

The official minutes of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees are maintained by the Secretary of the Board. Certified copies of minutes may be requested by contacting the Board of Trustees' Office at trustees@sc.edu. Electronic or other copies of original minutes are not official Board of Trustees' documents.

University of South Carolina

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee

August 10, 2007

The Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees met on Friday, August 10, 2007, at 11:00 a.m. in the 1600 Hampton Street Board Room.

Members present were: Mr. John C. von Lehe, Jr., Chairman; Mr. William L. Bethea, Jr.; Mr. James Bradley; Mr. Mark W. Buyck, Jr.; Mr. Samuel R. Foster, II; Mr. William C. Hubbard; Mr. Mack I. Whittle, Jr.; and Mr. Herbert C. Adams, Board Chairman. Ms. Darla D. Moore was absent.

Other Trustees present were: Mr. John W. Fields; Dr. C. Edward Floyd; Mr. William W. Jones, Jr.; Mr. Toney J. Lister; and Mr. Miles Loadholt, Board Vice Chairman; Mr. Michael J. Mungo; Mr. M. Wayne Staton; Mr. Eugene P. Warr, Jr.; and Mr. Othniel H. Wienges, Jr.

Faculty Liaison Committee representatives present were: Dr. C. Eugene Reeder, Chair of the Faculty Senate; Dr. Robert Best, School of Medicine, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect; and Dr. Andrew Gowan, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee. Dr. Marja Warehime, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee; Dr. Kathleen Fritz, Continuing Education, Chair of Regional Campuses Faculty Senate; and Dr. Pamela Cooper, USC Beaufort, Senior Campuses representative were absent.

Others present were: President Andrew A. Sorensen; Secretary Thomas L. Stepp; Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost Mark P. Becker; Vice President for Research and Health Affairs Harris Pastides; Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Richard W. Kelly; Vice President for Human Resources Jane M. Jameson; Vice President for Student Affairs and Vice Provost for Academic Support Dennis A. Pruitt; Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer William F. Hogue; Vice Provost and Executive Dean of Regional Campuses and Continuing Education Chris P. Plyler; Associate Dean for Medical Education and Academic Affairs, School of Medicine, Richard A. Hoppmann; Vice Provost for Faculty Development Christine Curtis; General Counsel Walter (Terry) H. Parham; Chancellor of USC Aiken Thomas L. Hallman; Chancellor of USC Beaufort Jane T. Upshaw; Dean of USC Sumter Leslie C. Carpenter; Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, USC Aiken, Suzanne Ozment; Interim Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, USC Beaufort, Blanche Premo-Hopkins;

Director of Athletics Eric Hyman; Budget Director Leslie Brunelli; Assistant Treasurer Susan D. Hanna; Public Information Officer, USC Lancaster, Shana Funderburk; Director of Governmental and Community Relations Shirley Mills; Director of Government Affairs and Legislative Liaison Johnny D. Gregory; Associate Director of Government Affairs and Legislative Liaison Casey Martin; Student Government Association President Nick Payne; Cynthia Lister, Wife of Board Member Toney Lister; Rupal Sham, Oracle; Marsha Perry, Montgomery Law Firm/Oracle; Director of University Communications, Division of University Advancement, Russ McKinney, Jr.; Board staff members Terri Saxon, Vera Stone and Karen Tweedy; and members of the media.

Chairman von Lehe called the meeting to order and invited those Board members present to introduce themselves. Mr. McKinney introduced the member of the media in attendance.

Chairman von Lehe stated that notice of the meeting had been posted and the press notified as required by the Freedom of Information Act; the agenda and supporting materials had been circulated to the Committee; and a quorum was present to conduct business.

Chairman von Lehe stated that there were personnel matters dealing with an appointment with tenure and a student academic grievance which were appropriate for discussion in Executive Session.

Chairman von Lehe called for a motion to enter Executive Session. Mr. Bethea so moved. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

The following individuals were invited to remain: President Sorensen, Secretary Stepp, Dr. Becker, Dr. Pastides, Mr. Kelly, Dr. Hogue, Mr. Choate, Dr. Pruitt, Ms. Jameson, Dr. Plyler, Mr. Parham, Dr. Moore, Dr. Curtis, Mr. Gregory, Ms. Martin, Mr. McKinney, Mrs. Saxon, Ms. Stone, and Ms. Tweedy.

