The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday November 5 2013 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order: 5:03PM by Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty
2. 1 October 2013 minutes were approved as circulated.
3. Reports
   A. The Speaker

   The Speaker offered an update regarding Heath Hoffman’s idea of “re-envisioning the senate,” the purpose or goal of which is to create opportunities for Senate to be more pro-active and to take up and lead discussions for the campus. Groups of faculty have met three times, and notes/summaries of the discussions are posted on a blog. Anyone interested in contributing to the blog can contact Hoffman (Hoffman-nH@cofc.edu).

   Two resolutions from this group will be presented to the Senate in December, one focusing on the expectations of reports presented by guests and committee chairs, the other proposing a change in the way curricular matters at both the undergraduate and graduate level are presented. The former will ask that reports for the Senate be submitted in advance, to allow the bulk of time to be spent on questions and discussion. The latter will allow curricular matters to be handled more efficiently and, again, open more opportunity for discussion on other issues.

   The Speaker pointed out that current meeting of the Senate is already enacting the principle of the first of these resolutions: committee reports have been submitted in advance, as has information regarding Larry Krasnoff’s discussion on the Charleston School of Law (CSOL) on the agenda for the current meeting (PowerPoint slides). The Speaker stressed that Krasnoff’s discussion is not intended to produce any action, per se, but for the Senate to be proactive in thinking through the issues associated with any future discussions of the fate of CSOL in relation to CofC. The Speaker noted that we will try this general approach to reporting and modify it as needed once we have a better sense of how it is working.

   A tobacco-free campus policy was passed by the Board of Trustees (BoT) in October and was recently distributed via email. The Speaker explained that a couple changes were made to an earlier form of the policy: 1) the BoT struck a provision that would allow designated smoking areas on campus during a transitional period, and 2) the BoT amended the effective date of the policy to July 2014, instead of January 2015. The President and the Board are looking into ways that smoking cessation programs might be made available before the policy goes into effect.
The Speaker reminded the Senators that there are two open forums scheduled for faculty to give feedback to Bob Lawless, the search consultant from AGB, who is helping the College locate candidates for the Presidency: Wed. 11/6, 11:00 - 12:00 and 5:15 - 6:15 in Alumni Hall Randolph Hall. The Speaker encouraged faculty to come to the meetings.

On the Presidential search, the Speaker reiterated the content of a recent email message to the campus from BoT Chair, Greg Padgett: there are now three faculty member representatives on the search committee. The Speaker thanked Greg Padgett for the change, upon which the Senate broke out in applause. The Speaker closed her report by welcoming Greg Padgett to the podium.

B. Greg Padgett, Chair - Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston

Padgett thanked the Speaker and the Provost for their service to the College and expressed appreciation to the Senate and, on behalf of the board, to the faculty of the College for the work they do. He also expressed appreciation to President Benson for his service and for allowing the time for the search to happen this academic year.

Padgett stressed that the BoT wants the search process to be thoughtful and deliberate. He asserted that every applicant for the position will go through the same nomination and application process, with all applications sent directly to Bob Lawless and AGB. All College stakeholders are included in the process, he also stated.

Padgett roughed out a timeline:

- End of November - Ad published in the Chronicle of Higher Education
- January - Nominations and applications will be due.
- February - Committee’s candidate interviews will be held
- February or March - finalists determined and invited to campus

Padgett noted that the finalists will be determined by the BoT and stressed that only the names of the finalists will be released to the public. The final candidate selected by the BoT will not be announced until there is a signed contract. The committee will maintain confidentiality as a means of insuring the very best pool of applicants.

Padgett promised to keep everyone up to date on the process as it unfolds.

Questions

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if, in addition to the job ad, there will be a prospectus for the job. Padgett replied that there will be one, written soon and made available soon after the ad goes out. To Shaver’s follow-up, “who will write it?,” he replied that, as search committee chair, he will be in charge of it, but that he will take input from outside.

