Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 11 March 2014

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 11 March 2014 in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order: 5:05PM

2. 4 February regular meeting minutes were approved as posted.

3. 18 February special meeting minutes were approved as posted.

4. Reports

   A. The Speaker

   The Speaker thanked Margaret Mauk from the Academic Affairs Office, who sat in for Heather Alexander.

   She also thanked everyone who volunteered for committee work next year. She reported that Calvin Blackwell, Chair of Nominations and Elections, said they received over 200 volunteers, and he hopes they will be able to fill most committees based on those submissions. If anyone did not submit a request and still wants to, the Speaker said to email Blackwell.

   The Speaker reported that the Board of Trustees will be holding their March meeting in the next week. The Academic Affairs Committee will meet on Thursday (March 20) morning at 9:15 in the EHHP Alumni Center. Among other topics scheduled for discussion, she said, is the College Reads! program. She encouraged all interested faculty to attend, adding that they should let Clara Hodges in Academic Affairs know if they plan to attend so that she can make sure there is enough seating.

   Finalists for the presidency of the College, she reminded the Senate, will be on campus Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday (3/12-14). There are two opportunities for faculty to meet with each candidate and ask questions, with the same schedule on all days: 1:30 in Alumni Hall (Randolph Hall) and a second meeting at 5:15 in the Stern Center Ballroom. The 5:15 session is open to faculty, staff, alumni, and the public. The Speaker stressed that it is important that faculty attend these events and be prepared to ask questions of each candidate. For anyone who cannot attend either event, the 5:15 session will be taped and posted to MyCharleston. Each session will provide an opportunity for Q&A and there will be feedback forms available so that everyone who attends can provide feedback about the candidates. A copy of the form (Constituent Summary Sheet) is posted on the Presidential Search tab on the home page.

   The Speaker announced an open faculty meeting on Monday, March 17 for all faculty to meet and discuss the three candidates, the exact time and location of the meeting to be announced via email as soon as they are confirmed.

   The Speaker reported that she received an email from Jordan Hensley, Student Government Association President, regarding an anti-McConnell banner that appeared in numerous place on campus and also an online petition regarding McConnell. Both
of these, Hensely wanted to make clear, were the result of individual students and were not sanctioned or endorsed by SGA.

Finally the Speaker introduced Greg Padgett, Chair of the Board of Trustees, and Lee Mikell, Vice-Chair of the Board, for an update from the board.

B. Greg Padgett, Chair – Board of Trustees

Below are Mr. Padgett’s prepared remarks, from which he read. Text in brackets represent substantive additions to the text in Mr. Padgett’s delivery of it at the meeting.

REMARKS FOR FACULTY SENATE
Greg Padgett
March 11, 2014

Good afternoon. I’m pleased to be with you.

I am here with Lee Mikell, vice chair of the Board of Trustees, to address faculty and community concerns about some recent events at the College of Charleston. I welcome the opportunity to address those concerns, and to take your questions. Today, I’d like to briefly address concerns about the College Reads program, proposals to merge the College of Charleston and MUSC, and the College’s search for a new president.

College Reads

Let me begin by discussing the College Reads program.

In light of recent events, members of the Board of Trustees know that many faculty members are worried that the Board is attempting to interfere with your responsibilities as faculty to determine what is taught at the College of Charleston. Today, let me leave absolutely no room for doubt: The Board of Trustees has no interest in interfering with the academic freedom and responsibilities that rightly belong to the faculty. Those rights and responsibilities of the faculty have been stated in the Faculty/Administration Manual for many decades.

At no time in the history of the College Reads program has the Board acted to censor a book, prevent a book from being taught, or choose any book that will be taught. Any attempt by the Board to determine what books will be taught, or how they will be taught, would violate College policies and the College’s longstanding commitment to academic freedom.

As background, during our Board meeting last August, members of the Board of Trustees did ask for the opportunity to provide input on the College Reads selection for 2014-2015. Because of a misunderstanding, Board members were not given that opportunity to do so early in the book selection process.
I don’t think it should surprise the faculty that, if legislators are going to hold Board members personally accountable for the College Reads book selection, some Board members have expressed interest in offering their individual opinions about those selections.

Happily, we were able to devise a process for the current year that will let Board members have a chance to look at David Finkel’s *The Good Soldiers*, the book that has been recommended by the College Reads Committee for 2014-2015.

Each Board member has been mailed a copy of *The Good Soldiers* and will have a chance to send individual comments about the book to President Benson. The deadline for doing so is this Friday [3/14].

Personally, I do not plan to offer the President any comments on this book. Even if I did want to express an opinion, I understand that President Benson’s decision will be final. Like me, other Board members also appreciate that basic curricular decisions must be made by the faculty and the faculty leadership – not by the Board of Trustees, or by individual Board members. The individual Board members can advise, but we cannot and should not decide.

[Nor should we have a say in the decision. In fact, Board members will have far less influence in book selection than the non-faculty members on the College Reads! committee, who get a vote.]

Of course, faculty and Board members all know that the College Reads program has been subjected over the past month to an unusual level of scrutiny, thanks to a very public discussion of our program in the General Assembly and the media. Legislators have criticized the College’s spending on the College Reads program, and, to address that concern, I believe the Board will eventually review the finances of the program.

Next week I expect the Board of Trustees will adopt a resolution reaffirming the College of Charleston’s commitment to academic freedom. I believe that the Board’s resolution will be similar to statements previously made by President Benson, and to the resolution on academic freedom the Faculty Senate will probably approve later this evening.

Further, for the Board’s meeting during August 2014, I am now inviting the Provost and the next Speaker of the Faculty to make a joint presentation to the Board about the history of academic freedom and the reasons we have academic freedom. I hope this presentation will continue our conversation about the idea of the university, and the respective responsibilities of the faculty, staff, administration, and Board of Trustees.
I hope my words today will assure you of what I already know to be true: The Board of Trustees respects and honors the exceptional work of the College of Charleston faculty. Your academic freedom has not and will not be threatened in any way by the Board of Trustees.

Regarding some of the recent media reports, let me also state for the record that our LGBTQ faculty, staff, and students are welcome and valued members of the College of Charleston community.

Merger

Next, I’d like to talk about the legislation proposing a merger between the College of Charleston and the Medical University of South Carolina.

As a reminder, this legislation was filed just over a month ago, on February 6th. The Board of Trustees has not had a regular meeting since that time, so we have not had the opportunity to discuss this bill.

Today, I don’t want to review the details of the House bill, or the similar Senate bill that was filed more recently.

We know that many members of our business community believe the resources of a comprehensive research university are needed in Charleston.

We know that a majority of faculty at the College oppose a merger for various reasons, including deep skepticism about the willingness of the state to properly fund a merged university.

We know that students and alumni are adamantly opposed to any change in the name, the traditions, and the undergraduate focus of the College of Charleston. As we move forward, I believe the Board will make a statement about merger. I also believe we will affirm that we as Board members want to preserve the name, the undergraduate excellence, and the unique culture of the College, while simultaneously working to meet the needs [of business], of our community, region, and state.

