Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 13 November 2007

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 13 November 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, and the minutes of the 9 October 2007 Senate Meeting were approved.

Reports

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens reported that applications for admission to the College were up by 35%. Why such an increase has occurred was not clear, she said, but it was good news. A lot of the applications, she added, were for early admission.

The Provost next mentioned the “Palmetto Promise,” which is a guarantee that all Palmetto Fellows as well as valedictorians of South Carolina high schools entering as freshmen will receive $2,000 in the form of a Presidential Scholarship.

The Provost announced that Sandy Hall is developing a “suggestion box” for the Provost’s office. Her office is also working on an electronic bulletin board that will publicly post information on matters concerning Academic Affairs.

The Speaker

The Speaker reported that he has met with the President and Hugh Wilder, chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee, about the development of the new system for determining faculty salary raises. He reported that the President wanted the instrument for evaluating faculty for merit increases to be developed at the departmental level. Deans will refine and make uniform what departments do for their schools. The Deans and the Provost will make sure that there are common standards that apply to all schools.

The Committee on By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual

Brian McGee (committee chair) first reported that the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual has consulted with the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review on various issues, including some in today’s report.

Mr. McGee next reported on the policy concerning emeritus/emerita faculty. His committee reviewed the policy at the request of Vice President Sandy Powers. Before making recommendations, the Committee received background information from Provost Jorgens, met with Professor Hugh Wilder, who chaired a committee that had also made some recommendations on the issue and looked at the policies of other institutions. Mr. McGee’s committee was also asked to revise the FAM so that the emeritus/emerita rank would not be automatically granted to retiring faculty, but would be an honor conferred upon deserving faculty who have met an appropriate standard. Accordingly, the By-Laws and FAM Committee made the following recommendations:

--that “a history of exemplary service” become the standard for achieving the rank
--that the word “Emerita” be used when applied to females, and “Emeritus” when applied to males
--that the standard use of the term by individuals, departments, and programs be clearly spelled out
--that Sr. Instructors and Asst. Professors be eligible for the rank
--that the President be allowed to make exceptions in granting certain faculty the emeritus rank
--that the College be allowed, but not obligated to give special benefits to those awarded the emeritus rank.

Mr. McGee noted that when his committee surveyed the policies of ten other institutions, it found that polices varied widely. He advised the Senate to decide on a policy that works best for the College of Charleston. He reminded the Senate, too, that the emeritus policy is in the administratively controlled section of the FAM, not the faculty controlled section. The administration ultimately makes the decisions on emeritus matters. Finally, he urged Senators to express recommendations to his committee, if they had any to offer.

Meg Cormack (at-large) commented that she had no complaint about the Committee’s recommendations; however, she would like “service” to mean not just having sat on many committees, but having served well. Mr. Wilder (Philosophy) asked for confirmation that the issue would not come back to the Senate for its endorsement, and Mr. McGee confirmed that it would not return to the Senate. Mr. Wilder then commented that he would like to suggest wording in the FAM that reflects Ms. Cormack’s interpretation of the word “service.”

Frank Cossa (Art History) asked if the recommended changes mean that faculty will have to produce a packet that demonstrates their service. Bev Diamond (guest and Associate Provost) responded that chairs will be well aware of the performance of faculty in the area of service and so packets won’t be needed. Provost Jorgens added that in the past chairs and deans have made recommendations with respect to conferring the emeritus rank. Chairs and deans will in the future determine the service contributions of faculty, eliminating any need for the creation of packets. The emeritus rank is an honorific status, she reminded the Senate.

Finally, Mr. McGee reported on the Committee’s recommendations to make changes in the FAM regarding the title of the Honors College. It used to be called the Honors Program, but is now called the Honors College, and alterations to the relevant pages of the Faculty By-Laws need to be made to reflect that change in name.