## Open Session

### I. Decision on Academic Grievance:

Chairman von Lehe called for a motion. Mr. Bethea moved to uphold Dr. Sorensen's decision to affirm Mr. Robinson's dismissal from the School of Medicine. Mr. Whittle seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

### II. Academic Grievance:

Chairman von Lehe stated that there was a personnel matter dealing with a student academic grievance which was appropriate for Executive Session.

Chairman von Lehe called for a motion to enter Executive Session. Mr. Bradley so moved. Mr. Buyck seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

Chairman von Lehe invited the following people to remain: Dr. Sorensen, Secretary Stepp, Dr. Becker, Dr. Plyler, Dr. Pruitt, Dr. Pastides, Ms. Jameson, Mr. Parham, Mr. McKinney, Mrs. Saxon, Ms. Stone, and Ms. Tweedy.

## Executive Session

### Personnel Matter:

#### Academic Grievance - Ryan Alexander Payne:

Mr. Ryan Alexander Payne was invited into the room. Chairman von Lehe read the following opening statement.

My name is John C. von Lehe, Jr., Chairman of the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the University of South Carolina Board of Trustees. This hearing is convened to consider the appeal of Ryan Alexander Payne, a former student and graduate of the South Carolina Honors College. Mr. Payne has appealed President Andrew A. Sorensen's decision to uphold the final grade awarded to Mr. Payne in the Honors College class in which he was enrolled during the 2005 Fall Semester. This hearing is being held in the Board of Trustees Meeting Room located at 1600 Hampton Street in Columbia, South Carolina, on August 10, 2007, at 12:15 p.m.

At this time I ask the other members of the Committee to introduce themselves.

The following members of the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee introduced themselves: Mr. Herbert C. Adams, Board Chairman; Mr. William L. Bethea, Jr.; Mr. James Bradley; Mr. Mark W. Buyck, Jr.; Mr. Samuel R. Foster, II; Mr. William C. Hubbard; Mr. Mack I. Whittle, Jr.; and Chairman John von Lehe.

Chairman von Lehe noted for the record that a quorum was present. He asked the members of the USC Administration to please introduce themselves: President Andrew A. Sorensen; Provost Mark P. Becker; Vice President for Student Affairs and Vice Provost for Academic Support Dennis A. Pruitt; General Counsel Walter (Terry) H. Parham; Vice President for Research and Health Affairs Harris Pastides; Vice President for Human Resources Jane M. Jameson; and Vice Provost and Executive Dean of Regional Campuses and Continuing Education Chris P. Plyler.

Chairman von Lehe asked other Board of Trustees members present to introduce themselves: Secretary Thomas L. Stepp; Mr. Miles Loadholt, Board Vice Chairman; Mr. Othniel H. Wienges, Jr.; Eugene P. Warr, Jr.; Mr. M. Wayne Staton; Mr. Toney J. Lister; Mr. John W. Fields; Dr. C. Edward Floyd; Mr. William W. Jones, Jr.; and Mr. Michael J. Mungo.

The following members of the Faculty Liaison Committee introduced themselves: Dr. Andrew Gowan, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee; Dr. C. Eugene Reeder, Chair of the Faculty Senate; and Dr. Robert Best, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect.

Chairman von Lehe continued.

The Committee is convening this hearing pursuant to the Code of Laws of South Carolina, and pursuant to Article VII, Section 4 of the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees.

This hearing will be conducted as informally as is compatible with an equitable presentation of both sides in this matter. As the presiding member of this Committee, I will take such action as is necessary to insure a fair, orderly and expeditious hearing.

First, we will allow Mr. Payne ten minutes to make any comments he wishes to make in addition to those contained in the written statement prepared by Mr. Payne, which is a part of the Committee's Exhibit. Dr. Mark P. Becker, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, will then be afforded ten minutes to make any comments he wishes to make in addition to those contained in the

written statement prepared by Dr. Becker, which is a part of the Committee's Exhibit. The presiding officer or any member of the Committee may direct questions to a party at the conclusion of the party's presentation. Both parties will also be allowed five minutes to make closing or reply statements.

Only information pertinent to the record on which the University's action is based, or relevant to the grounds on which the appeal is based, will be considered. Evidence which is irrelevant, repetitive or cumulative in nature will not be considered.

