I. Old Business

1. The minutes from November 10, 2004, were approved, as corrected. They may be viewed at http://www.ed.sc.edu/Documents.asp

2. There was no other old business discussed.

II. New Business

1. Dual Employment - Les Sternberg
   Dean Sternberg reminded the members that a new policy has been implemented at the University for dual employment requirements and paperwork. These initiatives are coming from the Provost’s Office and most recent requests have followed the new protocol. He expressed appreciation for those who have adhered to these new policies. Dr. Dickey asked for clarification as to how this would impact University 101, 201, etc., remuneration and Dean Sternberg told the members that he had spoken to Dan Berman of the University 101 Office about this issue. There was some discussion on how these new requirements may apply to University 101 or Honors College teaching responsibilities and other additional teaching/working opportunities. In addition, Dr. Seaman acknowledged that the timeliness of submission of the paperwork for approval of dual employment requests needs to be improved.

2. Workload Policy - Les Sternberg
   Dean Sternberg distributed copies of the College’s policy on faculty workload. He acknowledged that he felt that the COE was already adhering to this policy and stressed that he made sure that it was in compliance with the University’s Faculty Manual statement dealing with faculty workload. He asked that an appropriate group within the COE review this and then all faculty review the document so that an agreed upon policy is reached. Dean Sternberg reminded the members that an approved document like this may assist the new processes that have been put in place for dual compensation. Dr. Van Scoy initiated discussion as to the appropriate process to get the draft document disseminated and reviewed. Dr. Dickey reminded Dean Sternberg that, according to University policy, the Dean had discretion to set college policy as long as it was in line with university
workload policy, but acknowledged that Dean Sternberg was choosing to involve all faculty in review and potential endorsement of this document. Dr. Mitchell asked for clarification on the twelve-hour recommendation under the “Clinical and Non-Tenure Track Faculty” section of the draft document. Dean Sternberg was open to alternate phrasing to explain this concept. Dr. Seaman clarified that any agreement reached on this document could not exactly fit each individual in the COE, but that a written policy could provide needed parameters so that Departments had some way to interpret faculty workloads and needs within COE expectations. Dean Sternberg asked for departmental feedback on this document that he would then take the draft policy to the Faculty Affairs Committee in the COE.

   Dr. Sternberg informed the members that the remuneration to departments when a faculty member is teaching University 201 as a part of his/her load is $6,000.

4. **Graduate Student Day Awards - Les Sternberg**
   The University’s Graduate Student Day Awards is scheduled for April 6. Dean Sternberg expressed the desire to have education graduate students represented on this day. Forms to participate in this day are due March 11. Dr. Van Scoy informed the group that Gloria Price in the Dean’s Office is looking through past COE Graduate Student Awards to determine which might be represented at the University-wide awards day. Dr. Mitchell asked the group to think of graduate students who may be willing to present current research on this day, as this is part of the Graduate Student Awards Day schedule.

5. **Minority Faculty Hiring - Les Sternberg**
   At one point, there were dollars offered from the University to supplement salary dollars on a continuous basis to colleges/schools to hire minority candidates, but this policy has recently changed. Dean Sternberg reported to the group that these additional dollars would only be available at a 50/50 match for three years. Dean Sternberg agreed to contact the Provost’s Office to determine what financial liability a college would assume if an individual hired with assistance from the minority hiring dollars decided to leave the College once his/her salary were totally supported through college funds (i.e., would the College have to return any dollars to the Provost’s Office).

6. **Faculty Excellence Initiative (FEI) – Les Sternberg**
   Dean Sternberg announced that the University has made available matching funds for hiring new faculty who meet specific FEI criteria. Faculty may be brought in under cluster hires, endowed chairs, innovative additions to faculty, or unplanned opportunities. At the present time, FEI funds have been made available for one future hire in the COE (special education). Dean Sternberg outlined a timeline that would apply to these special initiatives. If a Department is interested in pursuing additional faculty under one of these initiatives, the request must go through the Dean’s Office.

7. **Faculty Recruitment Update - Mike Seaman**
   Dr. Seaman asked the Chairs to update the members on the searches being conducted in their departments.
Dr. Dickey reported to the group that ITE is moving forward with the Endowed Chair position and requested that AC members feel free to recommend qualified individuals for that position. Other searches are moving forward, but the clinical positions are slower to fill as they depend on what will be decided with the tenure positions.

Dr. Mitchell reported that physical education has received a number of applications but views only one as a viable candidate at this time. He reminded the members that this time of the year is early for recruitment in their discipline and there are many positions open at the national level. His faculty search chair is moving forward aggressively.

Dr. Carper reported that the Educational Studies Department is recruiting for three positions and will be hosting two candidates for counselor ed within the upcoming week. Two educational psychology candidates are extremely strong and will be visiting the campus within the next two weeks. Also, two applied assessment candidates have expressed a strong interest in coming to USC and the department is excited about these prospects.

Dr. Welsh reported that three candidates have been invited to the campus.

Dr. Seaman reminded the members to be aggressive when the recruitment process comes to the point of trying to bring them to USC. He volunteered his and Dean Sternberg’s time to speak to candidates to assist in their decision-making and convince them that USC-COE would be the right choice.

### 8. Faculty Salary Review - Mike Seaman

Dr. Seaman informed the group that the COE will be conducting a review of faculty salaries with the goal being to effectively reward productivity. He reminded the Department Chairs that he has distributed information that should help them review faculty salaries. However, this information does not include productivity measures. He explained the negative and positive residual information in the spreadsheets he sent department chairs as well as the non-linear relationship of years in rank to potential productivity. He acknowledged the strength of productivity data that lies within the Department and the importance of using this information in a model for a salary review.

He distributed a draft rating scale that outlined some ideas of how a scale might be developed and examples of the kinds of criteria that could be used. He asked for feedback regarding the rating scale and suggested using the scale in conjunction with APR information. Members asked for clarification on rating scores and how the proposed four rating scores should be defined. Dean Sternberg offered some explanation by proposing separate sets of data from personnel committees assigned to provide APR information to the Chair and the Chair’s independent evaluation. Dr. Seaman summarized that the discussion appeared to highlight two issues regarding the draft scale: the number of points used in the rating and the number of ratings that might be optimal. Dr. Dickey pointed out that advantage of staying with four points is that it is consistent with the University’s four-point scale, which would eliminate confusion when individuals try to compare outcomes. Members agreed to a basic interpretation of the lowest and highest points of the rating scale and on the use of a four-point scale.

In addition, Dr. Seaman indicated that an additional rating aside from those for teaching, research, and service might be appropriate. That fourth rated item might capture additional parts of a faculty’s responsibilities (e.g., leadership, teamwork, etc.). After some discussion, the committee settled on using the four-point scale with each of four ratings: a
rating for teaching, research, and service that is simply a translation of the APR rating, and a department chairs rating of productivity. Dr. Seaman brought up the point of a timeline for implementation and asked that ratings be returned to him by March 15 this year to accommodate APR committee work. Dr. Dickey asked if it would be appropriate to inform APR committees about how their ratings might be used this year. Dr. Seaman replied that it is not only appropriate but necessary to describe the work of APR committees as directly affecting salary decisions not just this year but from now on.

9. **Update on Admissions from Graduate School - Irma Van Scoy**
Dr. Van Scoy reminded Department Chairs that she has been sending messages to each regarding the Graduate School’s decision to move to an electronic format. She reported to the group that because of technological problems with this shift, the COE has had to move back to obtaining paper copies of everything. Staff in the Office of Student Affairs (OSA) have done an outstanding job in keeping the COE up to date, but at this point, the Graduate School is backed up with other colleges and schools because of these technology problems. She and Dean Sternberg asked for patience from the members and their colleagues as we move through this period of adjustment. Dr. Van Scoy encouraged faculty to go to the OSA to review incomplete files so they become aware of applicants who are trying to obtain admission.

10. **Summer II Schedule - Irma Van Scoy**
Dr. Van Scoy distributed a draft of the Summer II 2005 schedule. The first day of classes is July 5 and the last day is July 28. She told the group that she will alert them when a final schedule is approved.

11. **Showcase 2005 (April 9, 2005 beginning at 9:00 a.m.) - Irma Van Scoy**
Dr. Van Scoy reported that Gloria Price in the Dean’s Office has submitted paperwork so the COE will have a place on the Horseshoe at the Showcase. She asked for faculty volunteers who might be interested in being a part of the day with potential students, their parents, and the local community. In addition, she asked for ideas on how to display the COE during the day.

Dean Sternberg reported that discussions are happening with the Deans that relate to the University’s traditional ideas and the new Provost’s ideas and initiatives. There is a sense of stricter adherence to policies and procedures, promotion and tenure, and what a research university’s mission should be. In addition, discussion has continued with the Deans regarding the outcomes of VCM (now referred to within the University as “the budget”). A proportion of total tuition dollars will be returned to the college/school from where the student graduates. Conversations still continue with the Deans as the new Provost settles into his role at the University.

13. **Other**
Dr. Seaman distributed a list of state contract suppliers so Departments and Offices can look for better prices when making purchases.
Dr. Sternberg, Dr. Van Scoy, Dr. Field, and Dr. Dickey will meet with Midlands K-12 Superintendents to restructure the relationships/partnerships of the COE’s PDS Network. Dr. Mitchell has contributed to these conversations as well.

III. Reminders

No reminders were made during the meeting.

IV. Announcements

The COE Awards Day is scheduled for April 14, 2005, at 10:00 in the Campus Room of Capstone

Dr. Seaman will be out of town January 24 - February 8, 2005, but will be available via email if issues arise.

The next Administrative Council meeting is scheduled for February 16 at 9:00 a.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.