The College’s strategic plan, as developed in consultation with the faculty and originally approved in 2009, has always envisioned the development of more research capacity and graduate programs for the College, including a few, targeted doctoral programs.

We know that, if we plan carefully [and don't make foolish mistakes], the College can preserve its student-focused culture, while embracing the slow and steady growth of graduate programs and research activity.
In my view we should carefully consider the model provided by the College of William and Mary, which combines excellent undergraduate programs with a relative handful of strong master’s and doctoral programs. Of course, we at the College of Charleston have admired the model provided by William and Mary since I was an undergraduate in the 1970s, and that hasn’t changed.

Like many faculty, I recognize that substantial new funding will be needed to increase the College’s graduate profile. And, along with many faculty, I believe we shouldn’t create new programs at the expense of our already established and successful programs. [If we don't have the funding to create something new, we shouldn't do it.]

Perhaps the best way to explain the Board’s thinking is to look at the text of the presidential prospectus, which has been posted on the presidential search website for over four months:

“The College [of Charleston] is highly ranked and regarded as an exceptional public arts and sciences university. This outstanding reputation is based on the undergraduate programs and will need to be continued as research and graduate programs grow. ... The College’s leadership has the desire to move toward recognition as a doctorate-granting institution with high research activity and will need to significantly expand its graduate programs and support for funded research.”

The Board’s obligation is to preserve the best of the College of Charleston, even as we change and adapt with the times. We look forward to working with students, faculty, staff, the administration, and our local community to meet the needs of the times, while preserving our 244-year tradition of excellence in undergraduate education.

Presidential Search

Finally, I want to discuss the search for the 22nd president of the College of Charleston.

From the time George Benson announced his decision to step down as president, we Board members have recognized the importance of a thoughtful, open, and national search for the next president of the College.

We hired a highly regarded search firm. We named a search committee that included faculty, alumni, staff, and student representation. And, when faculty argued for the addition of more faculty to the search committee, we did so. The search process, as is customary, included the request that search committee members and Trustees sign confidentiality agreements covering our deliberations about the presidential candidates.
Unfortunately, some information about the search process has been leaked, in direct violation of those confidentiality agreements. And, predictably, those leaks have included misinformation.

Given what many of us have read in the media, I understand why people are skeptical about the presidential search process.

However, I need to say three things where this presidential search is concerned.

First, I want everyone to understand that the presidential search process has been followed, exactly as it was announced and described in November 2013.

The search committee conducted its deliberations and made recommendations to the Board of Trustees in early February. At that time, the work of the search committee was concluded, as was always our intent.

The Board then determined who would be offered the opportunity to be finalists. Those finalists have since been announced, and they will come to campus for interviews, beginning tomorrow.

If you don’t like the finalists, I can understand that. If you disagree with the decisions of the Board of Trustees, that is your right.

But, please, don’t suggest that the search process was not followed. While a few people clearly have ignored their confidentiality pledges, the search process has been followed, exactly as it was announced.

Second, I understand that faculty are curious about why some candidates have become finalists, while others have not.

In a confidential search process, those are hard questions to answer.

Here’s what I can say: Of course, the original position announcement included a series of attributes and desirable characteristics for the next president of the College. Those attributes were and are very important from the perspective of the Board.

However, some attributes have been given more weight by some Board members than others, just as faculty might disagree on the importance of different attributes when conducting a faculty search.

Further, while I know some faculty might not value candidate connections to South Carolina, it’s understandable that some Board members would consider existing community relationships as an asset.
The diversity of our three finalists should make clear that the Board of Trustees was not looking for only one kind of prospective President. Our three finalists have very different backgrounds and experiences. The advice of the faculty, students, staff, alumni, and our other campus constituencies will help the Board decide which finalist has the right attributes for this moment in the College’s development.

Third, I know that many people have heard it reported that our Trustees have been the subject of excessive or inappropriate attempts to influence their votes for the next president.

I want to report to you today that I understand the concern. I appreciate that faculty want a process in which Trustees make a decision based on their convictions, and not because their standing or their jobs are threatened.

Today, let me assure you that I have full faith in the ability of all the Board members to deliberate and decide based on principle, not based on political pressure. Our Board members certainly have been listening and will continue to listen to the ideas and opinions of the community about this search – including the ideas and opinions of faculty members. But listening to what others have to say does not mean people are being unfairly pressured or unduly influenced.

Ultimately, I believe all the Trustees share my desire to make a decision based on all the available evidence, and the best interests of the College of Charleston. I hope you will not assume that the Trustees have some malicious intent, or will make some decision out of some selfish desire for personal gain.

Speaking only for myself, I can tell you that no one in a position of authority has threatened my job, or my position as Trustee. Nor has anyone suggested that I will gain or lose personally, based on my own vote for the next President.

Of course, I cannot guarantee that everyone will be pleased with the final decision of the Board of Trustees. All three of our finalists have their strengths, and all three doubtless will have enthusiastic supporters. Some people will be disappointed in the Board’s decision, as is the case with any presidential search at a college or university.

What I can say is that the Board members, based on their own personal reflection and all the available evidence, will make the best decision they can. I ask you to give us the benefit of the doubt as we complete this critically important task for the future.

Finally, let me tell you that faculty input will be absolutely essential to us as we complete this search. Regarding our three finalists, I personally will read and carefully consider each comment submitted to the Board by faculty members.
Thank you for your time today. Lee and I are happy to answer any questions you have.

Questions & Discussion

Phil Dustan, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics, asked if the Board of Trustees is planning to make a statement to the state legislature regarding their actions related to the College Reads! program.

Padgett replied that the Board's forthcoming resolution on academic freedom will be a public statement.

Richard Nunan, Department of Philosophy, queried whether funding for the search firm for the presidential search came from College of Charleston Foundation, and on an affirmative reply from Padgett, asked if the board ever had any concerns about the propriety of Jody Encarnation's candidacy for the presidency since he is a member of the foundation's board.

Mikell replied that it was not considered. With 108 candidates in the application pool, he said, “that didn't cross my mind.”

Larry Krasnoff, Department of Philosophy, asked a hypothetical question about the deliberations leading to the selection of the three candidates for President: “Suppose one of the Trustees on the board, you or someone else, were contacted by someone from the legislature or [connected to] the legislature threatening either your position on the board or funding for our institution if you didn't vote a certain way. What do you think should be the appropriate response of a board member in that circumstance?”

Padgett in reply reiterated his faith and trust in the Board, whose members are “passionate about” and “love the institution.” There is feedback coming from all over the community, he stated, but he asserted that he does not know of any untoward pressure.

Krasnoff in replied that he asked the question as a hypothetical and repeated the question.

Padgett replied “abstain from the vote.”