Review by the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee will be limited to: (1) whether all administrative steps have been followed by the grievant; (2) whether all University of South Carolina procedures have been observed at earlier proceedings; (3) whether the final decision being appealed to this Committee was clearly erroneous, considering the record as a whole; and (4) whether the decision being appealed was an arbitrary or capricious abuse of discretion.

This is an appellate forum. New issues and new evidence will not be considered.

This Committee convenes this hearing with no preconceptions or information beyond those materials included in the file provided to the Committee, which includes the statement and attachments provided by Mr. Payne, and the statement and attachments provided by Dr. Becker. This file is being entered into the record as the Committee's Exhibit.

We are all mindful of the importance of these proceedings and the impact of our deliberations and our decision. I, therefore, request all participants to act reasonably, responsibly, and to conduct themselves in a manner consistent with reaching a fair and reasonable resolution of this case.

The hearing will be recorded, except the deliberations of the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee. The recording shall be maintained by the Secretary of the Board of Trustees.

This Committee will render its decision by vote in open session, and that will be immediately following this executive - this meeting. Within thirty (30) calendar days following the decision of this hearing, the Committee will provide Mr. Payne and the University administration with written confirmation of its decision.

Are there any questions concerning the procedure? Hearing none the Committee will now hear from Mr. Payne. Mr. Payne, you have ten minutes, please begin.

Mr. Payne addressed the Committee.

Good afternoon, I do apologize for wearing denim. I just got back from Habitat for Humanity and haven't had time to get my suits out of storage. I would also like to thank you for your time. I realize that you guys have a lot of stuff to do. So, I'm going to just start by kind of explaining where this started, and where this came from. I know this is an appellant body, but for the sake of kind of background I wanted to explain the issues as I see them from the get go. They started twenty months ago and so I have been doing this for twenty months and it started with just a desire on my part to understand where my grade in this class came from. It was a nine hour class and I got a B+ in it and I understand that looks like a waste of time possibly to spend this much time in reviewing that, but as it progressed it became less and less about the actual grade and more and more about the way I felt students, at least I, was treated by the procedures of the University.

So to start with the grade, I'm looking at the first academic grievance committee as kind of the lower court and what they found was restricted greatly in that they were not allowed to take up the actual issue of the grade, nor were they allowed to suggest a change. All they could do is kind of nudge anybody, you know, in a certain direction. But, within their purview they found that Dr. Rothman, the professor of record of this class, had violated the Faculty Manual in that she did not explain in the syllabus where grades were to be coming from, how they were to be determined, nor was the syllabus clear, which is also demanded by the Faculty Manual.

So, they found this, and additionally she was requested to - they felt like that it was a bad enough situation that she needed to change them so she wrote a new syllabus and provided, attempted to provide further explanation on how my grade was arrived at. In doing this she stated that I did receive in fact an A- but she rounded down and the syllabus didn't explain that and neither did she. It also said that she converted number grades on 100 percent scale into a letter grade, back to a 4.0 scale where they were combined. These three components were combined, back to a letter scale and then this letter grade was then assigned on a 4.0 scale by the Honors College. This is four conversions, none of which did she ever provide a scale or anyway that someone other than her would be able to replicate this.

Additionally in the components in which I received an A, she assigned a 3.8 rather than a 4.0. This is after the fact, after she was requested by this Committee to explain herself. To me this just looks like an attempt after the fact to justify actions which she had already taken.

So, what happened next is she herself said that her syllabus had problems that needed to be fixed. This isn't - she admitted this - the Committee found this - this is not necessarily in dispute. What happened after that though was absolutely nothing. So despite the misleadings or the ambiguity and vagueness in the syllabus, no attempt was made to understand how this could of misled me or not informed me accurately of how the grades were to be determined.

It is my opinion that this is the arbitrary and capricious part in that everybody makes mistakes and that's fine. But to not - but to acknowledge your mistakes and not try and remedy it or make it right to those who are harmed by it, is I think the problem.

This leads me to a nine enumerated reasons in my statement regarding the handling of this grievance by the University. First of all, I would like to draw attention that it's been twenty months of back and forths, and cancellations, postponements, and generally just trying to be I feel like just drug on so I would end this appeal. Again that is my opinion and there were things that did take time. But I feel that twenty months is excessive.