There were no more questions.

C. The Provost

Merit & Market Raises - the Provost noted that, following the recommendations of the Faculty Compensation Committee, guidance has been sent to the deans, who will
in turn, work with department heads to make pay raises available from the 1% mar-
ket adjustment pool and the 1.8% merit pool.

CofC-MUSC Update - CofC and MUSC continue to have discussions about collabora-
tion on programs, notably in Computer Science, Physics, Biology, and Business, and
are beginning to separately develop requests for funding related to those and other
areas of potential collaboration. He stated that it is “fair to say that we are moving
toward a collaborative model” and what that might entail will be clearer as we pro-
gress in developing the programs.

Addlestone Library (AL) Renovations - the AL will be undergoing significant renova-
tions next semester as a result CofC’s partnering with the South Carolina Historical
Society and serving to house many of their historical documents in Southern history.
The renovations to house these documents will add 200 seats for students, including
140 general seats, with more power outlets added. The entire current book collec-
tion will move to compact (moveable) shelving on the second floor. The special col-
collections area will expand, and a high tech lecture room will be added to the third
floor.

To accomplish the renovations, during spring break 2014, the journals will be re-
moved and boxed for temporary storage until the beginning of the fall 2014
semester. From early May to mid August, the second and third floor will be closed.
Books will be removed and stored to clear space for the work to be done. As with the
journals, these will return at the beginning of fall 2014. By fall semester the entire
library will be open and ready for use.

Faculty who anticipate a need for certain print journals may contact Sherry Gadsden
by February 15 to have those titles set aside. The same is true for books (including
reference books) that faculty need or feel they might need during the transition peri-
од: faculty need to contact Gadsden, but in this case, by April 15. Inter-library loan
will not be affected.

Questions

Mary Beth Heston, Senator - Art History, asked if the reading area on the third floor
of AL will still be there after the renovation.

The Provost replied that, based on his recollection of the plans, yes, it will.

Calvin Blackwell expressed concern that the current compact shelving does not al-
ways work and asked that any new compact shelving be upgraded from the current
or that the shelving be better maintained.

The Provost said that he would rely the message, and noted that Claire Fund has said
that she is happy with the firm that is coming in to install the compact shelving.

Moore Quinn, Senator - Anthropology and Sociology asked how departmental lib-
rary liaisons’ duties (ordering books, databases, etc.) might be affected by the renov-
atons.

The Provost replied that he couldn’t answer that but that he would make sure to
carry the concern back to Claire Fund.
Hollis France, Senator - Political Science, asked how students will be affected by the renovation.

The Provost reiterated that the first floor would remain open, though there will be some noise.

David Moscowitz, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (HHS), asked if there has been any discussion about allocating space for faculty research carrels.

The Provost stated that he cannot answer that question with a yes or a no, but that the small rooms already dedicated to faculty use will still be available.

There were no more questions.

D. Devon Hanahan, Chair - Faculty Compensation Committee

Report on the Committee's Proposal for Distribution of Salary Adjustment Funds for 2013-2014

Proposal | Table: School Differentials from CUPA-HR Data, 30 September 2013 | Powerpoint

Hanahan thanked the committee for all the hard work, going back to last year’s resolution at the April 2013 meeting of the Senate. She also mentioned the importance of the faculty feedback that the committee gets via email, which they read aloud at each meeting, and, if they can’t answer the questions or address the concerns, they pass them on to those they think can. She also stated that the committee exists to advocate for faculty and serve as a liaison to the Provost’s office.

The resolution approved by the Senate in April 2013 to align faculty salaries with CUPA-HR (College and University Professionals Association for Human Resources) data was presented to the BoT Academic Affairs committee. Influenced by the resolution, the BoT approved a 1% market and a 1% merit increase. The Welfare Committee was then tasked with coming up with a plan for distributing the 1% market increase funds. They also became aware at this time of an $840,000 college budget surplus.

