and the administrative requirements can be resolved.”

**Bruce Nims:** Inaudible. Any discussion?

**Tom Powers:** Tom Powers from Sumter. Does the Provost have the authority unilaterally to dictate changes to our faculty manual?

**Jessica Sheffield:** That was a question we had in committee as well. One of the reasons that we are hoping that we can get this resolution to come from the Faculty Senate at large rather than just our committee is that when we as a committee have gone back to the Provost’s Office and said, “No we can’t do this for this reason,” or “No, we don’t want to do this for this reason. The response always has been, “We need that data.” So as to your specific question this is the most recent version of the Faculty Manual. This is the summary of teaching evaluations data set. All it calls for is the faculty member and the campus averages, and then the narrative says that the summary writer may also provide contextual information that he or she deems pertinent. These are some examples; cross campus comparisons



would be another one I assume. What we understand from the Provost's Office is that any file that does not have these cross campus comparisons and cross course comparisons will be turned back and denied. I don't know how official that is but that's what we've been told.

**Anonymous:** Inaudible.

**Jessica Sheffield:** Turned back is the language I have heard used.

**Anonymous:** Inaudible.

**Jessica Sheffield:** Okay, so you have more complete information probably than I do. For the record she said that it would be remanded to the department. The department would then have to come up with that data and provide it, but there would be no consequences to the candidate. That's what she understands. Part of the issue with this is that obviously we are being asked for this information and we don't entirely – it's not clear what we are being asked for. It's not clear how we are supposed to get it. It's not clear how we are supposed to handle issues that come up. For example, very small sample sizes. If a class is only taught on two campuses by two instructors

and you get one instructor's scores to another, then you have a confidentiality issue with the second instructor that you are being compared to. It's pretty easy to find out how that is. So there is no mechanism in place for handling that sort of issue, either.

**Anonymous:** Inaudible.

**Jessica Sheffield:** We have communicated with Dr. Curtis with some of these issues and the response has been, "We need that data."

**Anonymous:** Inaudible.

**Jessica Sheffield:** We can discuss these issues and figure out whether to make them happen, I suppose. To the extent that we have control over that and how.

**Bruce Nims:** Any further discussion of the resolution?

**Jessica Sheffield:** Shall I read it again?

**Bruce Nims:** Read it one more time.

**Jessica Sheffield:** The System Affairs committee asks that the Regional Campus Faculty Senate resolve the following: “We recommend to the Provost’s Office that the new requirements for cross campus comparisons in the teaching evaluations for tenure and promotion files be delayed until logistical problems in data collection and inconsistencies between the Regional Campus Faculty Manual tenure and promotion criteria and the administrative requirements can be resolved.”

**Bruce Nims:** Any further discussion before we vote? All in favor of the resolution say aye. All opposed. Ayes have it.

**Jessica Sheffield:** Thank you.

**Bruce Nims:** Inaudible. I would say as a practical matter some of those concerns that are raised in general terms of the resolution would need to be documented in some detail when that resolution is conveyed to the administration so they will understand specifically what the issues we seen concerning the difficulties in conforming to the administrative mandate.

Okay, any other new business? Okay, we will now move to special orders.

The first special order is the election of officers and committee people.

Professor Chris Nesmith.

**Chris Nesmith:** Good afternoon everybody. In the February senate meeting as chair of the nominating committee I presented a slate of nominees for officers next year including two chair positions for the two open committee positions from faculty senate. So I'd like to just read those to you. It would be myself as chair for next year, Jolie Fontenot for vice chair, Hennie Van Bulck as secretary, Tom Bragg will be our at large member, and Bruce Nims will serve as past chair. The position for committee on libraries will be Julia Elliot, and the Faculty Manual Liaison Officer will be Lisa Hammond.

**Bruce Nims:** Inaudible. Hearing none I move to accept the nominations as passed. Seconded? All in favor? All opposed? The slate of nominations has been elected. The welfare committee has the very pleasant duty of our second special order which is the John Duffy teaching award.

**Fernanda Burke:** I would like to start by honoring each of the nominees from each of the campuses. I would like to invite Dr. Plyler to come up and

he will be presenting the award of the 2013 recipient of the John Duffy Excellence in Teaching Award.