Lynn Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration noted that she appeared before the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee in August and had a “long and difficult conversation” about the committee's selection, Fun Home. The minutes of that meeting reflect, she stated, that the Board asked for and she, on behalf of the committee, invited the Board’s participation on the front end of selecting the book for next year. She cited Padgett’s reference in his remarks to a misunderstanding of some sort, but asserted that, nonetheless, the invitation was issued. At the August meeting, she said, “no one spoke in support of Fun Home, no one had apparently read the book, and there was very distant engagement. They wanted
the controversy to go away, but they were not interested in engaging in the process for the purpose of which the College Reads! exists, which is to engage students with a wide variety of issues for educational purposes."

Referring to the section of Padgett’s remarks in which he said “I don’t think it should surprise the faculty that, if legislators are going to hold Board members personally accountable for the College Reads book selection, some Board members have expressed interest in offering their individual opinions about those selections,” Ford called the claim that “legislators are going to hold Board members personally accountable” an “absurd statement,” since none of us can be held personally responsible by legislators, especially the Board of Trustees, whom Padgett himself asserted has nothing to do with the decision and stays out of curricular decisions.

With reference to legislators’ questions about the College Reads!, Ford asked Padgett, “why isn't each and every Board member empowered to say 'that is not an appropriate question to ask me as a board member of a public institution of higher education’” And, why, she asked, are we engaged in a “continuing saga” regarding the selection for next year. Finally, “why,” she asked, “do we have a bunch of position-taking without, again, engagement with the faculty, staff, and administrative committee that has worked for years on a program that does a lot of good?”

Padgett replied that as regards the “new process” for the “new book,” what the Board requested, he asserted, was to “be part of the process,” not to chose the book, but that as the committee was working, to be updated. “I think,” he said, “the decision was made and we had a board meeting but did not have the opportunity to be brought up to speed,” but he is certain there will be such an opportunity at the March meeting. He further stated that the Board has a “process worked out.”

In response, Ford stated that the general statement on academic freedom is understandable, but that what is not understandable is individual board member’s “unwillingness to take a stand against legislative intrusion in what is clearly an academic decision in clear violation of SACS-COC standards.”

Padgett reiterated that the Board will make a resolution on academic freedom. Individual board members may have opinions on individual books, but these have “no bearing,” he said, on selection of books: “this is a faculty decision.”

Scott Peeples, Senator – School of Humanities and Social Sciences, following up on Ford's questions, asked why we have still not announced and have still not paid for next year’s books if, as Padgett said, the Board of Trustees is not involved in the decision.

Padgett responded that what the Board asked for in August was that, once the selection was made, that it be brought before the Board. At the January meeting, the book wasn't brought up, but it will be at the March meeting. He added that if Trustees have “negative information” to share regarding the selection, they can share it at the March meeting.

Bob Podolsky, Department of Biology, thanked Mr. Padgett for coming to the Senate meeting and answering questions. He read a quotation from a publication by AGB Search, the firm the Board hired to consult on the presidential search, “Increasing the Odds for Successful Presidential Searches”:
We have also seen boards that retreat into themselves and come up with the presidents they want, only to find their choices frustrated or rejected by important constituencies. Both types of outcomes—having to start a new search or appointing someone unwanted or likely to fail—are ones every board wants to avoid.

Podolsky posed three questions:

1. How important is it to the Board that the President have the support of the faculty?
2. What are you doing to assure that is the case, and what responsibility do you feel to make sure that it’s the case?
3. In light of the recommendation that is made by the consulting firm, what would you do with information and evidence suggesting that faculty do not support a candidate?

Padgett asserted in reply that faculty opinion is “absolutely essential,” “absolutely important,” and there will be an opportunity for faculty feedback during campus interviews. The Board will “take input” from faculty forms and it will be “incorporated into” the information that will inform the Board’s decision.

He asserted that the Board has put in place a proper search process, with through deliberations by the search committee and among Board members, to come to a list of well qualified finalists.

Podolsky replied, with respect, that the question was not answered: “what,” he asked, “would you do with evidence indicating that one of the candidates did not have the support of the faculty?”

Padgett stated that such information will be weighed into the decision. The Board will take in “a lot of input from a lot of constituents, but the faculty’s is absolutely essential.” The Board will make the final decision based on the input.

Podolsky asked if the board would hire a candidate that did not have the support of the faculty.

Padgett asserted that the Board will take faculty opinion into consideration.

Morgan Koerner, Senator – Department of German and Slavic Studies, asked why, at the outset of the search, there was only one member of the faculty on the committee and why the faculty had to agitate for more representation.

Padgett replied that sheer numbers were a consideration. There was one representative from “each area,” but after conversation with some faculty about adding more faculty representatives, he thought adding more faculty was a good idea.

Irina Gigova, Senator – HSS, noting that her source is media reports, asked on what basis the Board added two names to the five finalists recommended by the search committee.

Padgett reiterated that the process was confidential. The search committee presented five unranked candidates to the Board, and “the Board certainly took those into
consideration, and the Board made a decision as to who they invited” to be finalists.

Lance Foxworth, Student Government Association Academic Affairs Liaison, reported that the SGA passed a resolution in support of the College Reads! program and sent it to legislators and received a reply from Representative Stephen L. Goldfinch Jr. (District 108 - Georgetown and Charleston Counties), whom Foxworth added, is married to a Trustee of the College. He read both the initial email and Goldfinch’s reply into the record:

Dear Representatives,

Attached, please find a copy of a resolution from the Student Government Association, the governing voice of the undergraduate students, at the College of Charleston regarding the decision to remove funding from the College of Charleston 2014-2015 budget. In our regular session on Tuesday, February 25, 2014, this resolution passed with no objections with a final vote tally of 21 yays, 0 nays, and 4 abstentions and was signed by President Hensley. This resolution calls on you to restore the funding to the College of Charleston budget immediately and respect the academic freedom of institutions of higher education within the state of South Carolina. Our curriculum should be left to the discretion of the professors and administration. At no time, was the reading in question required by all members of the campus community or forced upon any student population. Higher education is meant to challenge students to think critically which often means coming into contact with ideas and beliefs that are different than one’s own. This sparks discussion and ultimately enhances the educational experience of creating well-rounded students who can prosper in a diverse and fast-changing global economy. The college experience is designed to allow students to grow as people and academians by interacting with multiple schools of thought covering a variety of issues.

Again, we demand that the SC House restore the cuts made to the College of Charleston budget and respect the right of academic freedom of the institution.

On behalf of the students of the College of Charleston,

Vice President Chris Piedmont

Chris [SGA Vice President Chris Piedmont ],

Out of one side of your mouth you demand that we fund your school and many of your educations, yet, out of another side of your mouth, you demand we stay out of your school and your education. I have a simple solution for
you: Ask your school to go private. At that point, you can require obscene pornographic mandatory reading without any intervention from the people who fund your school now.

We answer to Constituents. Each and every house member represents 38,000 people. I have multiple families in my district that were horrified when their 17 year old daughter was REQUIRED to read this book. President Pastides testified that students would be tested on the book. If that’s not required, I don’t know what is. My constituents demanded accountability and change. Not censorship, but rationale and reason. Society, and in this case, your faculty, can, in fact, go too far. And in this case, they did. No one has, nor will they ever object to the book being in your library, but mandated reading is out of the question if you desire continued funding from me and my constituents.