There are nine of these and I'm just going to hit some highpoints that I feel like are the most egregious. The Student Affairs Policy 6.3 on Academic Grievances states that every college is required to have procedures for the handling of an academic grievance. The Honors College by the admission of its own Dean did not have those procedures in place. So what they did was, I was told by the Dean, this may or may not be true, but I was the first grade grievance to actually come from an Honors College class, and because of that they didn't have these policies in writing, nor were they approved by faculty, which was - is required by their policy. What they did was just borrow the grievances - the procedures from the College of Arts and Sciences, which is fine, that's you know - I would expect them to be very similar in the actual workings. But these, to my knowledge, have still not been approved nor were they provided to me until about a week before what was to be my first committee hearing. When they provided them though, it was plainly obvious that two very important ones had already been violated.

The first one is confidentiality in which a staff member in the Honor's College just happened to be at a party of educators and talking about how he - just some of the students of the Honors College and how one of them had become rather infamous for appealing a B+ and wasting everyone's time and so this is the Honors College that is suppose to be providing me with an objective hearing. He did not know, but my brother and sister, who are also both educators, were actually there and knew from what he said, enough to know that it was me that he was talking about. They confronted him on this and he didn't say anything. But the Honors College did nothing about this. So, essentially you know this is - I felt very frustrated in that this body was suppose to act as a jury and a judge and they had already been discussing my infamy around the office.

Chairman von Lehe interjected.

Mr. Payne, just a moment. At some courtrooms have yellow lights that come on and tell people when they are getting close to time. So I just want to let you know that you have about three minutes, so if there is something that you think is essential to get before this Committee please do so.

Mr. Payne continued.

The second thing is when I was trying to learn about this appeal and the actual process of doing it I was told by Dean Burns of the College of Arts and Sciences, which it was a cross-listed course, 'that there was no appeals process, that I was out of luck and needed to take it up with the professor.' This I don't understand - is a flat out lie for lack of a better word I suppose, in that later she did give me the procedures for an appeal.

Thirdly, there was - upon knowing that I was appealing Fred Sheheen, who was in this - there's a fellowship and he was the director of one of the fellowship parties, had written a note and had his secretary call to express that I was to never contact or ever to be in touch with anyone from my fellowship from the Institute for Public Service and Policy Research and that if I were to be in contact with them, such bad things would happen. Things, he didn't enumerate, but this was a note his secretary read to me. When I asked for it in writing, obviously he did not give it.

But the highest point is that in addition to this Committee finding that there were definitely things wrong with this syllabus, that it lacked clarity, it violated the Faculty Manual in other ways, that after the fact the flimsy justification given by Dr. Rothman was never questioned, it was never even looked at in my opinion from a logical standpoint as to perhaps maybe she's trying to justify this after the fact. And, I think this is the arbitrary and capricious part in that there were several - it started with the Dean of the Honors College, and then the Provost Office, and then the President's Office, and I was simply just shut down. The Provost actually hung up on me when I was trying to understand. I'm sorry, not Dr. Becker, it was Dr. Heider, actually hung up on me when I was trying to understand why nothing was said, there was no justification or explanation given for the actions taken or the procedural mishaps between my actual appeal and the end of it.

And, this is I think the true wrong. And it's less about a B+ versus an A at this point, while it's obviously at the heart of the matter, it is more about what has happened since then, in that while this finding was rendered, there was no teeth on it. It was essentially powerless, the Committee was powerless, and even after the fact no one was willing to explain, look at this logically, or try to justify the actions taken by the University.

Chairman von Lehe thanked Mr. Payne and asked if there were any questions from members of the Committee.

Dr. Reeder asked Mr. Payne if the policies he referred to on changing a grade were University Policies related to correcting a grade recording error; or for a process to appeal a grade issued by a professor. Mr. Payne replied that he was never given an explanation of how to grieve his grade; that he "just kind of stumbled on it through inquiries." He clarified that there was not an Honor's College policy at that time.

There being no further questions for Mr. Payne, Chairman von Lehe called on Dr. Becker to present the University's Opening Statement.

Dr. Becker addressed the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, the essence of the appeal is dissatisfaction with the final grade in SCCC 498. Mr. Payne

received a B+. He believes he should of received an A. University Policy does not allow a student to challenge a faculty member's subjective evaluation of the quality of the student's work. So this appeal is premised on a notion that the course instructor violated her teaching responsibilities as outlined in the Faculty Manual by disseminating a deficient syllabus. The claim is without merit.

The syllabus prepared by Dr. Korey Rothman the Academic Director of the Washington Semester Program met University standards. It informed students of the course objectives and it advised students how grades would be determined. You will find the syllabus in University Exhibit #2. The course was divided into three segments each contributing one third to the final grade. We agreed that the syllabus could have been - could have provided more detailed information for students, and we are advised that the syllabus was subsequently modified as a result of Mr. Payne's concerns. However, I reiterate that the 2005 syllabus met University requirements. Contrary to the grievance claim, the Committee, being the grievance Committee of the Honors College, did not find that Dr. Rothman had violated the teaching responsibilities provisions of the Faculty Manual.

Reference you to University Exhibit #3. Please note also that SCCC 498 students had a day long orientation in Washington DC at the beginning of the course. The syllabus and method of grading were discussed at that time. Mr. Payne had opportunity at that time to ask questions if he thought the syllabus was unclear. To our knowledge he did not do so. Mr. Payne also had opportunity throughout the semester to ask questions or seek clarification about the grading system, but he did not do so. Only after dissatisfied with his final grade, did he express concerns about the syllabus. At the suggestion of Honors College Grievance Committee, Dr. Rothman provided Mr. Payne with a detailed explanation of how his final grade was calculated. That explanation can be found in University Exhibit #5. Dr. Rothman's calculations were logical and fair.

In summary, on the main point, the syllabus was satisfactory by University standards. In addition, Mr. Payne's final grade was appropriate given the academic evaluation of his performance.

Additionally, Mr. Payne has raised several issues about the process by which his grievance has been considered. He is correct in his assertion that the Honors College created an academic grievance policy as a result of his grievance. That was because, as he said, South Carolina Honors College had not had an academic grievance previously in its many year history.

Mr. Payne, also in his assertion that the Grievance Committee Policy was not approved by the Honors College Faculty, is correct. That is because the Honors College does not have its own faculty. You cannot have a - if you don't have a faculty you can't approve it. The faculty affiliated with the South Carolina Honors College are drawn from across the University and fluctuates each semester based on courses being taught.

Please also note that the Academic Grievance Policy adopted by the South Carolina Honors College administration was done in consultation with the Provost's Office, specifically the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies, and it mirrors academic grievance policies found in other USC Colleges and thereby is within our accepted standards.

In summary, the issue raised with regard to the South Carolina Honors College Grievance Policy in no way harmed the grievant. Another question is whether Mr. Payne received due process in the consideration of his appeal. He has received substantial due process. His appeal was considered by the course instructor, Honors College Dean, Honors College Academic Grievance Committee, the Provost Office, and the President. At each level of review it was determined that his final grade was appropriate and consistent with the course syllabus. If it indeed were the case that Dr. Rothman's syllabus somehow failed to adequately explain how final grades would be calculated, it does not follow that Mr. Payne's final grade should be changed from B+ to A. There is no evidence of a connection between the alleged deficiencies in the syllabus and Mr. Payne's academic performance in the three segments of the course.



In summary, Dr. Sorensen's decision to deny Mr. Payne's request for a grade change is neither arbitrary and capricious, nor clearly erroneous considering the record as a whole. Instead it is supported by the independent review and decision of the course instructor, the Honors College Dean, Honors College Academic Grievance Committee, and Provost Office. Mr. Payne was provided the opportunity for a hearing consistent with the Academic Grievance procedure adopted by the Honors College and for subsequent review of that decision by the appropriate University administrators. He has been afforded due process. Even if there was a technical violation of University process, and I speak specifically to the issue of the South Carolina Honors College Grievance Policy, those violations caused Mr. Payne no harm. That is, they did not affect the substance of consideration and merits of the grievance. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman von Lehe thanked Dr. Becker and asked if there were any questions from members of the Committee. Hearing none, he called on Mr. Payne for his closing remarks.

Mr. Payne addressed the Committee.

I believe that one of the objectives in a course is to earn an accurate grade and as such I don't think that you can earn an accurate grade if you don't know the steps which you need to do it. Dr. Rothman had expressed to me, why would you not bring this up earlier at the beginning in our day long orientation or during the course. What I said to that was, 'you don't really know your car is broken until you go out and try to start it.' It wasn't simple dissatisfaction with the grade that caused this appeal; it was the fact that this grade could not be objectively held.

Additionally, I did discuss with her in the course about my progress and she said 'everything was fine that if I continued the work I had done, I would have an A.' This is oral and obviously cannot be substantiated, but it's the truth.