**The Academic Standards Committee**

**Credit Overload Requests.** Larry Krasnoff (committee chair) reported that Lynn Cherry, Director of the Office of Undergraduate Academic Services, asked the Academic Standards Committee to consider the credit overload policy. Ms. Cherry, he said, used to decide all such requests, but now chairs make the decision, and she was concerned about uniformity and the need for standard criteria that could be applied to all those making overload requests. His committee revamped a form that is sometimes used for credit overload requests. The new form lays out the various criteria that chairs would need to consider before making decisions on such requests. Mr. Krasnoff presented a draft of the form and explained that it doesn’t set any strict limits or requirements, but does make chairs go through a deliberative process when dealing with
overload requests. He added that the form is recommended for use, but that no policy changes are being proposed.

Ms. Cormack asked if athletic participation should be a category of consideration. Todd McNerney (at-large) thought that was a terrific idea and said it would give guidance to chairs. On a different topic, Mr. Krasnoff noted that students often don’t take the full overload of hours granted to them, and instead use it as a strategy to get certain courses. Mr. McNerney said that if such abuses of overload requests were occurring, they should be investigated.

Speaker Kelly then requested that Senators send further comments and suggestions to Mr. Krasnoff.

**Proposed Policy about Baccalaureate Degrees:** an additional thirty hours required for a second degree. Cathy Boyd (guest and Registrar) explained that the policy issue about additional degrees arose when some students who were double-majors requested two diplomas, one for each major (the current practice is that double-majors receive one diploma that has both majors printed on it). Double majors are not allowed to receive two diplomas at graduation; however, if double-majors graduate twice in different semesters, they do receive two diplomas, and some students have taken advantage of this loophole to earn two degrees. Ms. Boyd said that President Benson asked her to look into the matter. Our current policy, she explained, says that students who wish to earn two degrees just need to complete the requirements for two majors, whereas most other institutions—such as Winthrop, Clemson, and University of South Carolina—have more stringent standards and require students to take another 24 to 30 hours to earn another degree. The College is thus out of line with most of its peer institutions and those it is seeking to emulate. After reporting her findings to the Academic Council, the Council asked Ms. Boyd to come up with a policy on this issue. Accordingly, her office has proposed that students take 30 additional hours for a second major to earn another degree.

Mr. Krasnoff added that the Academic Affairs Committee broadly supports the proposal and suggests that it go to SGA for their input. Alex Bodley (guest and representative of SGA) said that SGA would offer suggestions.

In order to be certain about the policy, Mr. Nunan said that for a student to earn another degree, he or she would have to put in another thirty hours and fulfill the requirements for a second major. Ms. Boyd answered “yes.”

At this point, the Speaker asked that Senators send further comments and suggestions to Mr. Krasnoff.

**Unfinished Business**

**Latin Honors at Graduation**

On behalf of the Academic Standards Committee, Mr. Krasnoff presented new data to support a motion that would change the GPA standard for Latin honors at graduation. (This motion, which had been originally made at the September 11 Faculty Senate meeting, was remanded to the Academic Standards Committee with the charge of finding additional data to support the
motion.) The motion stipulated that the minimum requirements for Latin honors at graduation be changed from

- 3.60 *cum laude*
- 3.80 *magna cum laude*
- 3.95 *summa cum laude*

to

- 3.50 *cum laude*
- 3.75 *magna cum laude*
- 3.90 *summa cum laude*

as soon as the Provost deems the change to be feasible.

The rationale for the motion was that the recent changes to our grading scale, which include the introduction of minus grades, have made it more difficult for students to achieve the standard for honors, and that some adjustment of the standard was therefore needed. The data presented included a comparison of the GPA requirements for Latin honors of many institutions, a comparison of the percentage of students graduating with Latin honors at the College with the percentage of students graduating with Latin honors at other institutions, the percentage of students graduating with Latin honors at the College since 2003, and statistics on GPAs of various categories of students at the College since 2003.

Mr. Nunan thought the motion was reasonable, but said that he didn’t like the first sentence of the rationale, which states that it’s harder to achieve the Latin honors because of the recent change in the grading scale. That idea, he said, hasn’t been proved, and is thus just rumor, which ought not to be spread. He thought the other rationale was fine, namely that our standards are out of line with other institutions and should therefore be brought in line with them.

