Faculty Meeting Minutes
Thursday, November 15, 2018

A regular meeting of the Faculty of the University of South Carolina Libraries was held on Thursday, November 15, 2018 at 2:34 p.m. in Thomas Cooper Library, Room 204. The Presiding Officer and Secretary were present. The minutes of the last meeting were approved without amendment.

The report of the Ad Hoc Bylaws Committee was received. Following discussion among the faculty, Ms. Snediker invited Dr. Heckman to draft a proposal for changing the quorum. Dr. Heckman accepted the invitation.

The report of the Dean of Libraries was received. Mr. McNally was absent, so Ms. Horton delivered the report on his behalf. During the delivery of the Report of the Dean, Ms. Horton asked Ms. Boyd to report on the Libraries’ digital scholarship services initiative. Ms. Boyd’s report was received.

Ms. Horton segued from delivering the Report of the Dean to introducing one of the scheduled items of new business, a review of the peer review process. Ms. Horton stated that she and Mr. McNally recommend the appointment of a Library Faculty committee to consider the following matters:

1) the incorporation of supervisory input into tenure progress and tenure review evaluations
2) the necessity of conducting peer reviews

Ms. Snediker stated that she would work with Ms. Horton to develop a charge for the committee and to send out a call for committee volunteers.

The report of the Ad Hoc Travel Implementation Committee was received. Information not present in the report distributed to faculty before the meeting is included in an addendum to the report distributed with the meeting minutes.
A quorum was not present, so the item “reporting outside professional activities” was not introduced.

The report of the Secretary was received.

Reports on the October and November meetings of the Faculty Senate were received.

Reports on the Faculty Senate Information Technology Committee and the CIO’s Faculty & Staff Advisory Committee were received from Dr. Heckman.

The following announcements were made for the Good of the Order:

1. Mr. Sudduth reported that a special meeting of the Faculty Senate had been called to elect a representative to the presidential search committee. Professor Julius Fridriksson was elected to represent the faculty. Professor Jessica Elfenbein was elected as the alternate faculty representative. Professor Marco Valtorta will also serve on the search committee in his capacity as the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

2. Ms. Schwoebel reported that the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Women’s Issues (PACWI) and other campus groups have expressed concerns about the presidential search committee’s gender imbalance. Only 2 of the 13 committee members are female. There will be a meeting to discuss these concerns in Hamilton 322 on Tuesday, November 20 at 12:00 p.m. The meeting is open to all faculty and staff.

3. Mr. Simmons shared information regarding the Thomas Cooper Library’s participation in the Carolina Cares Holiday Drive. This information was also emailed to Libraries employees by Ms. Bergmans on November 7 and November 16. The text of the November 16 email is quoted below.
Every year, Thomas Cooper Library takes part in the Carolina Cares Holiday Drive. This year we have 24 stockings to fill: 12 for girls and 12 for boys, ages 7 – 12. The filled stockings will go to the Salvation Army for distribution to children in the Midlands.

All monetary donations must be made by Wednesday, November 21st, and all other donations must be made by Thursday, November 29th.

The stocking stuffing party will be held at 1 p.m. Friday, November 30, in the TCL Staff Lounge. Come by, help stuff the stockings, and enjoy some cookies and holiday cheer. We will then take the filled stockings to Carolina Cares at the Russell House.

This year’s elves are Research and Instruction’s Brent Appling, Amy Edwards, Jade Geary and Timothy Simmons. Please give your donations to one of the elves.

4. Ms. Palmer announced that the Professional Development Committee will host a conference recap session on Monday, November 19 at 2:00 p.m. in TCL Room 412.

5. Ms. Palmer congratulated Ms. Geary on being named an ALA Emerging Leader.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Litwer
Secretary
Report of the Ad Hoc Bylaws Committee

Faculty Meeting Agenda Survey Responses
Changes have been made to the agenda in response to the information received via the faculty meeting agenda survey. The committee hopes that these changes will make faculty proceedings more deliberative and discussion-oriented.

One of the survey responses suggested time limits on reporting and discussion. The committee hopes that the adoption of such limits will not be necessary.

Adding Items to the Agenda
Any faculty member can put an item on the faculty meeting agenda.

Quorum
The Library Faculty Bylaws stipulate that 2/3 of the faculty constitutes a quorum. This is too high and is impeding the ability of the faculty to conduct business.

