Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 11 November 2008

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 11 November 2008, at 5:00 p.m. in Wachovia Auditorium. After Speaker Joe Kelly called the meeting to order, the minutes of the 7 October 2008 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens announced her retirement and read the following statement:

When I was interviewing for this position in the spring of 2003, then-President Higdon asked me if I planned to go on from a provost’s position to seek a presidency. I said I did not know but that I would not feel I had failed to fulfill my goals if I were to end my academic career as a provost. And that is what I am about to do. I have informed President Benson that I wish to retire as provost, effective June 30, 2009. At that time, I will have been in academia for 32 years, 17 of them as an administrator, and the last six as your provost here at the College of Charleston. It sometimes seems as though I just got here, but actually six years turns out to be a fairly lengthy tenure for a provost; I read recently that almost 45% of provosts nationally leave the job in three years or less!

I am not going to recount my accomplishments. Some days, as I head home after a day in which I have not even left the desk, I wonder whether I have accomplished anything at all! I can say, though, that while I had the usual faculty member’s concern about going over to the dark side, I have generally found academic administration both consuming and rewarding. I used to say to candidates for department chair positions that I thought the greatest challenge for faculty members going into administration was to put aside the need for personal accomplishment and learn to take pride in the accomplishments of others. That is what my job is really all about – your accomplishments, the accomplishments of students, and of alumni, and of course the overall performance of the College. If I am doing my job well, all of you will succeed. So as I contemplate stepping out of this role, I have much to be proud of. The College of Charleston is a great university and getting better – and better known – all the time. Our students are excellent, and reading the College Magazine about the things our alums are doing is quite simply inspiring. But it is faculty accomplishment that is nearest and dearest to me, and it is no exaggeration to say that you, the faculty of the College of Charleston, as devoted educators and scholars, have made my job here enormously gratifying.

I will, of course, still be here and working hard for this year. I would not have chosen to have to reduce budgets as my swan song, but the retirement has been lurking there for longer than the budget crisis. After I retire from the provost’s office, I will stay on with the College for one more year, on a reduced schedule. President Benson tells me there is a lot I could help out with, and I think that year of transition will be good for me too.

One of my accomplishments I will mention, because while it might seem now like a self-serving one, it is an area in which I hope to continue to make a contribution. That is the status and conditions of retirees. Some of you are aware that a year or so after I got here, I convened a group of retirees and near-retirees to advise me on this. It seemed to me that retirees here were a neglected group. Needless to say, they agreed,
and we have, in fact, made some progress in matters such as securing of on-going e-
mail accounts for emeritus faculty, and my office now does a retiree recognition
dinner for all retired faculty members and their spouses. But I think there are other
ways in which the College could continue to provide a supportive environment and, in
turn, ways in which retirees can contribute to the on-going strength and culture of the
institution. I hope to be able to provide some emeritus leadership, if you will.

And in the meantime, it’s those two grandchildren. They have made very clear that
they are not going to wait to grow up until I am ready, so I just have to accommodate
them!

President George Benson next thanked Ms. Jorgens for her work as provost, noting also that
she has met the difficult challenge of working with three very different presidents of the
College. He thanked her also for her great help to him in making the transition to the College.
President Benson pointed out that Ms. Jorgens has been more than a provost while at the
College and taken on the duties of general counsel, which has been an enormous burden.

President Benson then recognized a number of Provost Jorgens many accomplishments,
which included some of the following:

--Creating the Office for the Academic Experience
--Developing new student programs, such as the Freshman Seminar and First-Year
   Experience
--Initiating a review of General Education
--Focusing on Charleston as a learning environment
--Developing retention strategies and an enrollment plan
--Developing a merit-review process and an accountability plan
--Reviewing and developing a teaching-load plan
--Merging Institutional Research and Academic Affairs
--Organizing a space planning committee
--Helping in the creation and development of the School of Languages, Cultures, and
   World Affairs

President Benson also said that Provost Jorgens has promoted high standards for teaching and
scholarship, and done a great job in “holding the President’s feet to the fire” in supporting
academic quality. The President said that Provost Jorgens would continue to help with the
strategic plan. He concluded by formally thanking Provost Jorgens.

Next, President Benson said he would be happy to answer questions, if Senators had any.
One Senator asked whether more budget cuts were likely. The President said they were very
likely, especially given the fact that tax revenues are down farther than expected.

Rob Dillon (Biology) asked how the budget situation would affect hiring. President Benson
said that there would be a hiring slowdown, but not a hiring freeze. He added that the out of a
total budget approaching $200 million the state’s contribution was about $32 million, but that
has been cut to $28 million, which amounts to nearly a 2.5% drop in the overall budget.
“This is bad,” the President said, “but not catastrophic.” We will continue, he added, to make
new hires in critical areas, but each hire will be reviewed by the Executive Team. Some hires
will happen, some won’t.