Jason Overby (Chemistry and Biochemistry) asked how long the current honors standards have been in place. John Newell (guest and Dean of the Honors School) said “since 1979.” Phil Dustan (Biology) said that he had talked with some graduates about this issue, who said they felt insulted because they thought the change in standard “dumbed down” the honors they had earned. Mr. Newell responded by saying that in the past one could earn four B+ grades and the rest A grades, but that now a student can only get two B+ grades. (He added that with the proposed revised standard a student could perhaps get five B+ grades and the rest A grades and still earn Latin honors.) He thought it was harder to earn the Latin honors in the new grading system and that the proposed change for the honor standard was not a “dumbing down” of the honor. A member of the SGA said that the SGA supported the motion.

The Senate then voted on the motion to change the standard for Latin honors, which passed.

**Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review**

Proposed Changes to the Fac./Admin. Manual: Pam Riggs-Gelasco (committee chair), after summarizing changes that had been approved by the Senate last spring, took up the remaining proposed amendments to the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM), which all concerned tenure, promotion, and third-year review procedures. (These proposed amendments had been on the Senate agenda last spring, but the Senate did not have time to deliberate on all of them.)
The first proposed amendment—Recommendation XI in the total list of recommended changes proposed by the Committee—concerned section IV.M10 of the FAM. This recommendation would add more detail about the Faculty Advisory Committee Action and separate the discussion of the protocols of review into two groups, a group “a” dealing with reviews for tenure, promotion and retention of Senior Instructors, and a group “b” dealing with the third-year review. The rationale for the change was that because the protocol for review of third-year-review cases was sufficiently different from that for tenure and promotion cases, a separate discussion was warranted for each. Specifically, the proposed amendment would change language in the FAM from

10. Faculty Advisory Committee Action

The Provost will make packets of all candidates for tenure and promotion available to the members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Reappointment. The Faculty Advisory Committee will notify each candidate in writing of its recommendation. The Committee will also review third-year candidates on all negative departmental recommendations or if requested to do so by the candidate, any member of the departmental panel, the appropriate Dean or the Provost.

In cases where the Dean’s decision is different from the departmental evaluation panel or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative, he/she will refer the case to the Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee for their recommendations. The Provost and the Faculty Advisory Committee will interview each candidate for third-year reappointment when the departmental panel or the appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries recommendation is different from the departmental evaluation panel or the departmental evaluation panel vote is negative. The Provost’s and the Faculty Advisory Committee’s recommendation will be submitted in writing to the President.

to 10. Faculty Advisory Committee Action

a. Reviews for Tenure, Promotion and Retention as Senior Instructor

The Provost will make packets of all candidates for tenure, promotion, and retention as Senior Instructor available to the members of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review. The Advisory Committee will review all of the evidence and make an independent assessment of each case. The Advisory Committee may interview the candidate, the Department Chair, the Departmental Panel Chair, faculty members in the Department, the Dean, and others as necessary. The Faculty Advisory Committee will make a written recommendation to the President. The Faculty Advisory Committee will notify each candidate, Department Chair, and the appropriate Dean in writing of its recommendation.

b. Third Year Review

The Committee will only review third-year candidates if there is a negative recommendation from the Dean or the Department, or if requested to do so by the candidate, any member of the departmental panel, the appropriate Dean or the Provost.
The Advisory Committee will review all of the evidence and make an independent assessment of such a case. The Advisory Committee will interview the candidate and may interview the Department Chair, the Departmental Panel Chair, faculty members in the Department, the Dean, and others as necessary. The Provost’s and the Faculty Advisory Committee’s written recommendation will be submitted to the President. The candidate, the appropriate Dean, and the Department Chair will also be notified of the committee’s recommendation.