The committee proposed that the pool be distributed in a way that took into account how far in the negative departments within the schools differed from CUPA-HR salary means at peer schools. The committee also asked that the budget surplus be added into the 1% market adjustment pool. The surplus was added to the pool for raises, but in the merit pool.

Hanahan added that the merit and market increases will appear in faculty’s January 15th paychecks.

There were no questions.

E. Mark Hurd, Chair - Faculty Committee on Educational Technology (FETC)

Report on Status of Online Course Evaluations and Current Work of FETC

Powerpoint Slides
See the Powerpoint slides for the history of online course evaluations, issues and concerns, advantages and disadvantages. The slides also indicate efforts currently being made to improve the response rate, and other possible means, as well. In addition, the slides include a table comparing our practices with those of other institutions.

Questions

Devon Hanahan asked if it would be possible to *not* have to print evaluations for review binders.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, noted that there have been requests to use just the summary page, but there is some important data not on that particular page. She agreed that there should be more conversation about alternatives to printing a large volume of material for review binders.

Jon Hakkila, Astronomy and Physics, asked if we could introduce more incentives and better advertise them since students seem to respond well to them.

Hurd agreed, suggesting that giving priority registration might be a good way to incentivize doing the evaluations.

Caveny-Noecker noted that Academic Affairs is looking into incentives more and advertising, too.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, noted that a challenge related to students using the evaluation app is that students, while they will do the quantitative evaluation, they are less likely to give qualitative feedback.

Hurd agreed, adding that students might be more willing on tablets than on smartphones to enter more qualitative information. He suggested that faculty could advertise that on a particular day, students could bring laptops to class and be given time to do the evaluation.

Smith followed up by saying that even when students use laptops, they may be less inclined to give more than brief feedback, simply due to the fact that they are doing the evaluation electronically—the “Twitter mindset,” he called it.

Morgan Koerner, Senator - German & Slavic Studies, suggested that faculty could add a date on their syllabuses for students to do evaluations in class on their laptops, tablets, or smartphones.

Hurd noted that some faculty may not allow such devices in their classes and, thus, be uncomfortable with such a suggestion.

Koerner countered that it would just be on one day and, thus, not be much of a problem.

Joe Carson, Department of Physics and Astronomy, reported that about 15% of his students, when asked if they could bring a laptop or electronic device to class to do the evaluations, reported that they could not—a sizable number.

Hurd replied that 15% *is* a high number, but the tradeoff in that scenario would be capturing data from 85% of the students.
Carson countered that there’s a potential social cost to that 15% of the group who are barred from participating simply because they do not possess a laptop, tablet, or laptop.

Darryl Phillips, Senator - Classics CLAS expressed great concern about potential insensitivity to economic disparity in our students. Since students may feel they are put on the spot by a requirement that they bring devices to class, Phillips suggested that the committee could develop guidelines to maintain sensitivity to economic inequality in our students.

Bob Podolsky, Biology, asked if the committee’s research turned up institutions that require that students do evaluations in order to get their grades.

Hurd replied that some schools do just that, but these are mainly professional schools. Discussions with the Provost’s office, he noted, indicated that we are not going to go to such a requirement. There are arguments against it as a potential violation of student rights, unduly punitive, and so forth.

Kathy Boyd, Registrar, stated that it is important to realize that there is no way to put grades out early as an incentive or withhold them until evaluations are complete once they have been entered into the system. These things could only be done at the level of instructor.

Jen Wright, Senator - HSS, argued that allowing students who complete evaluations earlier access to their grades, as some schools do, would be a strong incentive to increase response rates.

Boyd, in reply, noted that there is a very short period of time between when grades are due and when they are reported to students.

Kelly Shaver argued that having evaluations open through the final exam period would be a good idea, especially for classes such as one of his, in which most of the bulk of the work comes due at the end of the semester.