**Chris Plyler:** Thank you, Fernanda. I'd like to congratulate the Welfare committee on their good work, their hard work, their thorough work. I am very excited, always, to present this award on behalf of you and the University of South Carolina Palmetto College. I'm really excited about this year's candidate. It's going to be pretty apparent as soon as I start reading the information about her, who she is, and I'd also like to thank Dr. Ryan Cox for giving me these words and compiling this information. Our recipient holds a Bachelor of Science in Chemistry degree from the University of West Florida. How many graduates from West Florida do we have in the room today? Her Ph.D. is in Analytical Chemistry from the Georgia Institute of Technology. She began teaching Chemistry at USC Lancaster in 2004 as an adjunct, and then as an Instructor. She entered the tenure track in the fall of 2006. In terms of her scholarship she is the author of numerous publications and has presented at several professional including the South Carolina Academy of Sciences and the Associate of Southeastern Biologists. In terms of professional service, she is a member of the American Chemical Society and the South Carolina Academy of Sciences. She is very committed

to community service and for five years she has coordinated with other faculty to visit high schools during National Chemistry Week in October. She coordinates the Lancaster County School Science Fair, where she has served as a judge. On campus, she has served on numerous committees including assessment, honors day, and academic success center. But the Duffy Award recognizes outstanding teaching and in this area is where she truly excels. As she noted in her most recent self-evaluation, despite her many activities in other areas, she has never lost sight of teaching is her primary responsibility. “I am firmly committed,” she writes, “to providing excellent teaching to all my students in both major and non-major courses.” Teaching evaluations illustrate her success in this endeavor, and she consistently earns scores of 4.5 or higher from her students on a five-point scale. We might want to debate how relevant that is across our faculties, but . . . And some selected student comments I think are worth waiting for an extra minute to hear about our winner. “She goes out of her way to meet with her student to make sure they understand the material. Her worksheets and written homework help a lot. I would recommend her to any other student. Very respectful and sweet. One of my favorites.” That came from her Chemistry 111 class in the spring of ‘12. Another comment. “Great teacher. Always willing to help us during office hours. Always explained the

lab and class material very thoroughly.” Chemistry 112 student. “It’s been my great pleasure being in Professor Johnson’s class. She has taken time to get to know each one of her students and has helped greatly throughout the entire semester.” And there are several other quotes from students along these lines, very positive, and lots of accolades from Dr. Johnson. She’s certainly an asset to the University of South Carolina at Lancaster and also to our regional campuses, our Palmetto College system and the University as a whole. And it’s my pleasure and my honor to present the 2013 John J. Duffy Excellence in Teaching Award to Dr. Betty Obi Johnson.

Congratulations.

**Dr. Johnson:** Well this is a huge honor and a privilege to receive this award and since I started teaching in 2004, going to work every day has just been a joy. I love my job. I love my students and I really enjoy working with all of you. So thank you very much.

**Chris Plyler:** Let us not forget that this comes with a stipend of \$250,000. Thank you. Congratulations. And congratulations to all our nominees. I applaud your good work.

**Bruce Nims:** Move to announcements? Are there any?

**Chris Plyler:** As we all know its our tradition at the last faculty senate meeting to recognize our chair – Inaudible.



Electronic Reports

**Dr. Sally Boyd**  
**REPORT TO RCFS APRIL 19, 2012**

Next Friday, April 26, will be the reception to honor this year's recipient of the Stephen L. Dalton Distinguished Teaching Award for the USC Fort Jackson Program. We will be recognizing Wesley Abercrombie, who teaches sociology classes in the Fort Jackson Program. For the first time, the award is going to an instructor whose teaching in the program is all online. We are sad to say farewell to Dr. Jessica Sheffield, who has for three years been an assistant professor of speech in Extended University. Dr. Sheffield has taken a position with the University of South Alabama-Mobile, which is where her home and family are located. A search is underway to fill the position for fall 2013. We will certainly miss Dr. Sheffield, but send with her all good wishes for success in her new endeavors.



UNIVERSITY OF  
**SOUTH CAROLINA**  

---

**SALKEHATCHIE**

Regional Campuses Faculty Senate Report  
April 19, 2013

On March 22, the Carolina Mathematics Association Spring Meeting was held on the USC Salkehatchie Walterboro campus. Presenters included professors from The Citadel, California University of Pennsylvania, and Furman University, as well as our own Dr. Bryan Lai and Dr. Fidele Ngwane and student, Robbie Bacon.