Mr. Dillon followed up by asking whether departments should go ahead with their searches
for new faculty. Mr. Benson said that each department should consult with its dean. Provost
Jorgens echoed Mr. Benson’s response and added that the Academic Affairs Office has
developed plans with various departments. She also stressed that the most important hires are
faculty hires. They have priority.
Mr. Benson added that the College is not looking at furloughs or layoffs. Things are not that bad. He also said that he does not think the funding cuts will do long-term damage to the institution. However, he was concerned that people aren’t standing up and publicly speaking for higher education in the state. The business community, for example, has been largely silent, but needs to speak out for higher education. While there does seem to be a tendency in the state to support K-through-12 education, he said that K-12 is linked to higher education forming one integrated system. All parts of that system, he stressed, need to be protected. The President also reported that he had recently come back from a conference where strategies for dealing with these issues were explored.

Addressing the need to speak up for higher education, one Senator said that the College’s Board of Trustees should be doing this. However, the Trustees, he pointed out, are appointed by the legislature, the very body that doesn’t strongly value higher education. The system thus produces a kind of vicious circle. The President replied that the point was valid, but that he found our Board to be strong supporters of higher education. He said, too, that he prefers a trustee system (in which board members are elected by the legislature) to a regents system (in which the governor appoints board members). When asked what could be done about this vicious circle, he said that faculty could encourage advocates for higher education to run for trustee positions.

Darryl Phillips (at-large) asked about when the search for a new provost would begin. President Benson said that it would probably begin in January 2009, and that Provost Jorgens has agreed to stay on until a new provost is found.

Returning to the issue of the budget and public funding for the College, the President said that state support has gone up and down over the years, but that the long-term trend, which mirrors the national trend, is that state funding is dropping. State support is now down to about 14%. We need, he continued, to think about “the end game”—how everything ends up in terms of the financial situation of the College and how the College sustains itself financially. He expressed his hope that the strategic plan would develop a more stable economic model for financially operating the College.

**The Speaker**

Speaker Kelly personally thanked Provost Jorgens for her work over the years at the College. He said also that she has been a strong advocate for the faculty, often behind the scenes where such advocacy counts the most.

The Speaker referenced his newsletter and said that the bulk of his report could be found in the most recent issue. He only wished to add that a survey is underway to assess the campus climate for gays. He said that his unsuccessful work on seeking equal benefits for gay faculty and staff led him to see that there might be a campus climate problem. He added that he has met with faculty about such issues, and invited anyone interested to join him in working on them.

**Deanna Caveny, chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Fac/Admin. Manual**

Ms. Caveny first mentioned that the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM) had recently been taken down from the Web site, edited, and re-posted in order to remove sections that indicated faculty members could be on disciplinary leave with pay. Ms. Caveny announced that the section in the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM) concerning payment to faculty, staff, and students from grant funds needs to be revised. She next reported that the name change of the Honors Program to the Honors College will be voted on for approval by the faculty. She also mentioned that Richard Nunan would be making a proposal to change the policy
regarding extra-departmental members serving on departmental tenure and promotion panels, and that more editorial work on the tenure and promotion section of the FAM is needed, for instance, to eliminate some redundancy and to better integrate language that was added for instructor and senior instructor positions. Ms. Caveny then reported that her committee had reviewed the motion to amend the duties of the Academic Planning Committee (the next item on the agenda) and recommends passage of the motion. She also reported that an ad hoc committee has been formed to review the duties, procedures and policies of both the Faculty Hearing Committee and the Faculty Grievance Committee, and to recommend possible changes to those committees, including the possibility of combining them. Ms. Caveny next announced that language explaining merit and annual evaluations has been posted on the Academic Affairs Web site. She added that when the final form of that language is approved, it will be in the administrative portion of the FAM. Her committee is also looking at the issue of faculty responsibilities to accommodate students observing their religious traditions. Such responsibilities may eventually be outlined in the FAM.

Unfinished Business

Motion to amend the duties of the Academic Planning Committee

Ms. Caveny explained that this motion was originally made by Hugh Wilder in the 1 April 2008 special Faculty Senate meeting devoted to Gen Ed, that her committee (By-Laws and FAM Committee) was required by the by-laws to review the motion, and that the committee recommends that it be approved with some slight re-formatting. The text of the original motion and its modified form follow below [note: the original motion refers to Art. IV, Sect. 2.B.1.b of an earlier version of the FAM, which has become Art V, Sect 2.B.1.b in the revised FAM].