Jason Overby, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), strongly seconded Shaver’s point, adding that he has gotten feedback from students to the effect that once they had time to do an evaluation for his class—during the finals—the evaluations were closed.

Hurd noted that he had a similar experience.

Burton Callicott, Senator - Library, suggested that an anonymous survey or quiz in OAKS could be administered in order for instructors to get feedback directly from their students.

Beverly Diamond, Associate Provost, in reply to Callicott, cautioned that such means of getting feedback at the level of the instructor might cause response rates on the school-wide evaluations to go down.

Podolsky raised a concern regarding faculty offering incentives for students in their classes to complete the evaluations: such practices could conceivably drive down rates of response in non-incentivized classes.
Hurd replied that one way to incentivize evaluation that would not have this kind of effect would be to grant class extra credit only if the student has completed all course evaluations, with proof being a printout of screenshot of some sort.

Caveny-Noecker noted that Academic Affairs encourages the use of modest incentives that do not potentially dis-incentivize evaluations of other classes.

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

Motion to More Clearly Define Faculty Eligibility for Committee Work, Change to By-laws Article V, Section 1, K [brought by Committee on Nominations and Elections to the 1 October 2013 Meeting, see minutes, 5 d. (1)]

Introduction

Paul Young represented the committee and took questions.

Discussion

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, expressed concern that the motion could be read to be foreclosing on adjunct service on committees.

Young noted that the purpose is to clarify the FAM’s language. The clarification brings the language of the FAM into alignment with current practice with regard to the composition of committees. Additionally, the language here would not preclude adjunct service on committees, since the composition of committees can be altered by later revisions of the FAM. Finally, the Faculty Welfare Committee is currently looking into just that issue.

Todd McNerney, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, confirmed that the committee intends to bring motions to the December meeting.

Decision

Motion passed.

5. New Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee

(1) Course Proposals: All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deactivated) will be voted on as a single group, unless a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote. Senators are asked to contact the Faculty Speaker or the Faculty Secretary in advance, if they wish to separate a proposal from the group. Of course, this action can also be done on the floor of the Senate.

   a) Change prerequisites

      COMM 301
      COMM 410
      ARTM 420

   b) Change course title
PSYC 410

c) New course proposals
   AAST 330, Black Images in the Media
   AAST 366, Race-Ethnic Relations
   AAST: Change Program (add new courses to the major)
   DANC 150, Dance Appreciation
   ARTM 230, History of the Recording Industry
   ARTM 390, Legal Aspects of Entertainment Law
   ARTM 401: Music Industry internship
   ARTM: Change Program (add new courses to the major)

Discussion
None

Decision
All proposals passed.

(2) Program Terminations:
   a) Italian minor (Italian Studies minor remains)

Discussion
None

Decision
The proposal passed.

b) French Studies minor

Discussion
None

Decision
The proposal passed.

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

(1) Change credit/contact hours
   EVSS 631

(2) Change title and description
   EVSS 633
   EVSS 642

Discussion
None

**Decision**

All proposals passed.

E. Larry Krasnoff, Director, Pre-Law Program

Discussion on the Idea of the College’s acquiring the Charleston School of Law (CSOL) | Powerpoint Slides

See the Powerpoint slides for background on CSOL, comparisons to other law schools, potential impacts of the proposed sale of CSOL to Infilaw, and questions we ought to consider in any proposed absorption of CSOL into CofC.

Krasnoff noted the importance of the Senate discussing issues regarding CSOL at this point, rather than later. What happens regarding CSOL is somewhat out of our control, but the Senate would have to be involved in numerous matters regarding the CSOL were it integrated into CofC, such as approving a JD degree.

The sale of CSOL to Infilaw has not gone through yet, there are still significant issues to be resolved: accreditation, etc. One of the three directors of CSOL is not happy with the proposed sale to Infilaw, and this has been the source of some of the proposals floating around right now.

