Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 3 December 2013

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, 3 December 2013 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order: 5:08 PM
2. 5 November 2013 Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.

3. Reports
   A. The Speaker

   The Speaker reported receiving a constituent concern email after November’s meeting regarding the status of the MBAD 500 course in the Master of Business Administration, which the senate did not delete at the October meeting (see 1 October minutes, 4. a.). According to Penny McKeever, Associate Director of Graduate Programs, all of the MBA students are registered for the course in the spring and corrections have been made to the School of Business website.

   The next Faculty Senate meeting will be on Tuesday, Jan. 14. Agenda items for that meeting are due by Thursday, Jan. 2. The Speaker advised those serving on committees to make sure their committee chairs know of the deadline.

   The ad for the President position has now been posted in The Chronicle of Higher Education. The ad has also been sent to other venues, all of which are online, to attract as wide and diverse a pool of candidates as possible. These additional venues include: Inside Higher Ed, Diverse Jobs Search, The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education, American Conference of Academic Deans, and Women in Higher Education.

   The deadline for applications is January 14, 2014. The search committee will review applications and hopes to make recommendations to the Board for “airport interviews” of candidates by the end of January and then to conduct the airport interviews in early- to mid-February. After the interviews are concluded, the committee will recommend to the Board the candidates to be invited for full interviews, with the hope that all interviews will be concluded before spring break. According to what she has heard from the Chair of the Board of Trustees, the Speaker reported that there will not be any on campus candidate visits during spring break week.

   The College has posted a Presidential Search webpage on the College’s website. Information including the position ad and prospectus/search profile are available on the College’s website, as well as on the AGB Search website (http://agbsearch.com/searches/president-college-charleston). The College page will be updated periodically.

   The Speaker noted that the December commencement ceremony will be next Saturday, December 14, at 2:00 in TD Arena. All faculty are encouraged to attend and should assemble in regalia by 1:30. The ceremony will be approximately 90 minutes, and there will be a reception immediately following.
B. The Provost

See the Provost’s Powerpoint slides

The Provost apologized for the 15 letter-sized flyers that were posted on campus promoting student course evaluations that many at the College found very offensive. He reported attending a public meeting organized by the Black Student Union soon after to discuss the matter. The Provost called this an error in oversight in his office, and assured the Senate that his office has taken corrective actions to make sure it never happens again. He said that his office apologizes and will continue to do so.

The Provost noted that the College is moving forward on a number of diversity issues and programs to promote diversity. He noted the success of SPECTRA and the summer project program. Additionally, this year, the African American freshman retention went up from 77% to 87%.

The online student evaluation response rate, the Provost noted, is currently at 35%, which is an improvement over past years at this same time. Some incentives will be offered to students, and it is possible that there may be faculty incentives as well. A committee is working on improving the response rate, and the President also remains very attentive to the issue. The Provost noted that we are interested not only in increasing the response rate, but also in “increasing the meaningfulness of the data that is gathered.”

On Deans searches, the Provost reported that, after three on-campus candidate interviews, the final input from library dean search committee is expected soon. For the Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs position a deadline has been posted. There is a relatively short timeline for the process, review of applications begins on January 8, with the goal of having a new Dean on board in the summer.

The Provost noted that earlier in the day, there was a campus-wide meeting on the planned renovations of the Rita Liddy Hollings Science Center and the planned demolition and reconstruction of the Physician’s Memorial Auditorium. These efforts grow out of the campus master plan from a few years back. That plan, among other things, revealed that the College is over a quarter of a million square feet short of needed instructional space. The plan has two phases. A slide included in the Provost’s Powerpoint slides (#3), shows a campus map and lists eight projects in phase one of the campus plan. Items with an asterisk are likely to be completed in the next three-to-four years, and some items are already scratched off the list (item 5, for instance, a 350-bed residence hall, the need for which has been satisfied by the new facility planned by private developer Anthony McAllister).

The Science Center renovation will cause disruption for two years. The Physician’s Memorial rebuild will include two additional stories to accommodate faculty and departmental offices. The Provost describe the project as “massive.”

Additionally, a planned Jewish Studies expansion will provide much needed instructional space.
The Provost asked for patience during the renovation/expansions. Disruptions will occur, including the need to move some faculty office off campus. The Provost promised continued updates during the process.

Questions

The Speaker, noting that video cameras were present at the meeting he reported on, asked if a video recording of the meeting would be available on the Academic Affairs website. The Provost said it would and that as soon as the video and slides have been posted, he will notify the campus through email.

C. Vince Benigni, Faculty Athletics Representative - NBC Learn Initiative

Benigni reported that the presidents of the Colonial Athletic Association (CAA) last year voted to buy into NBC Learn, a video library and repository of shared materials that, as a result, the College, too, will be able to access soon. The materials will be useful to students doing research and faculty developing lectures and teaching materials.