Current Motion: Revise Faculty By-laws to remove general education oversight from Academic Planning Committee

Duties: To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the College, including general education programs. To this end, the committee shall …

Original Motion: Revise Faculty By-Laws to change the duties of the Academic Planning Committee. (The original motion was proposed by Hugh Wilder at 1-Apr-08 Faculty Senate meeting devoted to general education proposals.)

Revise the Faculty By-Laws, Art. IV, Sect. 2.B.1.b as follows:

Duties: To consider and recommend long-range academic programs and goals for the College. [DELETE THE NEXT PHRASE IN THE ORIGINAL: “INCLUDING GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.” THE TEXT OF THE SECTION WILL THEN CONTINUE WITH NO CHANGES.]

Paul Young (Mathematics), speaking against the motion, said that as chair of last year’s Academic Planning Committee he had given his opinion on the motion when it was sent to the By-Laws and FAM Committee. He argued that it was not necessarily a good thing that the phrase “including General Education programs” be deleted from the Academic Planning Committee’s duties. He didn’t see a compelling reason why Academic Planning shouldn’t review things connected to Gen Ed.

The Senate voted on the motion and it passed.
New Business

A proposal to change the extra-departmental panel member workload policy with respect to departmental T&P panels

Richard Nunan, chair of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, proposed on behalf of his committee the following motion to change the policy regarding extra-departmental panel members on departmental tenure and promotion panels.

The beginning of paragraph 3 of Manual section M.4 now reads:

When the department consists of five or more tenured faculty members, one tenured faculty member from outside the department shall be added to the panel. If a department is reviewing more than one candidate for tenure, promotion, or third year evaluation, the same individual from outside the department sits with departmental panel members for all cases.

The Committee proposes the following modification of this language, to go into effect in the 2009-10 Manual and evaluation cycle:

When the department consists of five or more tenured faculty members, one tenured faculty member from outside the department shall be added to the panel. If a department is reviewing more than one candidate for tenure, promotion, or third year, the same individual from outside the department sits with departmental panel members for all cases, unless the department has six or more candidates due for panel evaluation. In such cases, a single extra-departmental panel member is still preferred, but at the discretion of the panel chair and panel, the department may appoint no more than two extra-departmental panel members to sit with the panel in different cases, with the cases divided in such a way so that a single extra-departmental panel member must serve in all cases under review for the same rank.

Meg Cormack (at-large) seconded the motion. Mr. Nunan then explained that the proposal arose in light of recent requests from two departments. He said that the proposal was designed to accommodate large departments that sometimes have trouble recruiting extra-departmental panel members because of the amount of work and time involved in reviewing large numbers of candidates. He stressed, however, that should the motion be approved the intent of the committee was that in cases where departments did recruit more than one extra-departmental panel member, one member should review the same category of candidates up for review, the other extra-departmental member should review another category of candidates. He added that since submitting the motion to be put on the Senate agenda, his committee has slightly modified the motion (though none of the changes is significant), and that the revised version will be what the Senate will vote on.

Speaker Kelly said that because the motion involved a change in the FAM, the by-laws required that the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty/Administrative Manual review the proposed motion. The Speaker therefore remanded the proposal (in the revised form) to the By-Laws and FAM Committee for review.

Resolution Regarding the Illegal Immigration and Reform Act

Tim Carens (English) moved that the Senate endorse following resolution.
WHEREAS, the 2008 Illegal Immigration Reform Act (A280, R327, H4400) requires South Carolina’s public institutions of higher education to prevent illegal aliens from enrolling; and

WHEREAS, we have seen no evidence, neither statistical nor anecdotal, of illegal aliens enrolled at the College of Charleston, which renders this requirement more symbolic than material; and

WHEREAS, we know that the cost of bringing the College of Charleston into compliance with this requirement will be significant; and

WHEREAS, in these difficult economic times, the state is seeking to cut unessential expenses; and

WHEREAS, the legislature has not appropriated any money to pay for this provision of the law, and

WHEREAS, the legislature has just ordered the College to cut $4.9 million from its 2008/2009 budget, and

WHEREAS, the symbolism of this requirement, which publicizes the exclusion of a class of residents, harms the spirit of a public university; and

WHEREAS, to demand proof of citizenship of every student unnecessarily inconveniences those students and offends the liberty to which they are entitled; and

WHEREAS, if the Act were successful in excluding anyone, those likely to bear the brunt of its provisions would be the children of undocumented workers; and

WHEREAS, the children of undocumented workers are not responsible for their immigration status; and

WHEREAS, such children are likely to be poor, and the purposeful exclusion of the poor from higher education would contribute unintentionally to the perpetuation of an underclass within our borders; and

WHEREAS, symbolic gestures of exclusion are unbecoming a great people;

WE, the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston, THEREFORE ask the President of the College of Charleston to work with the legislature for the repeal of that portion of the Illegal Immigration and Reform Act that deals with “Illegal immigrations and higher education” (Section 17).

Ms. Cormack seconded the motion. Mr. Carens remarked that the Illegal Immigration and Reform Act largely represents political symbolism. But even if one assumes that it really seeks to address a documented problem—that "illegal aliens" are attending our college and that they are absorbing benefits to the detriment of the state—the issue has already been addressed by the Supreme Court in 1982 in relation to K-12 public education. The logic of that ruling, Mr. Carens argued, extends to higher education. In Plyler V. Doe, the court held that a “Texas statute which withholds from local school districts any state funds for the education of children who were not ‘legally admitted’ into the United States, and which authorizes local school districts to deny enrollment to such children, violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment” (210-230). Mr. Carens then quoted Justice Brennan, who wrote for the majority in the case:
the Texas statute imposes a lifetime hardship on a discrete class of children not accountable for their disabling status. These children can neither affect their parents' conduct nor their own undocumented status. The deprivation of public education is not like the deprivation of some other governmental benefit. Public education has a pivotal role in maintaining the fabric of our society and in sustaining our political and cultural heritage; the deprivation of education takes an inestimable toll on the social, economic, intellectual, and psychological well-being of the individual, and poses an obstacle to individual achievement. In determining the rationality of the Texas statute, its costs to the Nation and to the innocent children may properly be considered.

Rob Dillon (Biology) offered an amendment to the motion. He said that he thought the first six premises of the motion were fine and he approved of them, but not the other premises, which he thought were hyperbolic and "nonsense." His proposed amendment received a second.

The Senate voted on the amendment to the motion, which failed.

Mr. Dillon, in response to the excerpt of the Supreme court ruling that Mr. Carens read, said that he didn’t see how that ruling was relevant to the motion, since that ruling did not deal with higher education, which, he stated, is a not a right, but a privilege. The state is just asking that those who attend institutions of higher learning to obey the law. Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) responded that though it is true that college students are not minors by the time they graduate, they are minors when they apply to and are admitted to college. In that sense, he said, the supreme court ruling read by Mr. Carens is relevant because the decision for most illegal immigrants to be in college is not principally theirs, but their parents. In that respect, they are not guilty of breaking the law as Mr. Dillon suggests. Therefore we should educate these students.

The Senate voted and endorsed the resolution.

Faculty Curriculum Committee

The following curricular proposals were approved without discussion:

Computer Science

New Minor--Computational Thinking
Change Course--CSCI 112 Communication, Technology and the Internet
Change Course--CSCI 420 Principles of Compiler Design
Change Course--CSCI 362 Software Engineering
Change Course--CSCI 320 Programming Language Concepts
Change Course--CSCI 380 User Interface Development
Change Course--CSCI 470 Principles of Artificial Intelligence
Change Course--CSCI 334 Data Mining
Change Course--CSCI 462 Software Engineering
Change Course--CSCI 332 Database Concepts
Change Course--CSCI 325 Declarative Programming Languages
Delete course--CSCI 130 Visual Basic for Applications

Discovery Informatics

Delete course--DISC 201 Introduction to Databases and Data. Mining
French

Change of Major--French and Francophile

German and Slavic Studies

New Course--RUSS 331 Business Russian
Change Minor--Russian Studies

The following proposals were next submitted for approval:

Latin American and Caribbean Studies

Change of Major--Latin and Caribbean Studies
Change of Minor--Latin and Caribbean Studies

Claire Curtis (Political Science) had a question about item #5 in the proposal form—“Justification for Change(s)”—for the Change of Major proposal. She said that she was not sure that requiring a disciplinary minor constituted an adequate grounding in a discipline. She gave the examples of minors in political science and computer science, which are not designed to give students a grounding in those disciplines. Doug Friedman (guest) responded that the proposal does not say that the same grounding will be provided in the minor as in the major. Also, he said that the addition of the Study Abroad component and the foreign language component should add sufficient familiarity with the discipline.

Mr. Krasnoff asked if there was a relevance requirement for the disciplinary minors. Is there, for instance, a list of approved minors? Or can students take any minor? He thought there should be an approved number of minors that were relevant to the major. Mr. Friedman said that there was no such list; the only requirement was that the minor be in a discipline (and not interdisciplinary), though there was the assumption that a set of disciplinary minors would naturally go with this major. Mr. Krasnoff replied that the requirements for the major did not make complete sense, and that they should be related to the field in a proper way. John Creed (Political Science) and Jeffery Diamond (History) also voiced concerns about the coherence of the major, and thought that it should be more in line with other majors.