Comparison to other regional law schools reveals that CSOL is “not really” a good law school. The tables in the Powerpoint slides reveal this, as do employment numbers. For instance, one estimate says that only around 50% of CSOL graduates have “lawyer” jobs.

Regarding the questions in the Powerpoint presentation

1. Can Infilaw receive state approval to run CSOL?

   This may or may not happen. While there is some support for it, clearly one of the directors is against it, added to which Infilaw has a bad reputation, particularly in online venues dealing with ranking and evaluating law schools.

2. How much would it cost us to buy CSOL from the directors or Infilaw?

   There has been one meeting in which the idea of CofC buying CSOL was discussed. [Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Vice President for Executive Administration, characterized this meeting as an “exploratory conversation”].

   This question is a “moving target,” since the question has not been answered as to whether or not a sale to Infilaw or CofC would be approved by the state. Also, matters of the financial model that might obtain are murky. On the matter of what tuition could be charged, Brian McGee noted at this point, that is not necessarily limited by law: it is a political decision. Still, Krasnoff, asserted, charging a higher tuition for law school than other programs might put us out on a limb, University of Virginia being the only other public school that he knows of that does this. Kelly Shaver then added that the MBA program is allowed to charge a higher tuition. Krasnoff agreed that, given this information, perhaps a law school at CofC could charge higher tuition, but it is still not the norm in the world of
public law schools (which are connected to an idea of public mission), even if it is a norm in MBA programs (to which Shaver agreed).

3. Could we receive state approval to run CSOL?

   It is not obvious that CofC would be approved to run CSOL. The University of South Carolina does not want another law school in the state.

4. How much could we realistically charge in tuition? Would a law school be viable at that level of tuition?

   See #2 above.

5. Does having a law school fit with our public and academic missions?

   It may be, as Krasnoff asserted has been said by some, that taking on CSOL fits our academic mission better than a merger with MUSC might. Do we feel, he further asked, that we need to rescue CSOL? Certainly this would be the perception in some camps.

   Could we make CSOL's programs consistent with our conception of academic quality?

   Krasnoff asserted that we would probably not be happy with CSOL's status and performance at their current levels, particularly if we are invested in rescuing CSOL from “the basement.” So, how, he asked, would we improve the academic quality of CSOL and integrate it into our own academic mission and structures? We would have to make decisions about promotion and tenure procedures regarding law school faculty, and there are a couple possible models. We would have to think about what level of publishing we might expect from the faculty and the other range of questions that are raised along the lines of tenure and promotion.

Questions

Phil Jos, Senator - HSS asked if absorbing CSOL would take a massive infusion of money and how much of the total cost of running a law school is tuition-based.

Krasnoff replied that until recent years, many law schools have been profit centers. Many law schools opened to make money, yet that may not be working; applications have fallen off and law schools are struggling. Washington University of St. Louis, for instance, in the last two years has had to ask for a subsidy from WU in order to run their program, which had not happened before.

One thing to consider, too, Krasnoff, noted is that in the case of CSOL it would not only be the cost of running the school to keep in mind but also the payment made for the school itself, lump sum, or time, or however the arrangement would be made.

Sue Balinsky, Senator - Health & Human Performance, asked what might be the benefits and drawbacks of the CSOL becoming a USC branch.

Krasnoff said that given USC's general desire to be the only law school in the state, a satellite might be better than any of the other alternatives, from their perspective,
since it would reduce competition. Of course, there is, also, the general quality concern of satellite campuses: would USC be prepared to fund it to the level of quality of the main campus law school.

George Pothering asked if Clemson has come up in these discussions.

Krasnoff said he was not sure and asked McGee.

Brian McGee stated that a significant context to consider is that the Dean of University of South Carolina Law School, according to one media account, is opposed to having any other school having a law school in the state, but that if there’s no other option, he would consider taking on CSOL as a branch campus of USC.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, asked if in an absorption of CSOL, certain law specialities might be possible, taking advantage of CofC areas of faculty specialization.