The Library Faculty’s current parliamentary authority, Robert’s Rules of Order, Newly Revised (11th ed.), states: “In an ordinary society[...]a provision of the bylaws should specify the number of members that shall constitute a quorum, which should approximate the largest number that can be depended on to attend any meeting except in very bad weather or other extremely unfavorable conditions.” (p. 21)

The committee recommends changing the bylaws to a simple majority, as recommended by RONR for groups with clearly delineated membership. This will allow the Library Faculty to more easily conduct business, including making additional needed changes to our bylaws.
Overview of Faculty Meeting Agenda Survey Results

1. Items to add to agenda

   University Faculty Committee reports – 5
   None – 5
   Other – 2

2. Items to remove from agenda

   Department/Special Collections reports – 13
   Any redundant reports – 8
   Administration reports – 4
   Library Technology Services report – 2
   Library Faculty Committee reports (written instead) – 2

3. Other comments/ideas/input

   More discussion/deliberative – 5
   Move business above reporting – 3
   Keep dean’s report – 2
   Keep Faculty Senate report – 2
   Time limits for reports/discussion – 2
   Submit written reports in advance with time for questions – 2

4. Specific suggestions for discussion

   “Annual department reports could be interesting.”

   “Faculty should discuss open faculty lines so that as a group the faculty can advise where faculty ought to be hired. The current system of how/when faculty lines are committed is a mystery.”
Report of the Dean of Libraries

Congratulations to Mr. DuPre on his appointment as the Digital Repositories Development Librarian.

Ms. Boyd will report on the progress of the digital scholarship initiative. Ms. Boyd is currently one of Dean McNally’s direct reports. She will report to the Associate Dean for Technology when that position is filled.

Librarians’ tenure progress and tenure review evaluations do not currently incorporate supervisory input. Supervisory evaluations are entirely separate. Vice Provost Addy has informed Dean McNally that a separation between supervisory evaluations and tenure progress/tenure review evaluations is common on campus.

Dean McNally and Ms. Horton believe that tenure progress and tenure review evaluations should incorporate supervisory input.

Dean McNally and Ms. Horton also believe that peer reviews are equivalent to librarians writing their own evaluations, since librarians provide their reviewers with the only information used to inform those reviews.

As a result of these beliefs, Dean McNally and Ms. Horton recommend the appointment of an ad hoc Library Faculty committee to consider the following matters:

1) the incorporation of supervisory input into tenure progress and tenure review evaluations
2) the necessity of conducting peer reviews

Ms. Horton suggested that she, the current chair of the Libraries Select Tenure Committee, and the current chair of the Peer Review Committee be among those appointed to such a committee.
Report on the Libraries’ Digital Scholarship Services Initiative

Benchmarking this Fall

- UTK visit
- DLF eRN webinar series with Stacy and Amie
- DLF conference made contacts with Ohio and Montana
- Talked to Houston, Duke, LSU
- 109 ARL library web sites

Needs Assessment this Fall

- Octoberbest survey: 43/177 people
  
  https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1HqvqFYZsIRn8yxPFRtpRZ2POTKcGhai_fpO80_Tumlo/edit#responses

- Focus Groups:
  
  - Questions –
    - Tell me about your current research data collecting.
    - How is your discipline evolving with research?
    - Are you writing grants and needing a data management plan?
    - Are you giving assignments requiring students to collect or create digital or multimedia files?
  
  - Faculty Reached: 15 people
    - Humanities: English (Rhetoric and Composition), History and Grad Student leader, Art History and McKissick museum (6)
    - Social Sciences: Anthro, PoliSCI, Sociology, and Criminal Justice (5)
    - Sciences: Earth& Oceans, Engineering, Biology, Chemistry (4)
  
  - Students Advisory to the Library group and Grad Students in History and Geography (5)
  
  - Individual meetings with Dubinsky and Brock in English, SLIS Director –Dick Kawooya, Simon Tarr of Art and Rhodos Living Learning, Jon Grego of Stats, CDH –Colin Wilder and Matt Simmons
    
    - https://www.sc.edu/about/offices_and_divisions/housing/living-learning-communities/rhodos_fellows/

- Still planning to talk to Business, HRSM, Journalism
Findings:

- All interested in help with data management in all departments, especially helping students
- Still need to get the word out about the DMP Tool
- definitely need help finding data sets too
- help with long term storage and journal management
- discussion about journals behind a paywall was everywhere, even a grad student who said she told her advisory she was not publishing her dissertation behind a paywall and he didn’t know how to respond
- social sciences at conferences are using data visualization more and data sets are required for submitting to refereed journals,
- History grads are all taking GIS and trying to differentiate themselves with tech skills for the job market – very interested in help with data vis software
- Rhetoric and Com are using data visualization and pod casting a lot, and say students need help to get jobs
- they don’t ask for equipment because not listed on our web site, Art does not have equipment to lend,
- silo-ed campus, with awareness that other dept. have software
- definitely understand departments can’t manage on their own and could use help from Library and IT for support

Overarching points learned along the way - Need to:

- Be the web that connects people to information and resources on campus, the conduit
  - Work with IT for software access and support
  - Work with OofR to find funding and support
  - Promote and bring people in with speaker series, etc.
  - Work with Writing Center to help students with software and presentations? Student Success Center?
- Focus on supporting and drawing in Grad students for work and projects:
- Start small – Stacy and Amie and Data Vis Librarian, write Aspire III grant for equipment to start
Report from the travel committee:

We heard from several people that routing paperwork was confusing. In response, we have added an administrative travel checkbox under the supervisor’s signature on the Travel Authorization Form. Going forward, SEND ALL FORMS TO MAGGIE BERGMANS. Ms. Bergmans will route forms for travel for professional development (administrative travel box unchecked) to the Committee. The document describing administrative processes has also been updated. Check the Faculty page on the Intranet for updated versions.

Addendum – additional information shared at November 15 meeting:

- $16,750 requested — approximately 20% of initial request total
- Number of trips to date: 15
- Reminder that you will have an opportunity to revise your estimate in January
Report of the Library Faculty Secretary  
November 15, 2018

The next Library Faculty meeting will take place Thursday, January 17, 2019 at 2:30 p.m. in TCL Room 204.

The call for agenda items for the January meeting will be issued on Monday, December 17, 2018. The deadline to submit items for inclusion on the agenda will be Monday, January 7.
Faculty Senate Meeting – 10/3/2018

- Sandra Kelly – Vice Provost spoke about experiential learning
  - Goal – have all students engage in at least 1 high quality experiential learning opportunity
  - Faculty and staff committee will review opportunities for verification to meet standards
  - Undergraduate Research Registry – system for registering projects
  - Next steps – Should we make experiential learning a requirement for graduation?

- 10 Faculty Senate committee vacancies

- Dr. Pastides’ last day will be July 31, 2019
  - Discussed reasons for retirement and said the faculty should be as involved as possible in the selection of the next president
  - We are hoping to receive more funding from the state legislature from taxes from online sales (Amazon)
  - Average student changes their major three times during college
  - Goal by 2021 – 6,000 student freshman class
  - He hopes to encourage collaboration between campuses
  - He hopes we improve faculty diversity in the coming years

- Provost Gabel
  - Last winter – winter session pilot
  - Very successful – 11 classes being offered this winter session
  - Talked about the recent mandatory Title IX online training we were all supposed to do
  - Discussed the reasons we closed for Florence (order of the Governor)
Faculty Senate – November 7, 2018

• Newly proposed, de-centralized university budget (handout attached)
  o Huron Consulting Group met with stakeholders and deans to assess spending & revenue trends
  o July 2019 new budget model will be live & in practice
  o Resource allocation has a redesigned timeline
  o Only colleges are listed in budget model, graphs based on revenue and expenditures from those departments
  o Central support units (HR, IT, Libraries) will need to have their “funding match their output” according to the new budget model. “We don’t want to spend more on them”.
  o Funding for research is considered to be, by Huron, too expensive to support; “not all research is good”
  o Reason we are switching: we asked for a de-centralized model assessment from Huron, which we have operated on before. During the recession, the university moved to ‘centralized’ to pool money and resources and now we are switching back

• Call for faculty committee nominations & volunteers, especially:
  o Faculty grievance
  o Advisory board
  o Tenure committee

• Report of committees
• Remarks from President Pastides
  o There are definitely problems with a de-centralized budget approach, but it should be financially better for us as a whole
  o Stats on our newest national awards
  o Opening a new campus in Hilton Head, mostly hospitality-based

• Report from the Provost Gabel
  o 12 winter sessions will take place, highly popular/demand
  o New faculty exit & retention survey coming out

• Report of the Faculty Senate Chair Marco Valtorta
  o Introduced the committee members, via slides, that will choose our next University president
  o Openly acknowledged that the committee is overwhelmingly white and male
  o Called for New Business. Received a faculty statement for upcoming university-wide release, condemning religious and ethnic persecution of any faith and rallying against anti-Semitism in light of the mass shooting at the Tree of Life congregation in Pittsburgh on October 27, 2018
Budget Redesign Timeline

Huron has partnered with USC to develop and prepare for the implementation of an incentive-based budget model that aligns with the System’s mission, culture, and strategic priorities through an inclusive and iterative process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Due Diligence and Planning</td>
<td>Develop a clear understanding and vision through an assessment of current resource allocation practices</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Financial Modeling</td>
<td>Build out a &quot;pre-form&quot; model to provide a platform for testing different model alternatives</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>Address change management through individual, data-driven stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Develop supporting tools, reports, budget processes, and governance to operationalize the new budget model</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Partnership Year</td>
<td>Test a new model to understand outcomes if the new model were implemented</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Huron Consulting Group logo and United States of America flag are present in the image.
Recent Higher Education Budget Redesigns

Since the Great Recession, and with the continued strain on revenue sources, universities are undertaking comprehensive budget redesign initiatives with increasing frequency.

Guiding Principles

Steering Committee members developed a set of guiding principles, which are summarized below. These principles have been used to inform decisions on the development of the proposed budget model.

1. Create a model that seeks to advance the University’s mission as an institution for excellence and remains flexible enough to adapt to changing priorities over time.

2. Feature incentives that promote balanced growth by rewarding entrepreneurship, innovation, and collaboration within and across disciplines.

3. Develop a highly collaborative and sustainable budgeting process that promotes transparency and accountability across all units.

4. Reflect a shared commitment to the fiscal health of the campus ensuring optimal efficiencies and that institutional priorities can be funded.

5. Provide a consistent and fair methodology for revenue and cost allocation that is relatively simple and easy to understand.

6. Use trusted and reliable data to facilitate strategic decision making and to enable enhanced forecasting and planning.
Steering Committee – Roles and Membership

The University has established a Steering Committee of faculty and staff to provide guidance for this initiative, to review project status reports, and to validate the opportunities presented.

Steering Committee Charges

• Provide guidance surrounding the development of a new incentive-based budget model
• Monitor and review project progress
• Validate key decisions by providing constructive feedback on budget model developments
• Engage with the campus community, acting as a liaison between the steering committee and various constituent groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jean Gober – Provost, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Mary Alexander – Chief of Staff, Assistant Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucie Braswell – CFO, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Steve Shelby – AVP, Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Grew – Dean, Business</td>
<td>Kelly Sapping – AVP, Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Ford – Dean, Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Tom Regan – Chair, Faculty Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoaishan Haji-Hari – Dean, Engineering and Computing</td>
<td>Jeff Talbert – CFO, Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Addy – Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School</td>
<td>Brian O’Connor – Shareholder, Elliott Capital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Model Decisions

Moving to an incentive-based budget model requires many decisions regarding the model’s scope, structure, and methodology. The graphics below highlight several key decisions that have been made through the iterative process to model development:

- [Diagram of Key Model Decisions]

- [Diagram of Key Model Decisions continued]

- [Diagram of Key Model Decisions continued]

- [Diagram of Key Model Decisions continued]

- [Diagram of Key Model Decisions continued]

- [Diagram of Key Model Decisions continued]
Model Development

While partnering with the University of South Carolina, Huron has developed two models relying on actual data (FY17, FY18) and a model relying on budgeted information (FY19) in the new budget model format.

Model Expansion Analysis – Tuition and Fees

USC’s academic units experienced significant tuition and fees growth from FY17 and FY18. This tuition growth was largely driven by increases in undergraduate enrollment.

Key Observations

- Total tuition and fees revenue remained stagnant between FY18 and FY19 after a significant increase from FY17 to FY18.
- There were increases of $21.4MM and $15.2MM in FY18 and FY19 respectively from undergraduate tuition revenue as a result of enrollment and credit hour increases.
- Growth in program fees for Arts and Sciences and Engineering of $6.4MM in FY18 and $6.8MM in FY19 from FY17 led to significant overall revenue increases.
Key Model Takeaways

The variances seen year-over-year within the model optimize the evolving nature of higher education and highlight that the University is continuing to adapt to a changing industry with both short-term decisions and long-term strategies.