Sincerely,

Representative Stephen L. Goldfinch Jr.

Foxworth closed by saying that he wanted to bring to the Senate's attention the resolution and Goldfinch’s response. There was applause.

Wendy Cory, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, returning to the issue of leaks, asserted that the fact that there were leaks points to flaws in the process. A recent editorial, which she called “outrageous,” blamed faculty for the leaks, when there was information presented that no one on the faculty were privy to and that only Board members could have known. She agreed that it was unfortunate that leaks may have caused one candidate to drop.

Cory read from the confidentiality agreement itself, item number five: “The search committee chair or his designee will be the only person to disclose the status of any aspect of the process to the public and/or media.”

She asked if there is any way that we can get some information about how all this happened in order to bring transparency and potentially restore trust between faculty and the Board of Trustees.

Padgett stated that search committee members can verify that he stressed confidentiality and that he asked the same level of care for confidentiality of the Board of Trustees. Everything that could be in place to keep the search confidential was in place, and it is “unfortunate” that there was some leaking of information.

Cory urged Padgett, as search committee chair, to make some of the decisions public because faculty do not understand what has happened and are being blamed for leaks, for having some agenda, and it is causing serious friction between the Board and the faculty.

Padgett offered assurances that the idea that faculty are the source of leaks is not coming from the Board of Trustees, emphasizing that “we are all on the same team.”
Bob Mignone, Chair – Department of Mathematics, thanked Mr. Padgett for coming, and brought attention to a section of a resolution to be discussed later in the meeting asserting that “multiple sources indicate undue pressure on Board of Trustee members by legislators in an attempt to influence the outcome of the presidential search.” Mignone said that he doesn’t have hard evidence that this has occurred, but an actual board member, he claimed, informed him that she felt that she would not be renewed if she did not support a particular candidate. He also said that during his time at the College, a past candidate for President was being forwarded by the legislature and that when, after much resistance on the basis of his qualifications, he was not made President, the Chair of the Board lost his membership on the Board because he did not go along with what the legislature wanted.

Thus, he argued, it’s easy to conclude that such pressure might be felt now. There are good reasons for concern.

Padgett replied that he understands Mignone’s concerns. “There’s a lot of passion in this search,” he added, “because people care.” He asserted that Board members do not hold their positions as jobs but as opportunities to serve the institution. He said he “feels comfortable” that the Board’s deliberations will be grounded in “love for the institution.”

Jo Ann Ewalt, Department of Political Science and Director of the Masters in Public Administration, thanked Mr. Padgett for coming and for stating unequivocally that the Board does not make choices for the College Reads! . Given that statement, she asked, “would it not be an act of good faith” to go ahead and release the funds for the books already ordered?

Padgett reiterated that the Board has not had a chance to discuss the selection for next year’s College Reads! program. The Board will discuss this issue in the March meeting, and, he added, he expects the outcome to be good.

Andy Shedlock, Department of Biology, suggested that when the Board convenes to decide on the President that it keep in mind how “wildly out of proportion” is the level of influence or control wielded over the College to the meager 8% investment the legislature makes in the College. “So,” he queried, “if you want to go to bed with those guys, why don’t you ask for more investment in our operations?”

Speaker Cherry noted that Board only has so much control.

Pam Riggs-Gelasco, Chair – Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and also a member of the presidential search committee, thanked Mr. Padget and Mr. Mikell for coming to the meeting and answering questions, which she noted is “extraordinarily important” at this time. She asked that the following be related to the rest of the Board. There is a resolution (and have been various resolutions) circulating among the faculty because of the “level of angst about the search” and the process. In a meeting with various faculty from across the campus, she reported, faculty bounced the idea around of approaching the Board directly with a resolution in order to have a back-and-forth about what the Board might do that might undo the need for the resolution, such as, perhaps, a guarantee by the Board that the next Provost search would have a great deal of faculty input. But in the end, the faculty at the meeting seemed to agree that nothing Mr. Padgett could say on the behalf of the Board could
be trusted. “That’s where we are,” she said, a mistrust that she noted that she and Padgett had earlier discussed was something they both wanted to avoid. The prevention of this was one reason for the expansion of faculty representation on the search committee. “I just want you to know,” she went on, that “we are at this really tragic place, where the trust in the Trustees is gone. I don’t want to speak for everybody, but I know I speak for quite a number of faculty members.”

Padgett repeated that he and the Vice-Chair came to the meeting because they care, and that he hates to see the distrust because he feels the Board does have the best outcome for the institution in mind and cares a great deal for what the faculty has to say.

Mikell added that one of the things that he enjoyed about the search was getting to “meet someone like Pam {Riggs-Gelasco}.” He stated that he has always “operated under the philosophy that the Board should be close enough to see but not to touch.” We do not often have the opportunity to interact, Board and faculty, however. He stated that when he has had the opportunity to talk with faculty on issues like the proposed merger, he has come away with the feeling that the faculty and the Board are not far apart. We need to work on better communication, he said.

Richard Nunan followed up on College Reads! funding, saying that while Padgett has said the decision is in the hands of the faculty, the money for next year’s book has been held up. He also asserted that Padgett expressed concern that Board members be able to review the selections and speak to the President in this connection as individuals. The image of holding up the money and, even if it doesn't actually happen, individual Board members consulting with the President is what we want to avoid—it has an appearance of interference, regardless of intent. He closed by thanking Mr. Padgett for taking the time to “come into the lions' den,” which Nunan said is a good sign.

Padgett asserted again that the Board is not trying to be part of the selection of the book: that’s the faculty’s decision. Referring to Nunan’s comment about appearances, Padgett said that he wants to make sure that the appearance isn’t there.

He also reiterated that the Provost has been invited to a Board meeting to have a conversation about the history of academic freedom so that the board can have a clear understanding of it. More interaction between the Board and the faculty would be helpful he said, and he closed by emphasizing again that the Board and the faculty are “on the same team.”

The Speaker thanked the Chair and Vice-Chair.

There was applause.
C. The Provost ([PowerPoint presentation](#))

The Provost remarked that the just completed dialogue between the Senate and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board of Trustees was refreshing and important, particularly as the presidential search has taken many of us into “new territory.” He asserted that “any President coming in is going to want to have the full support of the faculty because, after all, it is the faculty, the Provost, the curriculum, the students, that [the President has] to represent to the outside world, and [with a] passion...that is heartfelt and not practiced.”

**Tenure & Promotion**
The Provost expressed appreciation for the care that has been and is going into the process at all levels. At this point, all parties and committees have weighed in and decisions rest with the President. [See slides for numbers. Numbers in parenthesis are the number of faculty up for 3rd year review. Notably, 16 of the 31 cases used online documentation.]