Gerry Gonsalves (Management and Entrepreneurship) wondered about the wording in groups “a” and “b,” observing that in “a” the word “may” is used (“The Advisory Committee may interview the candidate. . . .”) which means the interview is not a requirement, whereas in “b” the word “will is used throughout, which means everything in the section is a requirement.

At this point, the Senate voted on Recommendation XI, which passed.

Ms. Riggs-Gelasco then moved that Recommendation XII be approved, which would change the reporting procedures of departmental review panels. Specifically, the amendment would change language in section IV.M.7 of the FAM from

The chair of the departmental panel will meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her of the panel’s written recommendation, which will include actual vote splits. Third year candidates will sign the panel’s evaluation.

to

The chair of the departmental panel will meet with the faculty member being evaluated to inform him/her of the panel’s recommendation, including the actual vote splits. A copy of the panel’s written recommendation will be provided to the candidate. The candidate will sign the copy of the panel’s written recommendation included in the packet.

Rationale: In some departments, chairs share the panel’s written recommendation with the candidate for promotion and tenure, and in other cases the department chair only relates the vote of the panel to the candidate. The Committee recommends that a consistent policy for all departments be in place.

Ms. Riggs-Gelasco added that the Committee felt that more was needed in the reporting procedures. Candidates need to see the letters of panels so that they can properly defend themselves. Most peer institutions (about 77%), she continued, already do what the Committee proposes; and though some other peer institutions have another process, the candidates still receive a written summary of problems (with the exception of two schools, which give verbal reviews that provide detailed information to candidates.) The Committee, Ms. Riggs-Gelasco concluded, would like the College to be more in line with other institutions.

Glenn Lesses (guest) offered the Faculty Welfare Committee’s report on Recommendation XII. Last year’s Welfare Committee, he said, was asked to review the recommendation and the Committee had some problems with it. While the Committee thought that transparency was good, it also thought that confidentiality was especially important. This year’s Welfare Committee is also opposed to the recommendation. It is
crucial that confidentiality be assured at the departmental level and other levels. He was worried, for example, that the reports of external reviewers would show up in panel reports and undermine the confidentiality accorded to them. The Committee, he added, also reviewed the handbooks of other institutions and found some notable schools that do not require written departmental panel reviews. At William and Mary, for instance, the Dean issues a report to the candidate, not the departmental panel. Mr. Lesses also remarked that the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in a court brief came down on the side of confidentiality. He urged that wide discretion be given to faculty to protect confidentiality. He concluded by noting that more transparency is needed at the level of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, which ought to provide a report.

Meg Cormack (at-large) observed that at Smith College candidates are allowed to see all documents. She said that she was in favor of confidentiality, but remarked that confidentiality is not a serious issue with external reviewers because candidates will know anyway if the verdict is negative.

David Gentry (at-large) asked Mr. Lesses about third-year review. Do the same concerns about confidentiality apply? Mr. Lesses replied that third-year review was different.

Brian McGee (Communication) remarked that in the Communication Department panel letters are given to candidates, and though they are blunt, the sources of views expressed is not specified. Faculty are protected, and external reviewers are similarly protected. It is important, he added, to create a culture of candor on campus. Senior faculty must provide a clear and honest assessment of their views. Fran Welch (guest and Dean of the School of Education) said that the practice described by Mr. McGee is also used in the School of Education.

Paul Young (Mathematics) said that if confidentiality is the key consideration, then it would have to apply to graduate letters too. Darryl Phillips (Classics) noted that if the rationale for the motion is to provide candidates with information, then the panel interview should provide that. Jack Parson (Political Science) was not convinced by that argument and remarked that discussion among the panel when the candidate leaves is generally more frank. He added that confidentially will be maintained, if the recommendation passes because panel letters will hide the sources of specific statements. Confidently, he thought was not a major issue.

The Senate voted on Recommendation XII, which passed.

Ms. Riggs-Gelasco then moved that Recommendation XIII, which pertains to section K.1.b.4 of the FAM, be approved. This recommendation would change the sample size of graduate letters for those being reviewed for tenure, promotion, or third-year review from 25 to 40. The rationale was that a larger sample was needed to judge more accurately the teaching impact of faculty on students who have graduated.