Dr. Eran Kilpatrick traveled to Santa Barbra, California with student Chris Bates, on April 5 to present at the National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis Conference.

USC Salkehatchie has hired two new faculty members for the coming year. Mr. Jeffrey Irwin was hired as Instructor of Business with specialization in Accounting. He has an MBA from USC Columbia. He is currently in the business sector and has been teaching as an adjunct at Park University in Charleston.

Mr. Jang Young Kim was hired as Instructor of Computer Science. He has master's degrees in computer science from Penn State and the State University of New York at Binghamton and is completing his PhD at the State University of New York at Buffalo. We are also in the process of hiring a third professor in mathematics.

Professor Joe Siren was named student's choice for the USC Salkehatchie Distinguished Teaching award.

On April 11, USC Salkehatchie hosted our annual scholarship ceremony, awarding over \$55,000 in scholarships. Mr. Eugene Warr, chairman of the USC Board of Trustees, was the keynote speaker.

In March, USC Salkehatchie hosted the NJCAA Region X basketball tournament. Salkehatchie qualified for the national tournament for the first time in our 48 hour history, one of 24 teams of over 200 contenders and traveled to Hutchinson, Kansas.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann C. Carmichael  
Regional Campus Dean



UNIVERSITY OF  
**SOUTH CAROLINA**  
LANCASTER

**Dr. Walter P.  
Collins, III**  
Regional Campus  
Dean

**Report to the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate  
Meeting at USC Salkehatchie, Allendale  
April 19, 2013**

### **Students**

USC Lancaster's enrollment is down 2.58% in student headcount and down 4.17% in FTE for Spring 2013 as compared to Spring 2012. As of April 15, 2013, preregistration numbers for upcoming terms were the following: For Fall 2013, 169 students pre-registered. For Maymester/Summer I 2013, 96 students pre-registered with 4 from other universities/schools. For Summer II 2013, 59 students pre-registered with 3 from other universities/schools. These numbers are lower than last year's at this same time, but preregistration began approximately two weeks later in 2013 when compared with 2012.

**Spring Fling** will be held on campus on Tuesday, April 23, 2013. The USC Lancaster Distinguished Teacher of the Year will be announced during lunch that day.

**Congratulations** to Dr. Sarah Hunt Sellhorst, Dr. Nick Guittar, and Professor Darris Hassel for being chosen by students as top professors in their respective academic divisions.

**Congratulations** to the following who were elected to serve on the SGA executive council: President: Ty Reeves, Vice President: Brandon Newton, Secretary/Treasurer: Brooke Watts.

### **Faculty**

A tenure track search continues in Astronomy/Physics. We made an offer to an exercise science candidate last week and are happy to report that she has given a verbal affirmative response. We are also searching for an Instructor of Sociology. These positions will begin in August 2013.

**Congratulations to Dr. Suzanne Penuel**, Assistant Professor of English, for being selected to attend the Summer Literary Studies Institute entitled “Versions of *The Winter’s Tale*: Theater, Literature, Film and Philosophy” at the National Humanities Center.

**Congratulations to Professor Karen Worthy**, Nursing, who was recently named the USC College of Education-PhD Recipient of the 2012-2013 Charles and Grace Sloan Fellowship.

### **Facilities**

Construction of Founders Hall continues in the heart of campus with occupancy expected by Maymester/Summer 2014.

### **Financial**

In consultation with various budget officers, we are currently preparing budget documents for FY 14. We look forward to presenting our budget to USC administrators within the next two weeks. The USC Internal Audit Department and an outside auditing firm continue their audit of several areas within the USC Lancaster system.

### **Palmetto College**

USC Lancaster continues to contribute to the roll-out of Palmetto College. Four students attended the Palmetto College Enrollment Kickoff Event at the SC State House yesterday. Various USC Lancaster administrators and staff members are involved on the advisory council and several sub-committees.

### **Other items...**

**USC Lancaster Travel Study** Our trip to Italy took place during Spring Break. Dr. Dana Lawrence and Professor Trena Kendrick led the group of eleven students. Academic Credit was offered in ENGL for a course entitled, “Shakespeare in Italy.” One of the highlights of the trip was being in Saint Peter’s Square as the world learned who the next Pope would be. For more information, follow this link: <http://usclancaster.sc.edu/travelstudy/2013/Italy.htm>

The **Association of Carolina Emerging Scholars** will present its second annual literature and culture conference at USC Lancaster on May 18, 2013. The conference is sponsored by all USC Regional Campuses. The theme of the conference is “Deathless Love.” We invite you all to come hear the work of

students from across our campuses. For more information, follow this link:  
<http://usclancaster.sc.edu/CESC/>

**Congratulations to the USC Lancaster golf team** and coach Rick Walters for winning the NJCAA Region X championship. They have qualified to go to the National Championship in Lubbock, TX in May 2013.