**Trifecta, Hat Trick or Perfect Storm?: News Coverage**
The Provost reported that the College on the same day as the Senate meeting was featured in news stories in Chronicle of Higher Education (front page), Inside Higher Education, and the Post and Courier (front page), respectively, on the proposed merger, on the state house budget penalty for the College Reads! selection of Fun Home, and on the NAACP’s statement on Glenn McConnell’s candidacy for President. Additionally, in 24 hours (at midday), there were 45 media pieces on the presidential search, with a focus on the NAACP’s statement, and 77 pieces on the budget cut.

This is “not the absolute best way to promote the College of Charleston,” the Provost said.

**Concerns & Path Forward**
The Provost noted, as concerns the reputation of the College, that the majority of the applications to the College come from out of state (about 7,000 from out of state, compared to 5,000 from in the state). This reflects a strong out-of-state reputation, but there may be reason for concern about this reputation considering the latest media, he asserted. He hopes that out-of-state applications do not fall because of negative publicity, but he also noted that applications may be on the decline somewhat, anyway, because of recent trends in college applications generally.

He also noted that academic freedom is a continuing concern, and he welcomed the Board of Trustee's invitation to speak on the matter in August.

As concerns accreditation, the Provost stated that we need to be aware of any impact of politics on the SACSCOC standards that we may be held to, adducing the following standards as “highly relevant” in relation to the recent press:

3.2.4 The governing board is free from undue influence from political, religious, or other external bodies and protects the institution from such influence.
3.2.6 There is a clear and appropriate distinction, in writing and practice, between the policy-making functions of the governing board and the responsibility of the administration and faculty to administer and implement policy.

3.4.10 The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty.

3.7.4 The institution ensures adequate procedures for safeguarding and protecting academic freedom.

The Provost asserted that we will need to respond in accreditation proceedings to the above and address any potential problems.

Finally, the Provost noted that the Commission on Higher Education is trying to work behind the scenes in relation to the recent legislative budget cut to try to get our lost funding restored. Richard Sutton, Executive Director – CHE, the Provost reported, is interested in making the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs a more active and proactive provost group, and he will be forming a subcommittee of state provosts to develop a statement on academic freedom that can be shared with all the provosts and presidents in the state and signed off on by those parties to be presented to the CHE. This would not merely be a response to recent events, but also a matter of best practices.

Questions & Concerns

Kelly Shaver asked whether it is true, as reported in the Chronicle and The State, that the next target is art courses that use live nude models.

Provost replied that he is not aware of this.

Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Vice President for Executive Administration, noted that reports he has seen are that one legislator in the House of Representatives, filed a motion to amend the state budget that would levy a one million dollar budget penalty for institutions that use live nude models in classes and require students to experience this live, nude modeling. Additionally, the same penalty would apply if students in any class are required to read “pornography,” though the motion, predictably, does not define the term. McGee said there is no reason to believe that this motion has any chance of passing, with which the Provost concurred.

Adam Mendelson, Jewish Studies, asked who stopped payment to the bookstore for The Good Soldiers, next year’s College Reads! selection.

The Provost responded that the payment was stopped “at the College level.”

Mendelsohn asked for more detail in the response.

The Provost replied that he did not think it would serve any good to go further in his reply.

Mike Auerbach, Dean – School of Science and Mathematics, asserted that in the Provost’s slide on concerns, that was a striking omission: faculty morale. While we cannot control the local newspaper, he said, we certainly have the same route as ordin-
ary citizens to try to publish articles, op-eds, etc., in it. There has been a continuous flow of op-eds that make anti-faculty statements. He singled out recent pieces by Wooten and Hicks, which essentially say, “faculty have no role. Shut up.” Auerbach stated, asking for a correction if he was wrong, that he hasn’t seen any response from the President’s office or elsewhere to these statements against the faculty. When will such a response occur?, he queried.

The Provost replied that he “can’t account for the past.” Turning to MUSC in relation to the question, he pointed out that, as regards the proposed merger, their board was unified against it from the start. Our board, on the other hand, has neither reached a consensus, nor formed a unified opinion. Once this is clarified, he said, there probably will be statements.

Auerbach pressed for more. Setting the merger aside, what about “the berating of faculty unjustly?” Is there any defense of faculty, he asked, forthcoming?

The Provost replied, “not that I know of but that doesn’t mean there won’t be.” He added that “the President has been very articulate in his remarks about the quality of education the students get here.”

Irina Gigova asked if the Academic Affairs office might write a letter in public defense of the faculty.

In reply, the Provost said, “it would be a good thing to do, wouldn’t it?”

Marianne Verlinden, Senator – School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs, asserted that the presidential search committee confidentiality agreement is much stricter and, thus, not typical, of confidentiality agreements, mentioning a particular provision. She wondered who was involved in drafting the agreement.

The Provost replied that he had no involvement in the confidentiality agreement for the presidential search committee. He deferred to Kathryn Bender, Senior Vice President and General Counsel.

Bender said that the Office of Legal Affairs helped with the agreement’s language and asked Verlinden for clarification: what provision?

Verlinden read provision one into the record:

1. I understand that this Presidential Search Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the College of Charleston Board of Trustees and that the Board of Trustees will make the final decisions regarding the determination of the finalists and the selection of the President;

Typically, Verlinden stated, it is the committee that forwards names to the Board of Trustees and has the determination of the finalists.

Bender replied that she, herself, does not know what is typical, but that Legal Affairs did work with the consulting firm on the language and the consultant said it was typical. If it is not, she said, Legal Affairs was not aware that it wasn’t.
Verlinden replied that she has seen an agreement that is very similar but without the restriction on the committee implied in the provision cited.

Bender reiterated that she was not aware of any atypicality.

Podlosky followed up on Verlinden’s observations, saying that AGB Search states that it is typical for feedback to go to the search committee and for the search committee to collate it and make a recommendation to the board for how to vote. The search committee in our search has been cut out at an earlier stage than is typical, according to published principles of the consultant the Board hired. Furthermore, having only one faculty member on the search committee at the beginning was also atypical in relation to the consultant’s prior searches, none of which used just one faculty member on the search committee.

Phil Jos, Senator – HSS, in reference to the conversation at the meeting more general, commented that the faculty he represents in HSS in conversations with him have very low morale and are really upset, which is even more acutely felt by those of the faculty who have a little more information about the things going on. He asserted that “we are in a bad place and that whatever happens this next week could potentially put us in a far worse place.” The restoration of trust and the assertion of the faculty’s central place is “going to have to be kicked into a higher gear.” Furthermore, “the routine just isn’t fine. Nobody’s fine with the ordinary way of dealing with things right now.”

The Provost replied, speaking to both Jos and Auerbach, saying that he would not defend the fact that there has not been an op-ed coming out of his office defending faculty. The President, he stated, has publicly expressed his appreciation for faculty and been supportive. He agreed that “right now, this is a tough place.”