Phil Dustan (Biology) asked for a clarification about whether forty letters must be sent out to graduates or forty received from graduates. Ms. Riggs-Gelasco said that the recommendation stipulated that forty letter would be sent out. Mr. Gonsalves wondered why a second wave of letters wouldn’t be sent out, if the panel felt that the response rate
from graduates was inadequate. Ms. Riggs-Gelasco said that she couldn’t speak to that question because departments handle that situation in different ways. Mr. McGee remarked that his department does what Mr. Gonsalves suggested: it sends out a second wave of letters, if the response rate to the first wave is low.

The Senate voted on Recommendation XIII, which passed.

Ms. Riggs-Gelasco then moved that Recommendation XIV, which pertains to the advising requirement for promotion to Senior Instructor in section IV.K.b of the FAM, be approved. This recommendation would require those wishing to be promoted to Senior Instructor to be active in departmental advising only, and not college-wide advising. The reason for this change is that the existence of the Advising Center, which handles college-wide general education advising, eliminates the necessity for other faculty to do college-wide advising. The motion to approve Recommendation XIV passed.

Ms. Riggs-Gelasco then moved that Recommendation XV, which pertains to the promotion requirements for librarians in sections L.4.a.(1), L.4.b.(1), and L.4.c.(1) of the FAM, be approved. This motion would change the phrase “sustained effectiveness in the area of professional competency” to “exemplary performance in the area of professional competency.” (For L.4.c.(1), which concerns promotion to the rank of Librarian III, the phrase “exemplary performance and” would be inserted in front of the phrase “significant effectiveness in the area of professional competency.”) This proposed language accords with the language used in other areas of section L of the FAM regarding third-Year Review, tenure and promotion of the library faculty, where the term “exemplary” is used in talking about professional competence. The motion to approve Recommendation XV passed.

New Business

Curriculum Committee

The following proposals from the Curriculum Committee passed without discussion:

Psychology
Proposal to Change Requirements for Minor – Neuroscience

Biology
New Course Proposal – BIOL 449 Biology of Coral Reefs (permission also to cross list)

English
New Course Proposal – ENGL 190 Introductory Special Topics

Political Science
New Course Proposal - POLS 119 Special Topics in Politics

Geology and Environmental Geosciences
Proposal to change a Course – GEOL 290 Special Topics (change number to GEOL 240)

Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

The following set of new courses were submitted for approval:
Jack Parson (Political Science) asked if HSPV 859 was a substitute for a thesis essay, and a Senator who was familiar with the proposal said “yes.” He also asked if it was graded as pass/fail, and Jennifer McStotts (at-large) said that it was. The Senate then voted, and approved all the proposed courses.

Next the following course changes were approved by the Senate:

- HSPV 520 – Preservation Law and Economics (re-numbered from 520 to 620)
- HSPF 611 – Research Methods in Historic Preservation (re-named from Documentation in Historic Preservation).

The Senate then approved the following graduate program: Joint MSHP Program.

Motion to Elect an Ad Hoc Steering Committee to Assess Faculty governance

Mr. Parson proposed the following motion:

The Senate shall elect an ad hoc Steering Committee to

1. assess the present state and need of faculty governance, including but not limited to
   a) the efficacy of all committees;
   b) the relationship between the Senate and the schools; and
   c) the composition of the Senate;

2. suggest how the Senate might conduct needed reform.

The committee shall be constituted by eleven regular faculty members and the Speaker of the Faculty. Each school must be represented by at least one member. In determining a slate of candidates, the Committee on Nominations and Elections shall attempt to achieve a balance of rank. Academic Affairs and the Office of the President shall each be invited to appoint a liaison to the committee, who shall enjoy all privileges but voting privileges.

Mr. Parson explained that it’s been many years since the current faculty governance structure was put in place, that there have been many changes to the College during those years, and that now was a good time to reflect on that governance structure in light of those changes. The motion, he explained, seeks to form a committee that will examine possible problems in the current structure and practices of faculty governance, recommend changes, and suggest a process for how such changes might be implemented.