The Senate voted on the two Latin American and Caribbean Studies proposals, which failed.

The following curricular proposals were approved without discussion:

Marketing and Chain Supply Management

Change of Major--BS International Business

Mathematics

New Course--MATH 445 Numerical Analysis
Delete course--MATH 545 Numerical Analysis I

The following proposals were approved:

Theatre

Change Minor--Scenography I
Change Minor--Scenography II
Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

The following curricular proposal was approved without discussion:

Proposal to Change a Graduate Program: MS in accountancy

Heather Tierney, chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, reported on some revisions to the Policies and Procedures for Graduate Certificate Programs. She said that the changes make the policies and procedures more transparent.

Constituents’ Concerns

Ms. Cormack said that she was concerned about the increase in bureaucratic paperwork and effort that would ensue from the requirements for annual and merit evaluation. She read the following statement that explained her concerns, and suggested that perhaps Provost Jorgens’ final contribution to the College could be the reduction of bureaucracy:

My concern is the implication of the increase in bureaucracy (especially that required by the new evaluation procedures at C of C) for department chairs. Even aside from these evaluations, the duties of chairs, during the 14 years I have been at the college the work-load of chairs has gone from bad to worse, and has not, been compensated in terms of additional time (further course releases) or money. I do not count the two additional months pay chairs receive: they work for that (and work hard) and those months are not ‘extra’ pay, but rather (in my opinion) an inadequate compensation for the time taken away from the teaching or research which most of us would prefer to do during the summer. To quote a chair whose term finished about 2 years ago - and who at that time was NOT required to write annual evaluations for every member of the department ‘not only does it eat up every minute of time during the semester, it completely wipes out the summer’

A chair must by definition put her research program on ‘hold’, and it is also unlikely that she would be able to do much in the way of development in the area of teaching. Given the current evaluation procedure, individuals whose contributions are essential to the administration of the institution are likely to be excluded from the ‘high’ or ‘outstanding’ ratings which they so amply deserve. Becoming chair involves a huge increase in duties and responsibility that is not, at present, recognized in any concrete form.

Present chairs are stuck with this situation; the problem will become critical when they step down. There is absolutely no incentive to become chair; my senior colleagues observing the situation are for the most part saying ‘not on your life’ or using even stronger language. Unless something is done to rectify the conditions of chairship, it is unlikely that anyone will willingly take on the job, which is likely to be imposed on newly promoted associates who have not yet realized that it is, in fact, possible to say ‘no’ when asked to perform an onerous and thankless task, and who may not realize that they are writing off any chance to do research in the period of their tenure. The college will find itself in a major administrative crisis a few years down the road. I would like to urge the administration to address this situation now, rather than waiting for that crisis. Perhaps a solution to this pressing problem could be the Provost’s legacy to the college.

Next, Mr. Krasnoff asked if the Budget Committee was playing any kind of role in making decisions on budget cuts. Norris Preyer (Physics/Astronomy and chair of the Budget
Committee) said that committee members had attended various meetings on budget issues, but have not been involved in decisions about budget cuts.

On a different topic, Deanna Caveny (at-large) said that she would like various committees to look at the language concerning annual and merit evaluations that will go into the FAM. Speaker Kelly said that he would see to this request and invited all faculty and departments to review such language and to provide input so that it could be brought before the Academic Forum.

Provost Jorgens, in a response to Mr. Krasnoff’s earlier question about budget cuts, said that no decisions on cuts have been made. Decisions on cuts will be discussed and “come up” from the faculty to the administration, and will not be imposed from above. No one, she continued, has been excluded in this process. Indeed, faculty and departments especially need to be involved in setting priorities.

Continuing the discussion on budget decisions, Todd McNerney (at-large) asked about a form that had been circulated that listed the key decision makers. The Provost explained that the form referenced means that all on the list have approved certain budget items as a priority. Provost Jorgens again emphasized that everybody needs to be involved in these discussions. She does not want vice-presidents to make all the decisions on budget cuts; faculty must be involved in establishing priorities.

Mr. Diamond asked if the faculty could have representation in the final decisions on budget cuts. Provost Jorgens responded that she is that representative. She added that all members of the Executive Team see faculty appointments as priorities. Steve Osborne, for example, Sr. VP of Business Affairs, is a staunch supporter of academic positions.

With its business concluded, the Senate adjourned at around 6:15 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,

Terence Bowers
Faculty Secretary