He encouraged faculty to attend the upcoming Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee meeting. Many representatives are present at this committee from a variety of offices and committees. Faculty presence alone could deliver a strong message of support, particularly while academic freedom is a hot issue. It might also help move us forward, to a place where we are communicating back and forth more regularly and, furthermore, coming to an understanding the values we hold in common. The Provost gave the time, date, and location of the meeting.

Tom Carroll, Senator – School of Education, Health, and Human Performance, expressed thanks for the Provost’s report on Tenure & Promotion, adding that, having gone through the process, himself, he was impressed with depth of review. While he was encouraged by the online process, he noted it is much the same as the paper process. He asked if the online process will develop such that electronic only evidence, such as video clips, online student projects, and so forth, can be provided.

The Provost said that he didn’t think there’s any restrictions.

He recognized Beverly Diamond, Associate Provost, who replied that when we began the online process, we made a commitment to align the online iteration with the paper-based process in order to disallow any reviewee’s advantage in one direction or another. If we do lift the restrictions on the online process, she added, there will have to be an understanding that no reviewer has to be committed to following all
links or else there will really be no restriction on what might be added to a packet. We also, she pointed out, have a restriction on when packets have to be closed, and that is difficult to maintain with external links that point to potentially changing content. We may in the future decide, she noted, as a faculty that those concerns are not so serious. She added that we can have a conversation with faculty who have gone through the electronic process as part of a larger dialogue about how we might loosen up the process in a way that makes sense and is not burdensome to reviewers.

The Provost added that the College has an aspiration that all dossiers and supporting materials will be online at some point.

Magaret Cormack, Senator – Religious Studies, asked why superior rating, the requirements for which, according to the FAM, are identical to coming up for full Professor, only comes with half the raise of the former.

Beverly Diamond responded that it is true that the criteria are the same. At the moment, though, the documentation is far less and the review process is different.

Cormack responded that this is punishing the candidate for a problem in the process, which she hopes will be changed in the future.

Penny Brunner, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness, commented on the Provost’s listing of SACS standards on his slides. She stated that it is always “a little dangerous” to look at only a few out and out of context of the full set of 81 standards.

There were no further questions

5. Old Business

None

6. New Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee

(1) Course Proposals and Program Changes

(a) **ASST**: Create new conversation supplement courses in Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, and Japanese

(b) **EXSC**: Create new special-topics course (EXSC 320)

(c) **URST**: Create new course (URST 360)

**Decision**

All the above items were approved by unanimous consent.

(2) New Program. New programs are voted on by the Senate.

(a) **SCIM**: New major in Supply Chain Management (with new courses, etc.)

**Questions & Concerns**
Bob Perkins, Chair – Academic Planning, noted that the committee approved the proposal.

**Decision**  
Approved

**B. Resolution on Academic Freedom**

| Resolution on Academic Freedom  
| March 11, 2014  
| Faculty Senate Meeting College of Charleston  
| The College of Charleston Faculty Senate unequivocally defends academic freedom as essential to higher education. This freedom, and the occasional controversies it can generate, is fundamental to the pursuit of truth and knowledge in all disciplines. Legislative efforts attempting to influence or limit curricular decisions at any institution are a threat to academic freedom at all academic institutions. |

Speaker Cherry stated that she wanted to speak on the motion and so, she temporarily stepped down. Speaker Pro Tempore Jennifer Wright took over as Speaker.

The Speaker Pro Tem noted that this resolution was brought by Kirk Stone, Senator – Department of Communication.

Stone described the resolution as short, direct, and extremely important. The motion was seconded.

**Questions & Discussion**

Lynn Cherry explained that two weeks or so prior to the meeting Kelly Smith, Speaker of the Faculty at Clemson sent an email to all speakers at institutions across the state, encouraging institutions to band together and present a united front in response to the legislature's withholding of budget funds from the College and USC-Upstate. Multiple institutions have either crafted their own or are copying a resolution similar to the one on the floor. At the moment, those that have passed or will consider passing a resolution include Clemson, USC, MUSC, The Citadel, Winthrop, Francis Marion University, USC-Upstate, USC-Aiken, and USC-Sumter.

The question was called by a senator and seconded, and passed.

**Decision on the resolution**  
Approved unanimously

Speaker Cherry returned to her role as speaker.
C. Proposal to Modify Admission Standards for the School of Business - Academic Standards Committee, Jim Bowring - Chair

**Introduction**

Bowring summed up the introduction provided in the proposal and read the motion as written.

**Questions and Discussion**

Paul Young, Senator – Department of Mathematics, asked if the items following “in particular” in the motion are the only things that are changed by, essentially, turning back the clock on the standards via the motion. Or has anything changed since February 2006 that this would also annul?

Bowring replied that to his knowledge nothing else would be affected.

The Speaker invited Marcia Snyder, Associate Dean of the School of Business, to reply as well. She verified that nothing else has changed, and no other changes are needed.

**Decision**

The motion passed.

7. Constituents' Concerns

Irina Gigova, Senator – School of Humanities and Social Sciences, proposed the following resolution for debate and approval if the Senate saw fit.

Speaker Cherry explained that consideration of the resolution would require a suspension of the rules of the Senate, since the resolution was not on the agenda distributed a week before the meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to suspend the rules and the motion carried with at least the 2/3 required majority.

The motion to consider the resolution was seconded by Hollis France, Senator – Department of Political Science.

---

**RESOLUTION OF GRAVE CONCERN WITH THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON PRESIDENT AND UNDERMINED CONFIDENCE IN ITS OUTCOME**

WHEREAS, the faculty was forced to request multiple representatives on the Presidential Search Committee, which has been standard practice in past presidential searches at the College as well as at other institutions where AGB Search was the consulting firm;

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has failed to meet a series of other principles regarding how to conduct a successful presidential search, as cited in the AAUP Presidential Search Committee Checklist and in recommendations of the consulting firm AGB Search;
WHEREAS, multiple sources indicate undue pressure on Board of Trustee members by legislators in an attempt to influence the outcome of the presidential search;

WHEREAS, reports suggest that the Board of Trustees removed at least 2 of the 5 names recommended by the Presidential Search Committee and replaced them with the names of 2 individuals with strong connections to several Trustees and/or the South Carolina Legislature;

WHEREAS, these events create the impression of partiality and undue influence in the selection process, and make it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they led to the withdrawal of 2 of the 3 remaining shortlisted names recommended by the Presidential Search Committee, leaving only a single name in contention that was recommended by that committee;

WHEREAS, there is an overwhelming impression among faculty that the selection for president was predetermined;

WHEREAS, the president of any academic institution must have the full trust, confidence, and support of its faculty to engage effectively in a relationship of shared governance;

WHEREAS, the incoming president will already be enormously challenged to restore the faith of the faculty in a Board of Trustees that has failed to convey its position regarding a proposed merger with MUSC and failed to defend the principle of academic freedom;

WHEREAS, the incoming president will need to begin with the confidence of the faculty, staff, students, alumni, community and the Board of Trustees to effectively lead the College of Charleston, and these constituencies all will need confidence in each other;

WHEREAS, the most important responsibility of a Board of Trustees is the selection of an institution’s President, and the concerns raised above suggest a breach of this duty thus far,

THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston expresses grave concern that the Presidential search process has been compromised, undermining confidence in a president chosen through the process and in the Board of Trustees that allowed the process to be compromised.

Phil Jos explained that those who wrote the resolution wanted to offer it as a means of going on the record and entering into our minutes discussion about the presidential search, particularly in the event that discussion with Board of Trustees Greg Padgett was not conclusive or satisfactory to the Senate.

Hollis France, Senator – Political Science, stated that she continues to find whole search process troubling, nor is having to take Padgett’s word that the search was on the “up and up” satisfactory. There seems, she said, to be a lot of hiding behind confidentiality. For these reasons, she said, she supports the resolution.
Joe Carson – Senator – School of Science and Mathematics, singled out a one “whereas” clause for discussion:

WHEREAS, there is an overwhelming impression among faculty that the selection for president was predetermined;

Carson said that this has been his impression but that making such a statement without actually polling the faculty makes him nervous.

Phil Dustan, Senator – SSM, noted that he would like stronger language than “grave concern” in the “resolved” clause.

Scott Peeples, Senator – HSS, moved that the clause singled out by Carson be struck from the resolution since it is conjecture and its being struck would not weaken the resolution.

The motion was seconded.

**Discussion of the motion to amend**

Todd Grantham, Department of Philosophy, argued to keep the clause that the motion to amend would strike. Grantham reported that in a conversation with Chair Padgett when there was a push to add more faculty representation to the committee, Grantham expressed concern at that stage about the two names—McConnell and Encarnation—that were being talked about in the news at that time in connection with the search. It seemed at that time that “the fix was in.” Now, having gone through the whole search process, if the reports are to believed, McConnell and Encarnation were names added by the Board to the list of finalists. We can’t know this to be the case because of the shield of confidentiality but there is “an overwhelming impression” that this is the case.

Jeff Wragg, Senator – Physics and Astronomy, stated that the Senate serves as a microcosm of the faculty and he is, therefore, as a representative, comfortable with keeping the clause since the Senate seems to agree with the sentiment of the clause.

Richard Nunan, Department of Philosophy, stated that he does not know if the impression at the present is overwhelming but that if McConnell is appointed, then it will be overwhelming, and this is reason enough for keeping the clause now.

Paul Young argued that, while there is no poll on what the faculty’s impressions are, the clauses prior to the one proposed to be eliminated, taken together, might quite reasonably give an “overwhelming impression.”

Dan Greenberg offered that a good idea might be to add “among senators” to limit the sense of who has the “overwhelming impression.”

Dustan noted that he has not talked to a single member of his faculty that would not agree with the clause. It should be kept in place.

Bob Podolsky noted that he was among those who wrote the resolution and pointed out that the clause sends a message now, but also lays groundwork for later. On the other hand, he pointed out, it is the clause that comes closest to pointing out actual candidates by name, and those who wrote the resolution did want to avoid that.

Peeples pointed out that he would vote for the resolution regardless of the success or
failure of his motion to amend. But another reason to remove the clause is that there may be a split on the board: there may be not just one, but two candidates for whom “the fix is in.”

David Moscowitz, Senator – HSS, suggested that in deciding to vote on this amendment, Senators might want to consider that, rhetorically, if there’s any one part of the resolution that looks like over-reach to others reading it, then this could weaken the entire document.

Jos noted that in many early discussions of this resolution, there was a feeling that we’re going to have to restore trust, not just regarding the presidential search but regarding many things. The relationship with the board after the search is over is what we’re setting our sights on. The real question is, as he put it, for those Board members who might have sympathy for our view of what makes for a fair and open search, what does this resolution do? Will it help them? Embolden them? Or does it perhaps undermine their position?

Podolsky suggested that changing the clause to read “selection of candidates” might address Peeples’s objection that the clause points to one candidate.

Andy Shedlock, Senator – Biology, expressed concern that the word “predetermined” might provide a distraction for those inclined to discredit the resolution.

Bill Olejniczak, Department of History, suggested that the clause can be seized on negatively by a reporter, for instance, in a newspaper column, which could put us again on the defensive. He said he would vote in favor of the motion to amend.

Nunan asked if a motion can be made to amend the motion to amend. He suggested, if so, that the language change Podolsky recommended be added in some way to the motion.

George Pothering, Parliamentarian, said, yes, one can amend a motion to amend, but in this case, the motion is to strike a clause. He suggested that the best method in this case would be to defeat the motion and then offer a different motion to alter the statement that remains.

Marybeth Heston, Senator – Art History, proposed, alternatively, voting to delete the clause and then rewriting it.

**Decision**
The motion carried.

Debate on the resolution continued, with the following text representing the resolution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOLUTION OF GRAVE CONCERN WITH THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON PRESIDENT AND UNDERMINED CONFIDENCE IN ITS OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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WHEREAS, the faculty was forced to request multiple representatives on the Presidential Search Committee, which has been standard practice in past presidential searches at the College as well as at other institutions where AGB Search was the consulting firm;

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has failed to meet a series of other principles regarding how to conduct a successful presidential search, as cited in the AAUP Presidential Search Committee Checklist and in recommendations of the consulting firm AGB Search;

WHEREAS, multiple sources indicate undue pressure on Board of Trustee members by legislators in an attempt to influence the outcome of the presidential search;

WHEREAS, reports suggest that the Board of Trustees removed at least 2 of the 5 names recommended by the Presidential Search Committee and replaced them with the names of 2 individuals with strong connections to several Trustees and/or the South Carolina Legislature;

WHEREAS, these events create the impression of partiality and undue influence in the selection process, and make it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they led to the withdrawal of 2 of the 3 remaining shortlisted names recommended by the Presidential Search Committee, leaving only a single name in contention that was recommended by that committee;

WHEREAS, the president of any academic institution must have the full trust, confidence, and support of its faculty to engage effectively in a relationship of shared governance;

WHEREAS, the incoming president will already be enormously challenged to restore the faith of the faculty in a Board of Trustees that has failed to convey its position regarding a proposed merger with MUSC and failed to defend the principle of academic freedom;

WHEREAS, the incoming president will need to begin with the confidence of the faculty, staff, students, alumni, community and the Board of Trustees to effectively lead the College of Charleston, and these constituencies all will need confidence in each other;

WHEREAS, the most important responsibility of a Board of Trustees is the selection of an institution’s President, and the concerns raised above suggest a breach of this duty thus far,

THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston expresses grave concern that the Presidential search process has been compromised, undermining confidence in a president chosen through the process and in the Board of Trustees that allowed the process to be compromised.

Jason Coy, Senator – HSS, suggested that prior to Padgett’s presentation and Q&A, the purpose of the resolution was clear. Similarly, he noted, had Padgett not come to the Senate meeting the resolution would be in order. But afterwards, what is the purpose of the resolution? It may not serve at this point.
Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, spoke against the resolution, expressing concern that the motion relies on newspaper reports that themselves may lack credibility.