In the near future, more information will be forthcoming to the campus community about NBC Learn.

Lynn Ford noted that NBC Learn would be available through the library’s website in the same fashion as other databases. Information on NBC Learn should come out in time for faculty to make use of it in course planning for the spring.

Benigni also reminded the Senate that the CAA sponsors an annual undergraduate research conference and that offices of the President and the Provost have offered to sponsor up to 10 students to go. Trisha Folds Bennett, Dean of the Honors College, will be responsible for selecting the projects that will be funded for the conference.

Questions

None

4. Old Business: Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual

A. Motion to Exclude Faculty Faculty Members Currently under Post-Tenure Review from the Post-Tenure Review Committee. Change to By-laws Article V, Section 3, B 15 a 5

Paul Young introduced both motions and noted that, as originally posted on the Senate website prior to the meeting, the motions were not correct, but that the motions as displayed on the screen were correct.

Discussion

None

Decision

The motion passed.
B. **Motion** to Exclude Faculty Members Currently under Promotion Review from the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review. Change to By-laws Article V, Section 3, B 7 a 5

**Discussion**

None

**Decision**

The motion passed.

5. **New Business**

A. **Faculty Curriculum Committee**

   (1) **Course Proposals**

   Dan Greenburg, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, noted that, as stated in the meeting agenda, all course proposal items would be voted on as a group, unless a Senator would like to discuss and vote on any of the items separately.

   - (a) **Change prerequisites**
     
     - **ASTR 210** - Black Holes in the Universe
     - **ASTR 311** - Stellar Astronomy and Astrophysics
     - **ASTR 312** - Galactic and Extragalactic Astronomy
     - **ASTR 377** - Experimental Astronomy
     
     Change credit hours
     
     - **Change URST 401** - Independent Study, to variable-credit (1-3 hours)

   - (b) **Change course prefix**
     
     - **Move MGMT 445** - Seminar in Entrepreneurship, to ENTR 445 - Seminar in Entrepreneurship

   - (c) **Change course number and/or prerequisites**
     
     - **Renumber URST 201** - Introduction to Urban Studies, to URST 101
     - **Renumber BIOL 396/PHYS 296** - Biophysical Modeling of Excitable Cells, to BIOL 396/PHYS 396; change prerequisites
     - **Renumber ASTR 206** - Planetary Astronomy, to ASTR 306; change prerequisites

   - (d) **New course proposals**
     
     - **THTR 288** - Selected Topics in Theatre: Literature and Criticism
     - **THTR 488** - Selected Topics in Theatre II: Literature and Criticism
HONS 121 and 122 - Colloquium in Ancient/Medieval/Early Modern Western Civilization, History Component & Humanities Component, respectively (to replace HONS 120D - Honors Colloquium in Western Civilization)

HONS 131 and 132 - Colloquium in Western Civilization: The Modern Self in Art, Thought, and Action History Component & Humanities Component, respectively (to replace HONS 130D - Honors Colloquium in Western Civilization)

ASTR 231 - Introduction to Astrophysics

AAST 290 - Special Topics

AAST 305 - Visiting Artist Practicum

AAST 315 - Black Women Writers

HTMT 310 - Current Topics in Hospitality and Tourism Management

(e) Course deactivations

MGMT 319 - Creation of New Business Enterprise (replaced by already-existing ENTR 320)

Discussion

None

Decision

All the motions above passed.

(2) Program Changes

(a) Change ASTR BA major, ASTR BS major, PHYS major, ASTR minor to incorporate above changes

(b) Change AAST major to incorporate above changes

(c) CRLS: Add POLI 310 - Urban Applications of Geographic Information Systems (GIS), to minor

(d) POLI: Add POLI 102 - Contemporary Political Issues, to list of electives in major

Discussion

None

Decision

All the motions above passed.

(3) Motion to change the method by which curricular proposals are approved by the Senate

Introduction
Greenburg noted that, for the most part, there is not much discussion in Senate meetings on the business of the curriculum committee. Additionally, as meeting agendas grow longer with the progress of the year, an increasing amount of time is dedicated to the Curriculum Committee Chair's standing before the Senate to present motions that will not garner any discussion. This seems inefficient. Curriculum Committee proposals, Greenburg stated, have already been vetted at a number of levels before they reach the Senate floor. The present motion answers a desire felt by many to focus the Senate's attention on the most critical issues, while still allowing the Senate to retain control over curriculum. In essence, the motion states that the "big stuff" (new programs, changes to programs, policy, and the like) will always receive a Senate vote. Most of the other curricular proposals would be handled using a consent agenda, in which all items would be approved without vote, unless a Senator felt that an item needed separate discussion or the committee thought that a particular proposal merited further discussion in the Senate.

Greenburg noted that, though he has submitted a motion, a conversation prior to the meeting with the Parliamentarian, George Pothering, suggested other possible actions, and he asked the Parliamentarian to speak to that.

The Parliamentarian specified a couple options. Reading aloud the duties of the Curriculum Committee as established by the by-laws [Art. 5, Sect. 3 B 8 (b) 1], he noted that the by-laws do not specify how the committee is to forward its recommendations to the Senate. Thus, this could be left up to the committee.

On the other hand, he said, if the Senate wished to adopt something along the lines of the proposal at hand, the by-laws lend support in their specifying that "the Faculty Senate may establish and instruct such committees, standing and ad hoc, as may be necessary for the performance of its functions..." (Art. 4, Sect. 1 D).

Along these lines, the Senate could make a change to the by-laws themselves, in which case the typical procedure for doing so (review by the by-laws committee, etc.) would be necessary. But a change to the by-laws is not absolutely necessary, as the Senate can simply decide how it is going to do business in this context.

These options aside, the Parliamentarian observed, the Speaker, under Roberts Rules, could in theory conduct the entire Senate meeting under a consent agenda because she has the ability to move items through unanimous consent. An objection to unanimous consent could be used by a Senator to allow specifics to be pulled out and discussed.

So, the Parliamentarian observed, we have mechanisms already in place to move curricular (or any other) items in the way the proposal details, but if the Senate would like to formalize the procedure, then the motion on the floor can be debated.

**Discussion**
The Speaker asked that discussion be broken down into two aspects and discussed in turn: 1. the recommendation that the Curriculum Committee present their recommendations on a consent agenda, 2. whether or not the Senate wants to adopt the motion or discussion of other options for the method of proceeding with Curriculum Committee recommendations.

Paul Young, Senator - Mathematics, asked about section D. 1. of the motion, which reads

“In most cases, proposals to create or terminate programs are submitted as a bundle: for instance, proposals for new programs often involve new courses. These proposals will be voted on as a bundle, unless:

1. a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote...

Young asked when it might be that a Senator would isolate a specific proposal.

The Speaker replied that the Speaker could simply say, “With no objection, the items on the consent agenda will be approved,” and if, at that point, a Senator raised a concern and said she or he would like to discuss a particular course proposal, for instance, she or he could ask that the particular item be removed from the consent agenda and discussed separately.

Young followed up, asking if a guest would have the same privilege to pull an item out of the consent agenda.

The Speaker noted that a Senator would have to ask for the item to be removed from the consent agenda. A guest could ask a Senator to represent his or her concern by requesting that the item be discussed separately.

The Parliamentarian suggested that if a Senator knew ahead of time that she or he were going to want further discussion and debate on the Senate floor, by notifying the Speaker in advance, that Senator could have an item put on the regular order of business for a formal vote.

Greenburg added that curriculum committee agendas are sent out in advance, and a Senator or any concerned party can raise issues with the committee itself, that venue being the best for doing so, but this still wouldn’t preclude action on the Senate floor.

Heath Hoffman, Chair - Sociology and Anthropology, expressed support for the motion and appreciation for the effort behind the motion.

Darryl Phillips, Senator - Classics, observed that it only took about one minute to vote on the proposals brought by the Curriculum Committee at the present meeting, and if we structure items on the agenda as a group or package to approve, we can streamline the process and still maintain the Senate’s formal vote without undue loss of time. The motion, he argued, does not offer much time
savings, and if that is the case, he stated, he would be hesitant to go to a system that requires objecting to unanimous consent. With a grouped list, the Speaker could call for discussion, which would allow concerns to be expressed about particular items without a Senator having to formally object.

Irina Gigova, Senator - Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS), responded to Phillips, noting that Curriculum Committee items have not always been presented in a packaged way, and adopting the motion would allow procedures to be formalized.

Greenburg also replied to Phillips that the Curriculum Committee’s list at the present meeting was fairly short, but that the lists grow longer as the year moves on. Additionally, he argued, formal votes can easily become pro forma votes, and the motion would help focus discussion by encouraging Senators to consider carefully which items need further discussion.

Jon Hakkila, Chair - Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs, noted that his committee, its work being similar to that of the Curriculum Committee, also supports the proposal.

Brenton LeMesurier, Senator - Science and Mathematics (SSM), argued that, because we already have all the procedural tools to do what the motion suggests, we don’t require a formal motion for a specific committee’s work.

Phillips noted that, while he agrees with streamlining, we do not need a formal motion to streamline. Going back to Gigova’s point, he suggested that committees could draw up procedures that would ensure continuity. Similarly, procedures could be drawn up for the Speaker to hand on to future Speakers to ensure efficient operations. He asserted that juggling the agenda with the existing powers and rights that already exist for the Speaker and committee chairs can produce greater efficiency, and since this is possible, we should avoid, he asserted, the negatives of the consent agenda idea, which, among other things, would disallow knowledgeable, interested visitors from weighing in on issues without having to get a Senator to make a formal objection to a consent agenda.

The Speaker, at this point, noted that there is, in principle, general agreement on the idea of streamlining processes and asked that the Senate begin to discuss means of streamlining.

Phil Jos, Senator - HSS, recognizing that his point did not conform to the change in discussion the Speaker just asked for, noted that, in discussions of this proposal with constituents and other concerned parties, two issues emerged: 1. praise for the committee bringing the motion for efforts to separate important work of the Senate from the less important, and 2., while this motion could help lessen the load of the Senate, we also need to attend to the significant work burdens and process challenges of moving curricular proposals at the departmental and unit levels.
The Speaker, replying to Jos, suggested that his second issue might be taken up directly with Greenburg and the Curriculum Committee.

The Speaker then asked the Parliamentarian for a recommendation: should the motion, at this point, be brought to a vote?

The Parliamentarian, in reply, said that he thinks the key question is whether the process the motion describes should be in the form of a motion or not. One of the things that might happen if it is a motion and is approved is that further motions might be necessary later to make changes if problems crop up. But, if instead of a motion voted on by the Senate, the ideas in the motion were adopted as procedure by the committee and passed on to future committees (say, via a web page), it could have the same effect as a motion and be more easily adjusted as needed.

Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Vice President for Executive Administration, suggested that, since the two curriculum committees have endorsed the procedure, the Speaker could, within her powers, adopt the procedure outlines and evaluate it over time. Any changes needed, he agreed, in this scenario, would be far easier to implement, than if it were adopted as a special rule of order.

Greenburg stated that he is perfectly happy to precede as outlined by McGee, with the Speaker adopting the consent agenda procedure, and he added that the point of bringing the motion to the Senate was to have discussion on the procedure.

Bob Mignone, Chair - General Education Committee, noted that when he served as Speaker, Curriculum Committee items were often bundled, which is up to the person presenting it or up to the person running the meeting, but there is, he asserted, one clearly defined right of the individual member of the body to divide the question, and that, if he is right, he said, division does not require a second. This right of division would serve to allow individual Senators, he argued, to separate items for further discussion.

[The Parliamentarian subsequently, having consulted Roberts Rules, pointed out that division does, in fact, require a second and a vote.]

Jos asked “does it make sense for the Senate to direct the committee and the Speaker to do what they are already willing to do?”

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, stated that he gets nervous about formalizing streamlining because if the body gets accustomed to “sailing through” things, raising an objection will be like “yanking the emergency break on the train,” which may not sit well with a body that has an expectation of sailing through. He asked that the Senate not make the procedure any more formal than it already is.
Greenburg commented that there might already be a lot of “sailing through,” as it is, and though one might have to “pull the emergency break,” that might also be the appropriate role of the Senate.

Greenburg further stated that he is willing to withdraw the motion and defer to the Speaker in her powers.

The Parliamentarian added that the approach to matters of the Curriculum Committee (bundling, etc.) is, from what has been said by prior Speakers in the discussion, wholly up to the committee chair and the Speaker.

Hakkila asked if procedures need to be formalized within the committees.

Greenburg replied that his committee officially passed the motion, and that Hakkila’s committee might do the same.

Greenburg withdrew the motion. The Speaker then stated that beginning in the Spring she can present items on a consent agenda and if there are objections, individual items can be separated for individual discussions and votes. The procedure can be evaluated as we move forward and changed as needed.

Phillips, noted that in his review of the full edition of Robert’s Rules, “consent agenda” does not appear, and he wants to ensure that we do not use a procedure that does not exist in the rules. The agenda would still be, he pointed out, an agenda of items coming up for a vote. At the Speaker’s discretion, items can be moved for adoption by unanimous consent.

The Parliamentarian concurred with Phillips that “consent agenda” does not appear in Roberts Rules, and that the Speaker may move items for adoption by unanimous consent. What the procedure being debated would amount to, he asserted, would be unanimous consent applied to a selection of items: “consent agenda” is just our own terminology for this.

Discussion ended at this point.

B. Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee

(1) Combined 5-Year BS/MS in Computer Science

Introduction

Renée MaCauley, Graduate Program Director - Computer Science, took questions.

Discussion

Catherine Thomas, Senator - English, noted that the sample program of study in the proposal does not seem to include courses that satisfy History and First Year Experience requirements.
McCauley replied that advising would help determine which First Year Experience classes students should take. As to the History requirement, it does seem to be missing, an error which will be corrected.

Shaver pointed out some inaccuracies in acronyms used in the proposal.

**Decision**

The motion passed.

(2) Discussion of Graduate Programs

Hakkila noted that the graduate committee has been very interested in many of the discussions that have taken place and continue to take place regarding merger and becoming a comprehensive university because they impact the potential growth and expansion of graduate education at the College. In discussing these issues, Hakkila noted, several of the faculty concerned with graduate education have come to the conclusion that, as important as graduate education is to the College at present and to the future of the institution, the faculty and college as a whole have never really had a discussion about graduate education (by comparison, we have had major discussions about general education three times, Hakkila pointed out, in his time at the College). The consensus of the those on the Graduate Council, Graduate Curriculum Committee, and graduate program administration is that we lack clarity on many issues concerning graduate education at the College, including:

- What people feel are good programs to have.
- Why departments wish to have graduate programs (the reasons appear to be numerous).
- How graduate programs and undergraduate programs interact.

Thus, the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs will sponsor a series of graduate education discussion groups on campus (tentatively scheduled during the week of January 22, 2014). The purpose would be to entertain a variety of opinions and exchange ideas and generally to have a deeper discussion about graduate education than we have had before. Groups will be composed of a variety of people from different backgrounds. What is discussed in the groups will be gathered and given back to the community, the purpose of which is not to make decisions, per se, but to see where we currently are with graduate education and where we might go.

The Speaker asked Senators to take this information back to their constituents.

C. General Education Committee: **Motion** to Approve For General Education Status

(1) Humanities
**DANC 150** - Dance Appreciation  
**THTR 288** - Selected Topics in Theatre Literature and Criticism  
**THTR 488** - Selected Topics in Theatre II; Literature and Criticism

(2) **Social Science**  
**INTL 120** - Economics of Globalization  

**Introduction**

Bob Mignone, Chair of the General Education Committee, offered a package of the above four courses, and asked the Speaker to ask for unanimous consent to adopt them.

**Discussion**

None.

**Decision**

The courses were adopted under unanimous consent.

D. **Faculty Welfare Committee (Motions presented for discussion only before being automatically referred to the By-Laws Committee)**

(1) **Motion** to add adjunct faculty members to three faculty committees

(2) **Motion** to add three adjunct faculty members to the Faculty Senate

**Introduction**

The Speaker noted that these motions are presented for information and discussion at the meeting. They will go to the by-laws committee for further review.

Todd McNerney, Chair of the committee, noted that the general topic of adjunct representation emerged from a survey done two years ago. A subcommittee within the committee has been working on it for the better part of two years. He noted that Simon Lewis, Department of English and member of the committee, and adjuncts present at the meeting might help to answer questions, as well as Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker.

**Discussion**

Jason Coy, Senator - HSS, expressed support for the first, but expressed concerns about the second motion (to add three adjunct faculty members to the Faculty Senate), since the Senate may, at times, be dealing with promotion or personnel issues affecting adjunct instructors directly.

McNerney replied that he cannot speak to whether this particular issue came up in the committee’s discussions but that in his time as a Senator, he cannot recall a time when the Senate engaged with tenure and promotion issues, aside from discussing language in the FAM.
Coy replied that this is what he had in mind and that there was also a notable discussion between the President’s office and the Senate regarding tenure and promotion.

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM, asked how we would you set the “tenure” for adjuncts on committees, since they are hired on a semester to semester basis.

McNerney stated that the committee thought that there are some comparisons to be made between semester-to-semester adjuncts and non-adjunct instructors who serve on committees but may have to leave due to changing jobs or for other reasons. Also, the committee took into consideration that some adjuncts have been at the College for a long term (some far longer than even some of our tenured faculty), and that these would be the most likely to volunteer and get elected. The committee has not set any time limits, nor are there service length requirements (ex. 3 years) in the by-laws for any of the committees.

Darryl Phillips, Senator - Classics, expressed support for the general idea of the motions, but offered his reservations about how elections might work. The College, he pointed out, did away with College-wide elections for Senators, in part, based on the rationale that faculty might not know each other enough to make an informed decision. He suggested that this might be even more the case with adjunct faculty. So, he asked if it might work to have the nominations and elections committee solicit adjuncts to serve and assign them to committees. This might address the potentially very low turn out and low information voting that could occur with adjunct elections.

Additionally, speaking in favor of the general idea of the motions, Phillips noted that Coy’s objection might be addressed by the fact that the Senate has untenured faculty members who are involved in discussions about tenure and promotion. Phillips closed by stating that having adjunct faculty members on the Senate would likely enrich the Senate.

Beth Lloyd, Senator - Teacher Education, wondered if Visiting Professors might also be included in the Senate and on select committees, since many departments have visiting professors.

The Speaker replied by noting that adjunct and visiting faculty are different kinds of faculty and that the motions under discussion cover only adjunct faculty.

McNerney added that the Welfare committee has discussed the uniqueness of visiting appointments, in that some visiting faculty may be employed as such for a very long time, suggesting the inaccuracy, in those cases, of the nomenclature.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, asked if, in the case of the second motion, it makes sense to have one adjunct per school, instead of having only three from across the College. Having one adjunct representative per school might address the knowledge issue to some extent.
Caveny-Noecker, not speaking for or against Smith’s idea, asserted that it raises a logistical issue in that adjuncts are not treated as having a departmental “home” and it is possible that some adjuncts might have multiple “homes.” This might create some problems in generating election rosters.

Melissa Thomas, an adjunct, noted that adjuncts who helped with motion felt that they “didn’t want to push their luck,” and arrived at the number of three as a good compromise and starting point, taking into account the multiple “homes” individual adjuncts might have.

Hollis France, Senator - Political Science, suggested that one idea might be to have the three adjunct positions represent particular schools on a rotating basis.

Brian McGee, on behalf of President offered thanks to the Welfare committee for their important work, further stating that the President has sent multiple messages to the Senate asking for recognition of the importance of adjunct faculty colleagues, who do about 35% of the teaching but have no representation on committees (it is the only large employee group on campus without representation).

He also added that in the Staff Advisory Committee to the President (SACP), there is one seat available for a temporary employee. Recognizing the issues also previously raised in this discussion, SACP’s system allows the elected Chair to appoint a temporary employee to that slot. While there are many virtues to democratic processes, a simpler option along these lines might also be available.

Young asked what might happen if an adjunct holding a committee position in the fall semester were to not have a teaching appointment in following spring? Would she or she continue serving in the spring?

McNerney replied that the person would be replaced, similar to when a faculty member steps down mid-term.

In response to a question by Bob Mignone about the difficulty of selecting adjuncts for Senate appointments, McNerney clarified that the proposal to have three adjuncts representing all adjuncts at the College arose as a means of addressing the complication of potential adjunct multiple-membership in different schools. Among the difficulties in this scenario might be voting rights: does an adjunct teaching in three different schools, for instance, vote three times?

Smith expressed concern that adjuncts teaching in departments that use relatively few adjuncts might have very small chances for election. And, conversely, adjuncts from departments who use more adjuncts might be more likely to be elected. A school-based model of representation might alleviate this and ensure that all schools are represented.

Joey Van Arnhem, Library, noted that many staff members at the College serve as adjuncts as well and might offer a vital and energizing force, but they are on and off as faculty members.
Melissa Thomas asserted that we may be presupposing more interest among adjuncts in Senate and committee positions than there currently is. She suggested that we start with the motion as written and that, if we discover greater interest among adjuncts and/or that more representation is needed, we can make adjustments.

Jos asked those who worked on the motion or adjuncts who are present if they regard election or appointment as a better place to start.

Simon Lewis, member of the Welfare committee, spoke in favor of election as a key democratic principle, whereas appointment raises issues of representation.

Tony Leclerc, Senator - Computer Science, asked, in reference to the second proposal, if it is correct that to serve as a Senator tenure-track faculty have to have been at the College for three years [the Speaker affirmed this], and if so, if this raises an issue when considering adjuncts for membership in the Senate.

McNerney stated that, to his recollection, there was some discussion about a minimum amount of time at the College as a requirement for Senate service for adjuncts, but the committee did not add that to the motion. Personally, he added, it might be a good idea to consider that. He noted that adjuncts are compensated at a relatively low rate and are compensated for teaching only, not for service on departmental committees or service to the College. For an adjunct to get elected, he asserted, or to even nominate her- or himself, one would expect that person to have been around for a while. Yet it is possible that a person with little time in service could be elected, though unlikely: perhaps for that reason a minimum number of time employee at the College might need to be added.

Leclerc added, in reply, that the motion as written might allow adjuncts easier access to representation than is allowed some junior, tenure-track faculty members.

There was no further discussion.

The Speaker noted that the by-laws committee will bring these motions in some form back to the Senate in the spring, but, considering their meeting schedule, that will not be in January.

E. **Resolution** that Invited Guests and Committee Representatives Formally Addressing the Faculty Senate Provide Text of Comments One Week Prior to Faculty Senate Meeting, presented by Irina Gigova

**Introduction**

Irina Gigova explained that the resolution emerged from the work of an ad hoc group that has been thinking about ways in which to streamline the way that the Senate works and especially about how to promote more constructive discussion. The resolution asks that guests present to the Senate in advance reports or other information and to use their time on the Senate floor primarily for Q & A.
The motion was seconded by Jen Wright.

**Discussion**

LeMesurier said he agreed with the idea of the resolution but argued that the one week deadline for reports to be submitted should be changed to two business days.

France asked, since the resolution only mentions “text,” if the diversity of presentation formats had been taken into consideration in the drafting of the resolution.

Gigova replied that whatever form the report or information to be discussed is in, the idea would be to provide it in advance. Using Benigni’s presentation earlier in the evening as an example, Gigova stated that she would have appreciated an opportunity to review the website he discussed in advance of the meeting in order to think about it and potentially formulate questions or comments. The purpose of the resolution is to stimulate discussion. She also agreed that two business days in advance would be fine.

Jos stated that he supports the idea of posting materials two business days in advance to accommodate quick-moving issues.

LeMesurier offered a motion to amend the motion to replace the two occurrences of “one week” in the motion with “two business days,” and the motion was seconded by Shaver.

**Discussion on the amendment to the motion**

Dustan asked if the resolution could read “normally one week.”

The Speaker asked for clarification from Dustan. Since there was a amendment on the floor (to change “one week” to “two business days”), she asked if Dustan meant to speak against it, and he replied “yes.”

Meg Cormac, Senator - Religious Studies, spoke against the amendment because, she said, she would like to read materials over the weekend.

Phillips asserted that we have an agenda deadline for the Senate and that we ought to stick with that.

**Decision on the amendment to the resolution.**

A voice vote was inconclusive, so there was a division of the house. Nine voted in favor of the amendment to the resolution and more than nine voted against: the amendment to the resolution failed.

**Continued discussion of the original resolution**

Coy asserted that he agrees with the spirit of the resolution, but he expressed a concern that it might have a chilling effect on the information the Senate actually gets from the upper administration. Some remarks made on the floor of the Senate are more candid than they might if materials are distributed ahead of time, which might
also mean their winding up in the *Post and Courier*. Coy asked if “invited guests” in the resolution would include the Provost, for instance.

Gigova replied in the affirmative, but she asserted that the resolution allows room for sensitive information or information that cannot be shared in advance to be presented at the Senate meeting. If time limit becomes a problem, the Speaker always has the right to extend time as needed. She also reiterated that the purpose is not to preclude, but to open discussion.

Hoffman pointed out that Senate meetings are open, public meetings.

Greenburg spoke in favor of the resolution in the interest of giving Senators time to review materials before the meeting. Replying to Phillip’s argument that the Senate deadline agenda should be the time for reports or materials to be provided, Greenburg asserted that two weeks might be too long, since a lot could change between the distribution of materials and the day of presentation.

Leclerc asked, in the spirit of trying to understand the problem that the resolution is addressing, how submitting reports a week ahead of time would shorten the amount of time the Senate meeting takes.

Gigova replied that it limits the time for presentation and lengthens the time for discussion.

Leclerc asked “how?”

Senators, Gigova explained, would read reports in advance, rather than being delivered the information in the actual meeting. And guests, rather than delivering an entire report on the floor, would be offering highlights and any new information that has come to light, expecting that Senators will have read the report in advance.

Leclerc stated that the actual report is not shortened by the resolution, and Gigova replied by saying that while the reports from the floor at the present Senate meeting were relatively short, at times reports have run as long as a half hour. The resolution would shorten reports of that length delivered on the floor of the Senate in favor of having the information provided in advance.

Leclerc followed up by asking what sort of feedback might be provided to a guest who has submitted material in advance.

The Speaker at this point noted that the by-laws already specify that reports are to be limited to no longer than five minutes, though we do not always enforce that rule.

Leclerc asked, if that limitation is already there, “what’s the problem?”

Gigova replied that the difference is that the resolution asks that reports be submitted in advance, so that Senators and guests come to the meeting already having read the report and with questions possibly already formulated.
Mary Beth Heston, Senator - Art History, emphasized two advantages brought by the resolution. Senators can be better prepared, and it also allows more questions and discussion.

LeMesurier argued that we might start by enforcing the five minute time limit and asking those who have more to say than can be done in five minutes to submit a report ahead of time.

Shaver stated that he would like reporters from the Post and Courier to come to the meetings rather than just picking items up off the web.

McGee offered what he prefaced as “a couple of fairly unpopular points, given the tone and tenor of the discussion.” Article IV, Section 1 E. of the by-laws, he noted, specifies that the “Faculty Senate shall hear reports from and have the opportunity to question the President of the College and the Provost,” further stipulating that the first report will be early in the first semester, the second report, late in the second semester. It also states that “any written reports provided to the Faculty Senate by the President or the Provost shall be distributed by the Faculty Senate Secretariat to all faculty members.” McGee argued that, as the President and Provost are compelled to present reports by the by-laws, it is hard to construe them as guest invited to appear and give reports.

The by-laws also, he argued, do not require a report but only state that, if provided, reports re to be distributed.

Any President, McGee asserted, would make presentations of complex material in which facts might be changing rapidly and right up to the moment of the report on the Senate floor. A two-to-four minute time span would not meet the needs of such a presentation. It is, thus, inherently problematic to impose that limitation on a President, Provost, or invited guest on an important and time-sensitive topic.