The motion passed.

Report and Recommendations from the ad hoc Vendor Code of Conduct Committee
Scott Peeples (English and committee chair) first provided some background information. He explained how the Faculty Senate had approved the creation of the Committee in October 2006 after students in the C of C Amnesty International organization, who were concerned about the College’s vending contract with Coca-Cola, had created awareness of the need for a Vendor Code of Conduct. The Committee, which is comprised of faculty, students, and Business Affairs staff, met several times and was ready to offer a report and two motions. He added that after some investigation, the Committee discovered it is unlawful to exclude some vendors. However, the College can spell out the values and conduct guidelines that vendors are expected to follow. Moreover, the College can do things to minimize the chance that College of Charleston apparel and other licensed products will be manufactured in “sweatshops,” where the majority of human rights abuses occur. Mr. Peeples also reported that the Committee has been in touch with Steve Osborne, Sr. VP of Business Affairs, and Andy Abrams, former legal counsel of the College, who said that there are no legal problems with what the Committee is proposing. He said, too, that it would be a good time to let Mr. Osborne know that the Senate supports the proposed code.

Debate then ensued on the Committee’s first motion that a values statement, entitled “College of Charleston Vendor Code of Conduct,” be attached to the "Vendor Guide for Doing Business with the C of C."

Mr. Nunan asked if the policy was merely hortatory and without “teeth.” Mr. Peeples responded that it was, that vendors would not be legally bound to obey us, and that violations would not automatically trigger a suspension of business. However, the code would give the College some backing, if the College wished to suspend business with vendors not abiding by the code. Mr. Nunan then asked what Mr. Osborne could do, if a vendor wasn’t compliant with the code, but was the lowest bidder? Mr. Peeples replied that the values statement does not dictate to Mr. Osborne whom he can and can’t do business with. George Hopkins (History) said that the reason vendors are the lowest bidders is because they engage in labor abuses. Jerry Boetje (Computer Science) added that we have idealistic students, who would probably boycott companies that committed such abuses.

A Senator asked how the College would differentiate between a corporation’s practices and policies and those of its affiliates and business partners. Mr. Peeples said that Mr. Osborne feels that there are some grey areas. A Senator stated that the College should make sure that it doesn’t fairly punish some companies because some problems may be out their control. Mr. Hopkins responded that the Senator’s concern was the reason for the Committee’s second motion to urge the College join the Fair Labor Association and the Worker Rights Consortium. These organizations, he said, will monitor conditions and circumstances and put companies on notice about problems so that they can respond to them.

Idee Winfield (Sociology) asked whether the College was obligated to accept the lowest bid? Jan Brewton (guest and Director of Auxiliary Services) said that the College must make clear how it makes decisions on bids.

In looking at the Code of Conduct, Mr. Krasnoff had several questions. He wondered why just women’s rights were singled out (why not, say, religious rights too?) and what the term “freedom of . . . collective bargain” implied: did imply the right to engage in collective bargaining or did it mean that collective bargaining must occur in labor negotiations? If the
latter was meant, then that would be a major requirement. He also wondered about the process of independent monitoring. Mr. Peeples said that with regard to the first question, the Committee took its language from similar documents used by other organizations, but that the Senate could certainly make changes. And as for the statement on collective bargaining, it meant that workers have a right to do that, but not that they must.

Peter Calcagno (Economics and Finance) was curious about what was involved in joining the Fair Labor Association. Picking up on an earlier comment made about how some companies may be unfairly punished for circumstances beyond their control, Gerry Gonsalves (Marketing and Chain Supply Management) said that sometimes companies are victims of prejudice and misrepresentation in certain countries, where it can be hard to find accurate, unbiased information about their business practices.

Mr. Wilder suggested replacing “women’s rights” with a fuller statement specifying non-discriminatory practices and policies with respect to race, gender, sexual orientation, and religion. Tim Carens (English) suggested that the Senate might wish to add before any list of non-discriminatory practices the phrase “included but not limited to” so as not to exclude other kinds of anti-discrimination practices from the list.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) said that it was odd to pass this particular code of conduct with the suggested amended language given that we (the College) would be holding vendors to a higher standard than the one to which we hold ourselves. He mentioned as an example that we have no policy prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation. Denis Keyes (at-large) said that there is language in the Faculty/Administration Manual that addresses the issue of discrimination based on sexual orientation, but there is no policy at the state level. Speaker Kelly said that he would look into matter regarding such a policy at the College. Mr. Nunan also noted that at the College we have freedom of association (another item listed in the Code of Conduct), but not freedom of collective bargaining. However, even though there may be some cognitive dissonance created by the Code of Conduct, he said that the values it lists are “ideals to shoot for.” In that regard, Code of Conduct is valuable. Mr. Peeples echoed that point and said that the Code of Conduct articulates values that will be made public.

Mr. Dustan said that the Free Labor Association [the organization mentioned in the second motion] lays out a list of anti-discriminatory practices. Another Senator suggested that that list be incorporated into the motion. The Senate gave its unanimous consent to do so. Mr. Krasnoff asked for unanimous consent to add the words “right to” before the words collective bargaining, and unanimous consent was granted. He also asked for unanimous consent to add the words “willingness to submit to” before the words “independent monitoring,” and unanimous consent was granted.

The Senate voted on the motion to endorse the values statement and attach it to the "Vendor Guide for Doing Business with the C of C.” The motion passed. Below is the edited text of the

College of Charleston Vendor Code of Conduct

College of Charleston is committed to conducting its business affairs in a socially responsible and ethical manner consistent with its educational and public service mission, and to protecting and preserving the global environment. This Code is
intended as an instrument for productive change, created through the cooperation and input from students, faculty and staff, and is established as a working document to guide vendors and institutional purchasers.

The College understands that vendors are independent entities, but the business practices and actions of a vendor may significantly impact and/or reflect upon us, our reputation and our brand, which is one of our most important assets. Therefore, College of Charleston expects a deep commitment to legal compliance and ethical business practices by all of its vendors and licensees.

College of Charleston recognizes the following cardinal principles as the basis for effective performance under this Code of Conduct:

- Safe working conditions
- Commitment to fair wages
- No forced labor
- No child labor
- Women’s rights: No person shall be subject to any discrimination in employment, including hiring, salary, benefits, advancement, discipline, termination or retirement, on the basis of gender, race, religion, age, disability, sexual orientation, nationality, political opinion, or social or ethnic origin.
- Freedom of association and right to collective bargaining
- Full public disclosure of factory addresses
- Willingness to submit to independent monitoring
- Compliance with all applicable anti-corruption laws
- Compliance with all applicable environmental laws
- Honesty and truth in discussions with regulatory agency representatives and government officials

College of Charleston expects affiliated vendors and institutional purchasers to conduct their business in a manner consistent with these principles, and to follow workplace standards that adhere to this Code of Conduct.

The Senate next began debate on the second motion made by the ad hoc Vendor Code of Conduct Committee: this motion, which combined items 2 and 3 presented to the Senate (see below), would endorse the proposal that the College join the Worker Rights Consortium and the Fair Labor Association, and that the Collegiate Licensing Company, which manages the C of C brand, include the C of C in its list of schools that require suppliers to meet certain workplace standards. The exact wording of the motion is as follows:

1. The College of Charleston should join the Fair Labor Association and the Worker Rights Consortium.

The Fair Labor Association (FLA) and Worker Rights Consortium (WRC) are the two leading monitoring groups who are trying to improve the working conditions in (mostly) garment factories that provide licensed apparel to colleges and universities. They operate differently from each other, in ways that we regard as
complementary; moreover, many colleges belong to both. (See Appendix 2.) The dues for each organization are 1% of our licensing revenue, which Auxiliary Services has agreed to pay out of their revenues.