Morgen Koerner, Senator – German and Slavic Studies, said that he would have preferred a no confidence resolution, but that he supports this resolution because, questions of news credibility aside, we do, in fact, have grave concern and want to put that on the record.

Susan Farrell, Senator – HSS, asked about the third whereas clause:

WHEREAS, multiple sources indicate undue pressure on Board of Trustee members by legislators in an attempt to influence the outcome of the presidential search;

What are the “multiple sources”?, she asked.

Gigova replied that Bob Mignone’s self-report of talking to a member of the Board of Trustees who feels political pressure is one source, added to which there are the press leaks to the same effect.

Farrell expressed discomfort with the second- and third-hand knowledge on which the clause relies and which the clause states as fact, and not as a perception.

Todd McNerney, Department of Theater, noted that he, too, was part of the conversation and group that wrote the resolution. It seems, he stated, that we have been reactive for much of the last two months or so. Once the decision comes on the next President, reactivity won't help, so the idea behind the resolution is to be proactive. After the fact, our complaints will just cast us as the “whiney faculty.” The process thus far has been deeply insulting. He doesn’t have the facts, he said, but every impression points to the search as predetermined. He added that he “couldn't write this as a play and [have] anyone believe it.” It’s important to make a statement because it might be difficult to be heard later.

Chris Starr, Senator – SSM, stated that he cannot support the resolution, although he empathizes. He said he did not have a better solution, but reflecting on what he would ask his own students to do—cite their sources—he cannot support the resolution.

Shedlock asserted that the Senate has to be prepared for the resolution to be easily discredited. That is likely to happen.

Margaret Cormack, while she is convinced, she said, that the hearsay about the search is correct, for the very reason that is hearsay, she can not support the resolution.

Jos asserted that this is a critical issue and it’s important to consider whether or not the document reads as is intended to be, which is not as a statement of fact. Confidentiality and a lack of transparency keep us from knowing things. "From a power perspective," he said, “the fact that we don’t have any information” shouldn't stop us. The intent was to say consistently that we do not have confidence. The fact, in the end, is that the faculty have lost confidence in the process.
We might consider changing, Jos suggested, in the wake of Padgett’s visit, the final, “resolved” clause:

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston expresses grave concern that the Presidential search process has been compromised, undermining confidence in a president chosen through the process and in the Board of Trustees that allowed the process to be compromised.

We might consider striking, he said, “and in the Board of Trustees that allowed the process to be compromised.” This phrase has a different meaning after Padgett has come and answered questions.

Grantham said he remains a little conflicted. What will be an effective move for the faculty? The faculty, he said, have a lot at stake, and it’s worth asking if we have any leverage with Board of Trustees, when in fact they can decide as they see fit, regardless of faculty opinions. So, in reply to Jos, Gratham asked the Senate, “did you find Padgett persuasive?” Grantham said, for him, the answer is “no.” We don’t have the facts, but the pattern is overwhelming. There is a small window to act, the document is not perfect, but it is the best shot, Grantham asserted, that we have. The question, he said, is “do we want to say something or not?”

The Speaker at this point notified the Senate that the room needs to be vacated in ten minutes.

Dustan asked, addressing what Jos said, if a phrase could be added to the effect of, “whereas confidentiality and lack of transparency have prevented access to the true facts and opinions of the process....” Such an addition, Dustan said, would help clarify the faculty’s position.

The Parliamentarian, in the interest of proceeding within the time constraints, at this point referred the faculty to Robert’s Rules on resolutions. When resolutions have “whereas” statements, the suggested way to proceed is to settle on the “resolved” clause first, and then keep, reject, or fine-tune the “whereas” clauses.

The Speaker said that she supported the Parliamentarian’s suggestion, given that, at this point, only six minutes remained before the Senate needed to vacate the room.

Jos moved that the final phrase in the “resolved” clause mentioned above be struck, as below:

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston expresses grave concern that the Presidential search process has been compromised, undermining confidence in a president chosen through the process and in the Board of Trustees that allowed the process to be compromised.

Additionally, Jos suggested that, after this motion is considered and, hopefully passes, the next step might be a motion to strike all the “whereas” clauses.

The motion was seconded.

The question was called by Jim Carew, Senator – Geology, was seconded, and passed.

Decision on the motion to amend
RESOLUTION OF GRAVE CONCERN WITH THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON PRESIDENT AND UNDERMINED CONFIDENCE IN ITS OUTCOME

WHEREAS, the faculty was forced to request multiple representatives on the Presidential Search Committee, which has been standard practice in past presidential searches at the College as well as at other institutions where AGB Search was the consulting firm;

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has failed to meet a series of other principles regarding how to conduct a successful presidential search, as cited in the AAUP Presidential Search Committee Checklist and in recommendations of the consulting firm AGB Search;

WHEREAS, multiple sources indicate undue pressure on Board of Trustee members by legislators in an attempt to influence the outcome of the presidential search;

WHEREAS, reports suggest that the Board of Trustees removed at least 2 of the 5 names recommended by the Presidential Search Committee and replaced them with the names of 2 individuals with strong connections to several Trustees and/or the South Carolina Legislature;

WHEREAS, these events create the impression of partiality and undue influence in the selection process, and make it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they led to the withdrawal of 2 of the 3 remaining shortlisted names recommended by the Presidential Search Committee, leaving only a single name in contention that was recommended by that committee;

WHEREAS, the president of any academic institution must have the full trust, confidence, and support of its faculty to engage effectively in a relationship of shared governance;

WHEREAS, the incoming president will already be enormously challenged to restore the faith of the faculty in a Board of Trustees that has failed to convey its position regarding a proposed merger with MUSC and failed to defend the principle of academic freedom;

WHEREAS, the incoming president will need to begin with the confidence of the faculty, staff, students, alumni, community and the Board of Trustees to effectively lead the College of Charleston, and these constituencies all will need confidence in each other;

WHEREAS, the most important responsibility of a Board of Trustees is the selection of an institution’s President, and the concerns raised above suggest a breach of this duty thus far,

THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston expresses grave concern that the Presidential search process has been compromised, undermining confidence in a president chosen.
The discussion returned to the resolution.
Susan Farrell moved that all the “whereas” statements be struck. She noted that she supports the resolution but some of the statements seem problematic and in the interest of time, the motion seems the best way forward.

The motion was seconded.
The question was called by Jim Carew, was seconded, and passed.

**Decision on the motion to amend**
The motion passed.
The discussion returned to the resolution as represented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOLUTION OF GRAVE CONCERN WITH THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON PRESIDENT AND UNDERMINED CONFIDENCE IN ITS OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston expresses grave concern that the Presidential search process has been compromised, undermining confidence in a president chosen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question was called by Irina Gigova, was seconded, and passed.

**Decision on the resolution**
The resolution above passed.

8. Adjournment: 7:30