The Committee's findings told me by Davis Baird, were limited in that they could not take up the actual grade issue. They could not say, 'we think you should change the grade.' They were simply unable to say that. Additionally, they could not say, they could not force anything; all they could do was make a recommendation. And so, I am curious as to if this syllabus met University requirements, and then why change it at all. It seems to me that the only reason to change it would be that if it did not meet University requirements.

What's been admitted here is that there was a poor syllabus that lacks clarity and does not sufficiently explain how to reach a goal as far as a grade, as found by the Academic Grievance Committee of the Honors College. What's also been admitted is that the Grievance Policy has been broken in numerous ways, confidentiality was broken. The Honors College had no procedure for this, which is required. I understand the faculty - that there are not full time or sitting faculty to approve it. However, the Student Affairs Manual doesn't make exception for that, there are I think people who can approve this, or something additionally should be done to make this fair and legal and provided these procedures to me at the inception of the process rather than towards the end of it. If my - if the procedural issues were reviewed by the office of the Dean, the Provost, and the President, no one has explained to me at this point why it's ok, why a simple technically like this, like not having a Grievance Committee is fine, why that doesn't hurt me. I don't understand that. Also, I don't understand why it hasn't been explained that there are no conversion charts, no way for anyone other than Dr. Rothman to replicate this grading process.

And, finally I believe that the deficiencies in the syllabus are directly related to my receiving a B+. Dr. Rothman has admitted that I should have earned an A-, but the University doesn't grant A-'s so she chose to round down, which - I don't understand her decision - is I think fine - had it been in the syllabus and on what that rounding would be based. So mathematically, I think that there is a strong case that I would in fact have had an A, in that there's - that given the other - that Dr. Rothman is avoiding this problem by not providing a

grading scale - using any grading scale during the Washington Semester Program I would of in fact ended up with over the threshold of an A, but she isn't providing this grading scale that she used to convert - obviously has used to convert - because there is no way she will be able to hold that I have a B+ if she does so. Thank you.

Chairman von Lehe invited Dr. Becker to give his closing statement. Dr. Becker addressed the Committee.

This will be brief. Again, Dr. Sorensen's decision to deny Mr. Payne's request of a grade change is neither arbitrary and capricious, nor clearly erroneous considering the record as a whole. On the issue of the grade round down, I just like for the clarification of the Committee, so that you understand this issue. In University Exhibit #5 you find the letter outlining by Dr. Rothman how the grade was assigned and comes to the final calculation of a 3.53, and then says it was rounded down to an B+, USC does not give an A-. To be more clear on this, the USC record is you have to have a 3.55 to get an A and then below a 3.55 would be a B+. So this was a 3.53, which is a B+. There is not a rounding down of subjective nature here. That is the grade to be assigned because a 3.53 in the calculation does not cross the threshold of a 3.55. Thank you.

Chairman von Lehe excused Mr. Payne and Dr. Becker so that the Committee could begin its deliberations, and invited the members of the Faculty Liaison Committee to begin its deliberations in the adjacent conference room while the Academic Affairs Committee discussed the matter.

After the Faculty Liaison Committee returned with its advisory opinion, the Committee of the whole concluded its deliberations, Chairman von Lehe declared the Committee to be in open session.

Open Session

I. Decision on Academic Grievance:

Chairman von Lehe called for a motion. Mr. Bethea moved to uphold Dr. Sorensen's decision to uphold the final grade awarded to Mr. Payne in an Honors College class, in which he was enrolled in the Fall of 2005. Mr. Bradley seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

II. USC Aiken Faculty Manual Changes:

Chairman von Lehe called on Dr. Suzanne Ozment, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and stated that Chancellor Hallman was also available. Dr. Ozment explained that most of the changes were matters of clarification.

Mr. Bradley moved to approve the USC Aiken *Faculty Manual* Changes as presented in the materials distributed for the meeting. Mr. Wienges seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

III. USC Beaufort Faculty Manual:

Chairman von Lehe called on Dr. Premo-Hopkins, who explained that the changes were a result of USC Beaufort going from a two-year to four-year institution.

Mr. Adams moved to approve the USC Beaufort *Faculty Manual* as presented in the materials distributed for the meeting. Mr. Bradley seconded the motion. The vote was taken, and the motion carried.

IV. Adjournment:

Since there were no other matters to come before the Committee, Chairman von Lehe declared the meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas L. Stepp  
Secretary