Key FY17, FY18, and FY19 Model Takeaways

1. While expected variances are visible over the three-year period, the model also exposes critical decisions that were made by the Deans to position their units and the Institution for success.
2. The multiple iterations of the model help illustrate the importance that planning, mid-year adjustments, and strong decision-making can have on year-end performance. Below are several trends that can be seen from FY17 to FY19:
   - Three academic units saw their revenues grow and their expenditures decline.
   - Five academic units experienced faster revenue growth than expenditure growth.
   - Four academic units saw expenditure-growth outpace revenue growth.
3. The amount required to fund Columbia academic units with negative margins declined by ~27% in the FY19 model, underpinning unit efforts to be more efficient and effective with their resources.
4. Strong tuition growth at Columbia more than offsets the growth in support unit cost allocations in FY18. These central investments will play a critical role in supporting the continued growth of the System.

Models Impact on Decision Making

Incentive-based models have the potential to materially transform institutions over a five to ten-year period as they change the culture of decision making.

- President’s Executive Council: remove luxury of “all things to all people” by forcing difficult decisions
  - Institutions understand how colleges and schools are creating and using resources
  - Allocations reflect the institution’s mission and act as “value judgments” for institutional units
- President, Provost, and CIO: foster clarity regarding priorities and strategic initiatives
  - Through the design of incentives, priorities have meaning and produce funding for local units
  - There is full transparency in how resources are used to promote strategic initiatives
- Deans: know the full-cost of activities (academic programs, research, etc.) and prioritize them through cross-subsidies between their revenue generating activities and their mission-driven activities
  - Program growth is no longer a question of simply “doing more with less”
  - Promotes understanding that research activities lose money and must be subsidized
- Central Support Units: connect service levels and resource levels
  - Administrative budgets must be justified and paid for by revenue producing units, which introduces enhanced accountability.
- Department Chairs and Faculty Members: see how activities drive funding for their respective units
  - Incentive innovation in the classroom, much like incentives for innovation in research
Ongoing Efforts

In order to continue progressing the System’s budget model redesign initiative, the following next steps have been identified:

Next Steps:

- Continue refining reports and tools to help prepare the units to make well-informed decisions when operating under the new budget model.
- Finalize committee memberships to develop a strong governance structure to support the operationalization of the model.
- Present the final FY17, FY18, and FY19 models to the Council of Academic Deans.
- Begin developing the FY20 budget model and continue to prepare for a go-live date of July 1, 2019.
UG Tuition Allocation: Instruction vs. Record

USC’s historical split between instruction and academic support expenses can serve as a starting point when considering the allocation of undergraduate tuition revenue.

Distribution of Undergraduate Tuition Revenue Examples

- College of Instruction
- College of Record

Tuition Allocated to College of Instruction
- Recognize trend back to instruction
- Incentive for course completion and redundancy
- Misaligned incentives for academic advising

Tuition Allocated to College of Record
- Promote retention and recruitment
- Does not recognize direct costs of instruction
- Can lead to “holding company” mentality

Appropriations – Research vs. Instruction

Huron has helped several other institutions determine the level at which research could be prioritized. The calculated starting point ranges between 50/50 and 60/40.

Distribution of General State Appropriations Examples

- Academic
- Research

General State Appropriations to Academic Programs
- Provides external funding
- Aligns with legislative intent
- Creates a trusted fund model
- Increases risk for research portfolio

General State Appropriations to Research
- Encourages research and outreach
- Recognizes the need to subsidize research
- Clarifies unfunded legislative intent
- May place a large burden on instruction portfolio
Report from the IT Committee:

The Committee met with representatives from University Communications in response to complaints about the website update process sent to the Faculty Senate.

It is working on a brief survey of all faculty that will include scale satisfaction questions as well as open questions about IT. The plan is to send the survey out annually going forward.

The Committee plans to focus on classroom technology for the remainder of the year.
Report on the CIO’s Faculty & Staff Advisory Committee

I was invited to sit on the CIO’s Faculty & Staff advisory committee. This semester groups are looking at cloud services, automatic audio transcription, digital wallet integration on campus, and software training. Next semester an additional 4 topics will be investigated.