2. The Collegiate Licensing Company (which manages the C of C “brand”) should add the College of Charleston to their lists of schools that require their licensed products be obtained from suppliers that meet workplace standards in specific areas: wages and benefits, working hours, overtime compensation, child labor, forced labor, health and safety, nondiscrimination, harassment or abuse, freedom of association and collective bargaining, and women’s rights.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics and Finance), noting that the dues for each organization are 1% of our licensing revenue, asked how much 1% amounts to. Mr. Peeples said it was $2,118 per year.

The Senate voted on the motion, which passed.

Motion to Require a Super-Majority to Change Gen-Ed Requirements

Mr. Blackwell read his motion that would require a two-thirds majority of the Faculty Senate for any changes to the Gen-Ed requirements: “I move we adopt the following Special Rule of Order for the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston: All changes to the Liberal Arts and Sciences General Education Requirements of College of Charleston shall require a two-thirds vote of the Faculty Senate.” The motion then received a second.

Speaker Kelly then informed the Senate that Mr. Blackwell’s motion, consistent with Robert’s Rules of Order, would require a two-thirds majority for it to pass.

Mr. Blackwell explained why he brought this motion before the Senate. He referred to the C of C catalog and said that p. 11 outlines the rules by which our students live. If we are going to change these rules, he said, then we should require a two-thirds vote. (Adding courses would not, however, require a two-thirds vote were his motion to pass.) In explaining his reasons for the motion, he began by saying that he found last year’s Gen-Ed discussion confusing, and thought that things would be clear by this year, but such has not turned out to be the case. He thought that the Senate should first have discussed the reasons for changing the current Gen-Ed system. He said, too, that he was concerned about process, noting that if wanted to add a class to the catalog he would have to follow a process that involves various committees as well as the Senate. But with the current Gen-Ed reform any Senator can make a motion on the floor of the Senate, which, if approved, could drastically change the Gen-Ed system. He found it troubling that such fundamental changes that would affect many people could be made by a small majority of the Senate. Fifty percent of the Senate plus one, he said, was not a sufficient level of consensus for making such potentially drastic changes. Two-thirds of the Senate would be a sufficient level. He concluded by saying that he wants to avoid a situation in which a new Gen-Ed system might fail by one vote short of a majority. That would be as bad as if it passed by one vote above fifty percent: more consensus, he stressed, is needed for such major changes.

Ms. Cormack said that she agreed with Mr. Blackwell. Mr. Parson said that he strenuously opposed Mr. Blackwell’s motion. What we have been doing, he said, is going through a process, a long process. He couldn’t imagine how we could make it any more deliberative. He argued,
too, that a simple majority is sufficient for changing Gen Ed. Any changes to Gen Ed will always meet with some opposition, and what the motion does is give too much power to a small minority to block change.

Mr. Nunan agreed with Mr. Parson, saying that if we pass the Gen-Ed proposals, the faculty can still vote them down: that’s an adequate check on the Senate. If the vote is close, then that will be a message to the Gen-Ed Committee to proceed cautiously—that’s another check. If we go to a two-thirds majority vote, we will never change Gen Ed.

Mr. Hopkins, speaking against the motion, said that significant change is difficult. He noted that we have gone through a lengthy and strenuous process, but that it has been a good one. A two-thirds vote, he said, gives too much power to a small group to kill change, and it is undemocratic. All have been welcome to participate in the Gen-Ed reform process, but Mr. Blackwell’s motion tries to change the rules in the middle of process. In response, Mr. Phillips said that a two-thirds vote is required for approval of the Gen-Ed Steering Committee, and that this fact was presented to the Senate last spring as a decision for or against the Gen-Ed reform package; therefore, in that respect, Mr. Blackwell’s motion doesn’t change the rules in the middle of the process.

It was now 7 p.m., the scheduled end of the meeting. The Senate adjourned. Debate on Mr. Blackwell’s motion is scheduled to resume at the next regular faculty meeting on 4 December.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary