Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 4 Feb 2014

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 4 February 2014 in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order at 5:03 PM
2. 14 January 2014 Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.
3. Reports
   A. The Speaker

   The Speaker noted that the Provost reported that on Friday, January 31, the Board of Trustees approved a Distinguished Adjunct Faculty Teaching Award. This award will be given for the first time this spring with the other Distinguished Faculty Awards. She encouraged senators to consider nominating outstanding adjunct faculty members in their departments. Information about all the Distinguished Faculty Awards was sent out via email.

   The Speaker made a special appeal for faculty to volunteer for college service: “if we want and believe in the idea of shared governance, it is critical that faculty step and run or volunteer for service.” She pointed out that it is not unusual for there to be only one or two, and sometimes no one at all nominated for elected offices – Speaker of the Faculty, Faculty Secretary, and at-large Senators. Friday, February 7, she noted, is the deadline for nominations for at-large school senators.

   Additionally, she pointed out, for the past two years there have not been enough faculty volunteers to fill all the committee positions. We need faculty participation on faculty committees and we need a diversity of faculty: not just junior faculty, but senior faculty as well. She noted that, while we are all busy and have multiple responsibilities, faculty committees are responsible for much of the work that takes place on this campus and they provide a voice and sense of direction regarding the type of institution we are and want to be. “As senators, many of you are committed to serving the College; it is important to talk with your colleagues and to encourage them to also participate and serve in the Senate and on College committees. If faculty do not volunteer, we lose the opportunity we have to try to make a difference.”

B. The Provost (PowerPoint presentation)

   Merit & Market Raises – The Provost reported that 456 faculty received merit raises, another 263 received a market adjustment, all totaling about 2.3 million dollars. He stated that the next step in the process is to see if these raises have had an impact on our faculty salaries in comparison to peer-group institutions and to see how much
we have closed the gap. About 85% of the faculty received merit and market adjustments. This initiative, he noted, arose from the Faculty Senate, in concert with the Office of Academic Affairs.

CofC-MUSC Update - A month ago, the Provost reported, there was solid support for the introduction of a bill this year to merge the College and MUSC. There seemed to be support for at least introducing the bill in the House and, perhaps, a little support to carry those discussions forward; however, the enthusiasm for introducing such a bill, the Provost stated, has diminished somewhat. As it stands now, he said, it looks like a special committee may be formed to look into a merger. There are still individuals, however, who want to put in bill to merge the two institutions, but he characterized enthusiasm for it as “low.” MUSC’s interim President made a statement in his president’s report that MUSC was not opposed to working with CofC, but MUSC was very concerned about its brandmark, its esteemed history, and that they are in the middle of a presidential search, and merger discussions are very distracting at this time. MUSC’s interim President, nonetheless, supports working with CofC to explore how collaborations under some arrangement could contribute to the Charleston area economy.

The Provost stated that he does not believe we are moving at “light speed” toward a merger, but that we may be moving toward more discussions of structured collaborations of some sort.

Presidential Search – The Board of Trustees is moving forward with the Presidential search with a plan of getting three to five names for candidates to visit on campus. The Board is slated to meet on February 11 to get recommendations from the search committee.

Faculty Coordinator for E-learning and Distance Education – The Provost announced that Professor Doug Ferguson in the Department of Communication has agreed to coordinate e-learning and distance education for the College.

Mandatory training in sexual harassment and discrimination – The Provost announced that faculty and staff can expect email shortly from the President’s office detailing required training.

There were no questions.

C. Gia Quesada and Karen Smail – General Education Assessment

Quesada made the presentation. See the PowerPoint slides: amplifications of or additions to information in the slide deck are below.

Faculty were trained in workshops in developing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and subsequently identified 16 SLOs in seven different areas.
Objectives were aligned to curriculum through the process of re-certifying (old) general education courses. General education courses were reduced by 70% last year, but with some new courses added, we are currently at a 68% reduction from the prior numbers.

Quesada stipulated that we still do not have a very clear definition of general education.

Assessment Reading Groups (ARGs) were composed of 30 faculty members. Meetings of ARGs began with workshops for working with rubrics, calibrating scoring, etc. Quesada characterized the meeting as being a learning experience in which some flaws in the process were identified. The results from this first round of assessment, she said, may not be reliable because the ARGs found that the signature assignment descriptions were not aligned with the rubric that the faculty created.

ARG representatives will now go back to departments to help faculty with providing better directions to students, which will produce more reliable data.

Rubrics, SLOs, training videos, and other materials used in the assessment process can be found in OAKS under the student tab. All faculty have access. Results will be reported there as well.

We will use results to develop action plans for improvement.

20% of ARGs will be going to conferences and training in assessment. We are building capacity and developing an assessment culture.

Quesada asked Amy Kolek, Department of Psychology and member of the Social Science ARG, to speak a bit about the process. Kolek described it as a surprisingly smooth process, especially given the number of artifacts to assess. Additionally, she found the process to be valuable simply for bringing together faculty from different disciplines in the social sciences and learning from each other about similar goals for student learning.

Quesada noted that the process, to some extent, is about forgetting about one’s individual general education course in order to focus on the general education program as a whole.

Questions/Discussion

Bob Mignone, Chair – General Education Committee, congratulated Gia Quesada, Karen Smail, and Shawn Morrison on their work, noting that in his long service at the College, he has seldom seen such a high the level of dedication and competence. This comment was followed by applause.
There were no further comments or discussion.

D. Darryl Phillips and Hollis France - Campus Climate Survey Committee (PowerPoint presentation & Faculty Senate Report - PDF)

Please see the PowerPoint slides and fuller PDF format report at the links above.

Questions/Discussion

Shawn Morrison asked for a clarification as to who will be surveyed.

Phillips replied that the survey will go out to everyone in the campus community, anyone attending or working at the College, part- or full-time. The more participants in the survey, the better; the wider the participation, the better, too. The committee is especially concerned, noted Phillips, to get students to complete the survey, and he asked that faculty take a few minutes in each class to advertise it.

David Moscowitz, Senator - HSS, asked how long the survey will take to complete.

France and Phillips replied that the survey should take 15 to 30 minutes.

Jannette Finch, Senator – Library, asked if the survey would be pushed to mobile devices as well.

France replied that she would assume so, but for clarification, Phillips asked Jim Posey, Associate Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning, to field the question.

Posey replied that right now, the survey is not being set up for mobile devices.

Finch asked if it could be, and Phillips replied that the committee can recommend that.

Lance Foxworth, a student representative from the Student Government Association (SGA) attending the meeting, suggested that the committee make a presentation to the SGA. Phillips and France agreed that it would be a good idea.

Irina Gigova, Senator – HSS, asked if the survey can be saved in progress in order for users to come back to it should they be short on time.

Phillips said that the survey has to be completed in one sitting for anonymity purposes. Saving it in progress would mean saving an IP address as well, which can be traced.
Margaret Cormack, Senator – Religious Studies, asked if there is any way that the questions could be seen in advance to allow those who take the survey to consider them before beginning. This might reduce the time needed to complete it.

Phillips replied that the committee will explore that.

Kirk Stone, Senator – Communication, asked for an example or two of the questions that might be asked.

France said that one question is along the lines of, “have you ever thought about resigning from the College of Charleston?,” which goes to workplace environment. Phillips emphasized that there are a range of questions dealing with concerns like tenure and promotion processes for faculty, comfort level in classrooms or problems in living spaces for students. The survey is quite comprehensive, and includes opportunity for free responses, since the interest is in collecting information.

Marvin Gonzalez, Senator – School of Business, asked whether the data gathered will be made available.

Phillips replied that the intention is that reports based on the survey get widely circulated. The raw data, however, will not be distributed, but will be owned by the College and will be in the office of the Associate Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning. The reporting out process, he added, however, will be at the discretion of the new President.

E. Bob Podolsky - Recent Online Faculty Survey (PowerPoint presentation | Executive Summary | Responses | Faculty Survey Comments)

See the PowerPoint slides, Executive Summary, Responses, and Faculty Survey Comments at the links above. Below are amplifications on or additions to information in these sources.

Podolsky noted that he, for the purposes of reporting to the Senate, represents an ad hoc committee of the Chairs of the standing faculty committees. The ad hoc committee was originally convened in October as a way of increasing communication and coordination of duties across the standing committees, but the committee also took on other charges of their own, notably an effort to increase the faculty representation on the Presidential search committee, and now the effort represented in the report. The survey grew out of a concern that faculty attitudes may not actually be known on key areas of concern: potential changes to the mission of the College and value of the current mission, the model of institution the College of Charleston should follow, and future leadership of the College.

The survey, he noted, is far from perfect, but this is a compromise that needed to be made in order to execute it in a fairly short timeframe.
Podolsky noted that Speaker Cherry presented the findings of the survey to the Board of Trustees, and stated that free-form comments gathered in the survey needed to be redacted before being presented to the public, to eliminate identifying information and commentary that “might be seen as less professional.” Since these will be made public, it's important that the comments reflect faculty opinion in a dignified way.

Podolsky stipulated that in the Executive Summary reporting of the results, “agree” or “strongly agree” responses were grouped together under the heading “Agree”; similarly, “disagree” and “strongly disagree” responses were grouped together under the heading “Disagree.” “Neutral” and “I don’t know” answers were left off, for the purposes of reporting.

The Executive Summary also includes an index column that indicates the degree of agreement or disagreement. A negative value shows that people disagree more than they agree. A positive value indicates that people agree more than they disagree.

In the report’s section 2, “greatness” in question b is taken from speeches made by President Benson.

Podolsky, in concluding his report on the survey findings, commented that what might be done with the results of the survey is up to the faculty. The ad hoc committee has no charge regarding that. The data might serve a number of purposes, not the least of which, is to back positions the faculty might take on the important concerns addressed in the survey. These data provide a fuller perspective on faculty attitudes.

Questions/Discussion

Kelly Shaver, Senator – Management and Entrepreneurship, addressed a question to Speaker Cherry: did she get any particular vibe from the Board of Trustees when they received the results?

The Speaker replied that some of the results were presented to the Presidential search committee by Pam Riggs-Gelasco at a meeting on Jan. 24, and the board members on that committee were the first to get some of the information. The Speaker presented the survey data and the executive summary to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board at their meeting on Thursday, Jan. 30, and then she presented the information to the full Board of Trustees at their meeting on the following day.

The Speaker reported that after her presentation to the Academic Affairs committee, a member of that committee who is also a member of the Presidential search committee spoke to her and said that the Board needs to do a better job communicating to the faculty. He also, speaking for himself, said he does not believe that the Board thinks we should change the College’s mission. Better communication between the Board and the faculty, the member said, would help the faculty understand in what directions the board wants to go. Whether and how that will happen, the Speaker
said, she does not know.

At her presentation to the full board on Friday, Jan. 31, she said she noticed several board members nodding their heads as they looked at the information and heard her presentation of it. The Speaker said that her sense is that the Board is looking at this information, though she doesn't know what conclusions they might draw. She noted that she informed the board of the comments still to be redacted and provided and that several board members expressed interest in reading them. She expects that the board will find the comments insightful.

Irina Gigova, Senator – HSS, expressed thanks to the committee for their work. There was applause.

4. Old Business
   None

5. New Business
   A. Faculty Curriculum Committee, Chair - Dan Greenberg

Speaker Cherry reminded the Senate that, as was discussed in the December Senate meeting, we intend to be efficient in dealing with business such as the Curriculum Committee’s. The Speaker noted that no emails were received by her or Mike Duvall, Faculty Secretary, asking that individual items of the Curriculum Committee’s business be discussed and voted on separately, and she asked if anyone at the meeting wished to separate items under (1) for individual discussion and voting. There were no responses.

(1) Course Proposals and Program Changes
   (a) SOCY/ANTH, ARCH (all documents)
       Change prerequisites for ANTH 381 (Internship)
       Change prerequisites and credit hour range for ANTH 490 (Independent Study)
       Change credit hours and description for ANTH 493 (Field School in Archaeology)
       Change credit hour range for SOCY 490 (Independent Study)
       Change SOCY, ANTH, and ARCH programs accordingly
   (b) Asian Studies (documents)
       Create new independent-study courses for CHNS, JPNS, and ARBC
   (c) ENGL (all documents)
Create ENGL 371 (Multi-Ethnic Literature)
Create ENGL 315 (Black Women Writers)
Deactivate ENGL 400 (Seminar)
Change description (ENGL 499, 190, 290, 350, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 370, 390, 395, 399, 404)
Change program
(d) FREN (all documents)
  Deactivate courses (FREN 150, Intensive Elementary French; FREN 350, Intensive Conversation and Composition)
  Change prerequisites (FREN 341, Phonetics and Advanced Language Study)
(e) HEAL (all documents)
  Change prerequisites for HEAL 325 (Health Promotion)
  Change prerequisites for HEAL 325L (Field Experience in Health Promotion)
  Change prerequisites for HEAL 403 (Health Internship)
(f) HONS (documents)
  Create two new courses (HONS 203, Financial Accounting; HONS 204, Managerial Accounting)
(g) MATH (documents)
  Change prerequisites for MATH 203 and MATH 250
(h) PHYS (all documents)
  Create new course (PHYS 272, Methods of Applied Physics); add as prerequisite
(i) PSYC (all documents)
  Add new courses (PSYC 385, Cognitive Neuroscience, and PSYC 391, Foundations of Psychotherapy); change major accordingly; change minor
(j) RUSS (all documents)
  Add new course (RUSS 398, Independent Study); change minor accordingly
(k) ARTM (all documents)
  Change program to replace 9 hours of SOTA courses with list of options
  Change name and description for ARTM 200 (Introduction to Arts Management to Contemporary Issues in Arts Management)
Change name and description for ARTM 210 (Advanced Arts Management to Principles and Practices in Arts Management)

Change credit hours and prerequisites for ARTM 360

Change prerequisites for ARTM 370

Change credit hours for ARTM 380 (Independent Study in Arts Management)

Change minor (add ARTM 401 as alternative to ARTM 400, add ARTM 390 as alternative to BLAW 205)

Add C- prerequisite (students must have C- in ARTM 200 and 310 to continue)

(I) CHEM (all documents)

Broad reworking of CHEM (BA, BS, CHEM with Secondary Education cognate), Biochemistry, CHEM minor, Marine Biology

a. Renumber and rename courses

   CHEM 511 (Adv. Inorganic Chemistry) to CHEM 311 (Inorganic Chemistry)

   CHEM 512L (Adv. Inorganic Chem Lab) to CHEM 312L (Inorganic Chem Lab)

   CHEM 522/522L (Enviro. Chemistry/Lab) to 422/422L (Enviro. Chemistry/Lab)

b. Renumber courses

   CHEM 583 (Special Topics) to CHEM 483 (Special Topics)

   CHEM 531 (Advanced Organic Chemistry) to CHEM 431 (Advanced Organic Chemistry)

   CHEM 541 (Advanced Physical Chemistry) to CHEM 441 (Advanced Physical Chemistry)

c. Renumber courses and change credit hours

   CHEM 221/221L (Quantitative Analysis, 4/1 credits) to 220/220L (3/2 credits)

   CHEM 521/521L (Instrumental Analysis, 4/0 credits) to 421/421L (3/1 credits)

d. Change name, prerequisite, and descriptions

   CHEM 341/341L (Physical Chem. I to Thermodynamics, Statistical Thermodynamics, & Kinetics)
CHEM 342/342L (Physical Chem. II to Quantum Chemistry & Spectroscopy)
e. Change prerequisite
   CHEM 354 (change CHEM 351 from prerequisite to co-requisite)
f. Deactivate courses
   CHEM 528, Nuclear and Radiochemistry
   CHEM 526, Introduction to Nuclear and Radiochemistry
g. Create new course
   MATH 229, Vector Calculus with Chemical Applications
h. Change programs
   CHEM, B.S.
   CHEM, B.A.
   Biochemistry, B. S.
   Marine Biology, B.S.
   CHEM minor
   CHEM B.A. with secondary education cognate
(m) GEOG minor (documents)
    Add existing course (POLI 331, Geography of Native Lands/Indian Law) to minor
(n) PPLW concentration (documents)
    Add existing course (POLI 320, Constitutional Law) as alternative to POLI 321 (Civil Liberties)
o) EXSC (documents)
    Add CHEM 101/101L and 102/102L as alternatives

Decision
All the above items were approved by unanimous consent.

(2) New or Deleted Programs.
(a) Create URST minor (documents)

Questions/Discussion
None

Decision
Approved
(b) Create ARTM music-industry concentration (documents)

Questions/Discussion
None

Decision
Approved

(3) Announcement
Greenberg advised Senators to ask their constituents to submit proposals as soon as they are ready (no need to wait for the deadline) and to ask them to communicate with him in advance about any large proposals forthcoming for the purposes of scheduling committee meetings. Finally, he invited anyone contemplating changes to the curriculum to discuss them with him: this kind of conversation can be very productive and save missteps and time.

6. Constituents’ Concerns

Hao Chen Liu, Senator - Economics and Finance, inquired and expressed concern about language in future new hire letters going out that stipulates that new hires might be required to teach classes on different campuses in future.

The Provost replied that teaching on other campuses is noted as a possibility in the new hire letters. He then invited Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker to further comment.

Caveny-Noecker explained that the language reads “something like, ‘The College of Charleston has multiple campuses, and faculty may be required/expected to teach at campuses other than the main campus.’” The letter was sent out to all the chairs and deans for comment. The objective is, she explained, to have an expectation not just of new faculty, but of all faculty that when there is a need for instruction at other campuses, chairs and deans can be positioned to ask faculty to do so. The Provost felt the need to inform faculty as we are hiring them of this possibility, Caveny-Noecker remarked.

Emily Skinner, Senator – Health and Human Performance, informed the Senate, as a member of the Faculty Welfare Committee, that the committee had seen the letter and made some recommendations about wording.

Caveny-Noecker noted that she has been in touch with the committee’s chair and that they are in conversation about the letter.

7. Adjournment: 6:21