Krasnoff replied that such collaboration could be possible, but that opportunities for specialization in law schools are somewhat constrained. General and specialized law degrees also need to be tied to employment and confidence that a degree can result in employment. The academic interest, say, in preservation law, would need to be attended by some demand for preservation lawyers.

Darryl Phillips, Senator - Classics, expressed a more optimistic read of the Krasnoff’s comparison of law schools. We ought to consider not only the LSAT quantitative scores, Phillips argued, but also the percentile scores, since the achievement gap does not look as stark from viewpoint of those scores. Looking at all the evidence for academic standards, he asserted, is important.

He also suggested that, if some collaboration is not already ongoing between CofC and CSOL, there are opportunities for it with our students in programs like the Masters in Environmental Science, Masters in Public Administration, and Masters in History. There may be some real positives, in other words, in CofC’s acquiring CSOL, to which our name could add some value.

To Phillips first point, Krasnoff replied Phillips is right to say that we should consider all the evidence, but that when a student scores at the lower level on the LSAT, he feels advisors ought to steer them away from law school schools, and yet the schools at the bottom, and on the “edge of fraud,” are accepting students with these scores. on the lower end of his comparison may be accepting students who

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, asked if in the ten years since CSOL has been around there has been improvement in scores.

Kransnoff replied that the scores have gone up, but since accreditation, scores haven’t gone up, but he also noted that this may be due to the market. Applications are down. But other information that might go to the question of quality is not readily available, such as faculty hiring, scholarships, offered, etc. We need to know more about these things if we are serious about acquiring CSOL.

Gigova noted that reviewing the CSOL website, she noted that they use many adjunct instructors.
Krasnoff replied that, to some extent, this is not unusual at law schools, since they often use the expertise of practitioners, and there’s an advantage to students in working with faculty who are actually practicing attorneys. But high quality law schools also invest in academic faculty. Krasnoff noted, that in this regard, CSOL has actually gotten a little better about hiring academic faculty, too.

Kelly Shaver, Senator asked if it useful to consider first-time-out bar exam passing as a quality metric.

Krasnoff replied that bar-passing as a measure can be artificially manipulated by schools. In high-end schools, there is no preparatory coursework for the bar exam, and students still do well, but some schools dedicate a disproportionate amount of time to teaching the bar exam and supplant other coursework as an effect.

Shaver followed up by noting that bar passage is essential, of course, for employment as an attorney.

Paul Young, Senator - Mathematics, asked, aside from the name, what else CofC would offer that would improve CSOL.

Krasnoff suggested that the integration into academic culture and collaboration might factor be attractive to CSOL, though there are obvious questions to be asked about physical plant and other resources as well.

Tom Carroll, Senator - School of Education, Health and Human Performance, asked about how many student CofC contribution to USC and CSOL, which may be a kind of a “safety school.”

Krasnoff noted that, while current numbers won’t be available until spring, CSOL is the place that more of our students go than any other. Last year 43 students applied to CSOL, 33 were accepted, and 12 went. There is a perception that CSOL is a “little bit of a safety school.” Numbers have been as high as 20 or more attending CSOL. Last year numbers going to USC and CSOL were roughly even.

Krasnoff asked the Provost if any other meetings with CSOL or other parties are scheduled.

The Provost mentioned that, while he cannot speak on the subject right now, there is interest in continued meetings.

The Provost noted that we are the largest feeder school to MUSC.

Krasnoff added that this is true of CSOL, as well, and it is also true that CofC students make up the largest percentage of the CSOL student body.

The Provost adduced the example of William and Mary, an aspirational peer institution, for its combined tradition of liberal arts with a few specialized PhD programs and a law school, all as a state-supported institution. While we have a lot of unknowns, he said, this comparison is one to keep in mind as we consider options for bringing together not only CofC and CSOL, but also whatever collaborations might emerge with MUSC.
6. Constituents’ Concerns
   None

7. Adjournment: 7:08