THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING OF FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, December 9, 2020 AT 3:30 p.m.

PRESIDING: Professor Mark Cooper, Chair

1. **Call to Order**

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

via the Blackboard Collaborate Ultra platform.

2. **Report of the ad hoc committee on unit level governance**

CHAIR COOPER: We were prompted by calls of the Senate in the spring to respond to some fairly concerning survey results which suggested that faculty were fairly dissatisfied with the way governance worked at their units (with variation across units on campus).

We conducted a unit-by-unit review of shared governance practices at the University of South Carolina, Columbia, and its Schools of Medicine. Each committee member summarized the policies, by-laws, and practices (or lack thereof) guiding shared governance in their respective units. We discovered a wide range of practices and, also, that more-developed habits of shared governance generally correlated with higher levels of confidence in college leadership in recent survey results.

These recommendations are contained in the section "Recommendations and Rationale," can be summarized as follows:

- Units should adopt and publish by-laws to formalize shared governance at the college level.
- these by-laws will vary considerably according to the size and structure of each unit.
- Units should take steps to ensure faculty decision rights in the areas specified by the Faculty Manual, as granted by the Board of Trustees, and especially in the areas of curricula, instruction, and research.
- Units should cultivate faculty understanding of their budgets and engage faculty in establishing budget priorities.
- Units should engage faculty in efforts to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- As part of the Blueprint process, deans should report annually the health of shared governance in their units.
- The Senate should ask the Chair of the Faculty Senate to provide an annual summary of these Blueprint reports.

SENATOR MIHALIK: I am a former dean and initially I came because of the revenue-based budget model in use at the time. It went away but now it is back. It is important for faculty to have important say.

Faculty need to be involved in setting budget priorities. Currently we have virtually no say in how money is spent, and we should.

SENATOR VALTORTA: Sympathizes with MIHALIK's point. On p.9, I noticed that there was no mention of the Associate Deans for Diversity Equity and Inclusion was this an oversight or by design?

CHAIR COOPER: No slight intended, not sense that something was wrong with them, but the committee wanted to describe things that the faculty do is that were not already being provided by those associate Deans and the faculty can make actionable their own commitments to diversity.

The Next steps for this report are that it will go to a committee that will respond to climate survey. That university-wide committee has this report and may include it in their analysis. Ultimately it will be up to faculty in their local units to work together to form bylaws and follow these recommendations.

PROFESSOR TEEGAN: Was there conversation about getting involvement from local unit faculty?

CHAIR COOPER: There was. The committee wanted to do something that would allow some standardization across units that we can build as we learn. We wanted a low barrier to entry and that the process would improve over time.

Blueprints are public. Which allows units that are ready to very easily take the blueprint report submitted by their dean and have conversations and make progress with local issues of shared governance.

SENATOR CARNES: Item #8 on page 6, regarding parliamentary authority, within college of education he put forth a motion to adopt Roberts Rules. What are thoughts on college of education and their partial adoption Robert's rules on motions,

CHAIR COOPER: When units adopt Roberts, consider adding a Parliamentarian. The goal is orderly flow and to protect the voices of dissent.

3.Report of the ad hoc committee on curriculum approval process improvements

In a project sponsored by Faculty Senate Chair Mark Cooper on behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, an improvement team studied the curricula approval process and developed a set of proposed improvements. Its work unfolded in May-June 2020.

The proposed improvements would:

- Establish a single online location for all information and resources relating to proposal development and the approval process. Design the web pages so they are user-friendly, making it easy for people to find what they need right away.
- Develop additional information and resources on key aspects of proposals and the approval process. Locate these in the one-stop online location.
- Establish, post, and communicate clearer information on deadlines, to set expectations and establish a common understanding – and potentially smooth out the inflow of proposals to reduce the surge in the C & C queue that is typical in November and December.
- Develop on-demand tutorials that complement the resources, so faculty in general and proponents can access quick learning when needed.

- Identify and promote a group of internal experts to provide rapid-response guidance on developing proposals and navigating the approval process.

CHAIR BICKLE: Improvement roadmap to the Curricula process. Our goal was to develop a more user-friendly process and increase the accuracy of applications, streamline the process. Our scope of the work was to clarify what needs to be done. Bring it before the Faculty Senate to discuss and vote.

The approval process has 5 steps and many mini steps inside each one. It is very time consuming. We had focus groups and asked a series of questions to see what folks thought about it.

The current process includes: Initiate, Develop, review, Decide, Submit in APPS. APPS is being replaced by Coarse Leaf.

There are currently 13 steps in the review and approval process. They are sequential, cannot skip, are time sensitive.

Findings are: Faculty are unfamiliar with APPS, they find it too time consuming, it need for "help desk", the system is far too cumbersome.

There are 5 completed improvements. Three In-process improvements (including an express lane for minor curricular changes). There are also 6 upcoming improvements.

SENATOR EDWARDS: Went over the proposed timeline for changes to the systems. The categories in the proposed timeline included: Unified effort, Clearer timelines, practical resources, on demand tutorials, rapid response guidance, one-stop location; all proposed changes should be implemented by early Fall 2021.

The changes should improve efficiency, make for an easier process, produce faster approvals, and connect users to help when it is needed. All of this should result in a 34-50% reduction in time spent on proposals by users on both ends.

PROFESSOR BINEV: The role of this committee is to influence the educational agenda. The opportunity to influence the educational agenda will be decreased by these changes. CC will only review policies, but it will not make policy because that is done by InDev, but that separation does not make sense.

SENATOR VALTORTA: Would like to see the ability of senate to make changes to proposal from the floor of the senate. Out of respect for the Senate, there should be mechanism to make some changes, beyond the nuclear option (everything must be redone).

CHAIR COOPER- Professor Binev is correct that there is a philosophical divide on how the two committees should work and the differences in their roles. The Senate should consider that carefully.

4. New business

5. Good of the order

Yvonne Dudley will retire at the end of the year. Elizabeth Meade will be our administrative person going forward. Please join me in welcoming Betsy Meade!

6. Adjournment