Dean's Report  
USC Union  
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate  
April 19, 2013

**Hiring:** Despite the fact that it's relatively late in the academic hiring cycle, we are proceeding with two faculty hires for Fall 2013, one of which will be funded by Palmetto College. We have been approved to hire a new Sociology professor and a new Criminal Justice professor. In addition, we are awaiting approval for our Palmetto College Student Services Coordinator. We hope that person will start in June or July.

**Enrollment:** Final enrollment for the spring semester is 496. FTE is 332. Unfortunately, those figures are 12.5 and 12.25 percent lower than last spring. As I mentioned in my previous report, the bulk of that decline is due to reductions in classes at one of our high school partners.

**Facilities and IT:** 311 Main Street, our future new bookstore and student center, is on track to be completed by the start of the fall semester.

**Athletics:** The USCU Bantams, in their first year of competition, won the District IV East Conference and are the #1 seed in the playoffs, May 3-5. Their overall record was 11-1.

**Special Events:** The third annual Upcountry Literary Festival was held March 22-23, 2013.

**Graduation:** We are preparing for commencement on May 4 at 6:30 p.m.

Associate in Arts -- 38 degree candidates  
Associate in Science -- 36 degree candidates  
BLS -- 4 degree candidates  
BOL -- 10 degree candidates  
13 of the degree candidates will receive both Associate degrees  
1 of the degree candidates will receive an AA & a BOL  
2 of the degree candidates will receive an AA, AS, and BLS  
56 degree candidates will be participating in graduation

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Lowe, Interim Dean

Courses & Curriculum Report to the  
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate (April, 2013)  
Robert B. Castleberry

There is nothing really new in my report to you today; what I have said in the past still holds true. That being said, let me just quickly get to the core (pun intended) of what I need to say.

The Committee continues to act on curricular changes as departments and schools alter their degree requirements to conform to the Carolina Core. We also continue to act on courses that have been proposed to satisfy specific Core requirements (e.g., ARP and GSS courses). Please check the Provost's website for the evolving look of the Core.

While this has nothing to do with Courses & Curriculum, I would like to briefly mention one more matter. This does relate to us and to the Core, especially as we develop associate degrees that meet the new requirements. Please consider two actions – 1) look at the Core approved courses; there may be a course that you do not normally teach that you could consider teaching since it specifically fills a Core requirement (especially one of the overlay courses or the VSR course), and 2) if you teach a course that currently is not approved as a Core course, but you think it should be, consider submitting the paperwork to get your course approved. Don't expect Columbia to do this (it is a hassle, and they may not want to bother with it), but clearly work closely with Columbia to make sure they can support the action.

Thanks,

rcastle@uscsuporter.edu

April 11, 2013 Conflict of Interest Committee report

The Conflict of Interest Committee is reviewing “recently submitted proposal(s) to the NIH seeking support for a research project(s). In connection with these proposals, [the professor] disclosed several financial interests that are connected to his institutional responsibilities as required by NIH regulation and USC policy (RSCH 1.06). It is incumbent on the institution to determine whether these related financial interests constitute a financial conflict interest (FCOI) related to the proposed research. This decision is made in a two-step process, which involves 1) deciding whether the research is related to the financial interest, and if related, 2) determining whether the financial interest could directly and significantly affect the design, conduct, or reporting of the research. “

In cases where there may be a FCOI, the primary concern is recognizing, disclosing and managing any conflicts that may appear to impact the integrity of the research, handling of intellectual property, and treatment of students/USC employees who may (may not) perform work on behalf of the outside company (financial interest). To address these conflicts, USC faculty usually execute a Conflicts Management Plan, either the recommended General Plan or one customized by the Committee.”

The above information comes from information used by the COI folks as described by Tommy Coggins. I have removed the specific information about the professor and the research.

Noni McCullough Bohonak, Ph.D.  
University of South Carolina Lancaster