McGee further asserted that one could argue that this is discourteous, since senators are not required by the resolution to have written remarks prepared a week in advance, yet invited guests are required to do so. He added that he does not think that the discourtesy of requiring advance written remarks of some members of the community but not others is “particularly fair” or “conducive to free and spirited and open debate or sends the right message about egalitarian and shared governance.” He concluded by stating that while he appreciates, whenever possible, the goal of providing information in advance, he does not support the spirit of the resolution.

Hoffman replied that the spirit of the resolution lies in having the President and Provost respect that the Senate is “not just a repository for information, not just ears,” to which he added that he cannot recall a presentation that the President has made to the Senate that included pressing, time-sensitive information. He characterized them, rather, as “canned speeches given to other bodies.” Also, he asserted that, even if the President and Provost are not “invited guests,” this does not mean that they cannot provide written texts ahead of time.
Hoffman then called attention to the section of the resolution that points out that the time limit can be extended by the Speaker as needed, and that the President and Provost’s reports might fall under that provision. Senators, he also noted, do not have to submit texts ahead of time, unless they are doing something like forwarding a resolution. Senators do not do anything like standing up giving speeches. The resolution asks that guest provide a report in advance to give Senators time to digest the information versus being told what could have simply been read in advance, providing the opportunity for a meaningful discussion.

Gigova interjected that a good example of the principle of the resolution was Larry Krasnoff’s report from the November meeting (see Minutes, 5. C.). While she felt he may have spoken a little too long, the provision ahead of time of a detailed PowerPoint slide deck with information and key questions worked well to stimulate meaningful conversation.

Phillips asserted that, while he supports the spirit of the resolution, he is not in favor of the resolution itself. By-laws, he observed, already address setting of agendas and time limits, and the resolution is similar to the Curriculum Committee’s motion from earlier in the meeting in that it seeks to establish operating procedure through motion, rather than through the by-laws. We, thus, do not require the resolution to achieve the ends of the resolution, which will, in turn, require the leadership of the Speaker and adherence to the by-laws.

Jen Wright observed that the resolution addresses less a “quantity issue” than it does a “quality issue,” whether or not we are using our time effectively. She stated that having a person present 30 minutes worth of material and then to have that be followed by very few questions, is also disrespectful of the presenter’s time. It would, thus, be worth the President and Provost’s time to provide materials in advance that would facilitate a lively and meaningful discussion so that however much time is put into the process, it is “good” time that maximizes the benefit to all of us.

The Provost suggested that it is important to think about what is meant by “report” or “speech.” He noted that the PowerPoint format he uses for his topical reports allows him to expand or clarify as needed, depending on the audience. However, he stated, if he were required to provide text more along the lines of a speech he would be likely to be much more circumspect. He noted that the Senate meeting is an open environment, but “the more we put things in digital format,” the more committed we might become to be “circumscribed and restricted in our conversations.”

Jos, referring to McGee’s comments, argued that the analogy between what Senators do as a matter of regular course and what a guest delivering a report might do is, as Hoffman pointed out, not the most telling. But there is an analogy when it comes to Senators giving committee reports or formal reports to fellow Senators. With that in mind, he asked the Speaker and Speakers past in the room what our “compliance rate” is in terms of submission of written reports.
The Speaker noted that in the past, we have not asked of committee chairs reporting to the Senate that they submit anything written in advance. The Speaker noted, however, that in November, she asked Larry Krasnoff to put together his Powerpoint slides in advance (see Minutes, 5. C.). In a related matter, committee chairs, the Speaker noted, are required to submit annual reports at the end of the year. Over the last two years, all committee chairs have submitted reports, and these have been posted online.

McGee pointed out that reports are labor intensive, which is worth considering when thinking about what the resolution would require. He added that given the amount of work that might go into a report, a future President, should she or he choose to be bound by the resolution's requirement, having gone to significant labor, would probably distribute the report to the entire campus and not just the Senate. Also, he claimed, there might be a chilling effect on the kind of and extensiveness of the information provided in such a report.

Dustan called the question. It was seconded and affirmed by vote.

**Decision on the resolution**

A voice vote was inconclusive, so there was a division of the house. 11 voted for the resolution and more than 11 against: the resolution failed.

F. Motion for the approval of degree candidates for the December graduation ceremony made by Provost Hynd.

The motion was presented by the Provost and passed.

6. **Constituents’ Concerns**

LeMesurier stated that some faculty are still confused about general education assessment and that it would be nice if a brief memo went out explaining it.

The Speaker asked Lynn Ford, if between the two of them (the Speaker and Ford) they can see that a memo goes out. Ford replied that, yes, yet another memo can be sent.

7. Adjournment – 7:09

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary