Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 1 October 2013

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 1 October 2013, at 5:00 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium)

1. Call to Order: 5:03 PM by Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty

2. 10 September minutes were approved as circulated.

3. Reports (The Speaker, President Benson, and Provost George Hynd)
   A. The Speaker

      The Speaker recognized Susan Morrison, who substituted as Parliamentarian for George Pothering, who could not be at the meeting.

      The Speaker had no update regarding plans for search for new President, though she expressed hope that she will have an opportunity in two weeks, when the Board of Trustee meets on campus, to speak with Chair Greg Padgett. She will report on any news on the search at the November meeting.

      The Speaker noted that Heath Hoffman and a group of faculty have met to follow up on the discussion Hoffman initiated at the prior Senate meeting (see the 10 September minutes, 3E; also see the blog Hoffman set up to facilitate ongoing discussions). The group is developing ideas and will meet again on Tuesday 10/8. The Speaker encouraged other faculty interested in joining the conversation to contact Hoffman.

      The Board of Trustees will meet Thursday, October 17 - Friday, October 18th. Clara Hodges sent out an email announcement of the meeting and an agenda. The Speaker encouraged anyone interested in attending any of the meetings to let Clara know so she can make sure there are sufficient chairs available. Committee meetings are on Thursday, the full Board meeting is on Friday morning.

      Following up on conversations last year with the Faculty Welfare Committee and President Benson on creating opportunities for adjunct faculty to have a voice or representation in faculty governance, the Speaker held an adjunct faculty forum the week prior to the October Senate meeting. All adjuncts were invited. 25-28 attended, with another five or six attending electronically. A number of ideas and concerns were expressed, and the adjuncts seemed very appreciative of the effort to provide a forum for them. A second forum will be held in November.

      The Welfare Committee may be bringing motions soon to the Senate concerning adjunct representation on particular committees, an idea the adjunct faculty were very excited to hear. On a different note, the Speaker mentioned one long-time adjunct's sobering observation that, while individual regular faculty often appreciate and support adjuncts, he felt that adjuncts are still seen as second-class citizens, and the Speaker suggested that we might want to keep that perception in mind as we move forward.

      Questions: none.
B. The President

See the President's written report. The following represents the elaborations and extensions the President made on the written text of the speech during his delivery for the Senate.

To the "New Charleston Update" section of the written text, supporting his statement that "the best solution to meeting the current and long-term needs of Charleston's economy is to establish a comprehensive research university in Charleston," the President added that the Mayor is "beyond 100% supportive of this," and that the Mayor "has made this one of his goals for the end of his administration, to make this happen." Also, the metro Chamber of Commerce, the President stated, are "major players in this game right now, doing studies, doing needs analysis: what does the community need?, what types of degrees?, what types of PhDs?, what types of undergraduate degrees? The metro Chamber;" he emphasized, "is all over this idea."

In same section, President Benson said of "Option 1" ("The legislature could designate the College as South Carolina's fourth research university") that he does "not necessarily think it's the best option."

To his discussion of "Option 2" ("Legislation could be enacted to merge the College and MUSC"), he added that "there is a very high probability that something like this will occur, whether we like it or not."

Regarding "Option 3" ("We could significantly increase the collaboration between the College and MUSC, including joint PhD programs and other PhD programs outside the field of medicine that are important to New Charleston"), the President stressed that at present, we could, with special approval, collaboratively offer PhDs with MUSC, but only in the medical field. Even though, as the written report text notes, with this option "we would undoubtedly not achieve all the synergies that a merger would create," the President added that such a plan "could go a long way toward" providing assets we need "by simply a significant collaboration between the two institutions." He noted that this option also has a "fair probability" of happening. He said that he believes either this option or option 2 "will happen."

In discussing "Option 4" ("The state could build a full-blown branch campus of Clemson or USC in Charleston and, potentially, require that new institution collaborate with the College and MUSC"), the President added to his assertion that Charleston needs its own research university, rather than a branch campus:

We want the faculty living here, we want the faculty working here, we want the faculty in our churches and our synagogues, we want the faculty's kids going to our schools, we want all of that happening here, and we want the best faculty we can possibly get.

The need for a comprehensive research university in Charleston, the President stated, is "no longer a question. This is a done deal." He went on to say, "we may not end up having it, but the need is completely recognized by 99% of the people that I come in contact with and, beyond that, around the state. Our community leaders are
all for it, our business community’s totally for it, our donors are for it, and the list goes on and on and on. The question now is 'how do you do it?' That's what we're wrestling with."

In addition, the President specified that the Trustees also support the idea.

The President bolstered his observation in the written report "that research universities can easily lose their passion for great teaching," by saying that this outcome is an "unbelievable" and "very steep" slippery slope, but that it is, nonetheless, possible to have a research focus and a focus on undergraduate education.

The President stressed that "there has got to be new money" for any collaboration or merger to work.

Having outlined the significant challenges to higher education in the state, yet noting the tremendous potential we have, and bringing to a close this section of his report, the President asserted that "we are at a tipping point. There need to be some investments in higher education: we have been waiting a long time in South Carolina for this to happen."

Under the heading of "Faculty and Staff Salary Increases," the President's written report specifies that "in the budget approved by the Board of Trustees last June, $800,000 was allocated to support what we believed at the time would be a state-mandated salary increase for all employees." In the report as delivered, the President asked for verification of that figure from Brian McGee, who replied that the actual number was $837,000.

The President stated that he hopes that any salary increases will appear in January paychecks.

Rounding out a narrative of the College's ultimately failed plans to raise faculty salaries and hire new faculty through tuition increases, the President noted that the tuition increases we have had over the past few years, "3%, 0%, 3.2%," and such, "don't even cover inflation."

Questions and Answers

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, expressed concern that a shift toward becoming a research university might "very likely" "destroy what we are right now," since there is apparently no money forthcoming. She stated that many faculty appear to not be happy about the idea of becoming a research university: many, in fact, came to work at the college precisely for the kind of place it is now. She asked what happens to faculty already here who are not interested in this research university model.

The President answered by saying "the ball is rolling," but it could be stopped by lack of money. There may be increased collaboration with MUSC, which might be the best alternative from the standpoint outlined in Gigova's question. In that model, there would be "heavy duty" research done in a set of our departments, but it wouldn't be across the board. MUSC wants to match up, for instance, with
Computer Science, Chemistry, Public Health, and Physics at CofC, to name a few programs. The President said that he liked that model, but only until "New Charleston" came along, Boeing arrived, and "this economy caught fire." "We are on the radar screen," the President further said, with the Research Triangle, Silicon Valley, Austin, and although they are far ahead of us, there's an excitement, "probably not seen around here in a couple of hundred years." "It's the type of thing," he said, "that wants to be fed, and the business community is all over this idea of some sort of a research collaboration or a research university."

The President expressed grave concern that Clemson or USC might come into the area and marginalize the College. The result would be a loss of donors and support from businesses. He asserted that if we are to keep pace with the transformation of Charleston, we too will have to transform to an Arts & Sciences university, which would require a good deal of money. One area that money would go to is to offer competitive faculty salaries. Even staying precisely as we are, he cautioned, would require more money to recruit and retain faculty.

Phil Dustan, Senator - School of Science and Math, pointed out that the institutions that we collaborate with have particular missions (he adduced examples: MUSC, the Citadel, NOAA, and DNR) and problems to solve. Our mission, he said, is "curiosity driven and is innovative and, in some respects, that makes us very, very precious and very valuable." He expressed fear that in melding with other institutions, we might become more like them, rather than the other way around.

Dustan asserted that funding from a significant donor might be superior option to funding from the state. The state, he says, has a "plantation mentality," in which it is good to have uneducated people who will work for low wages. Dustan admitted his charge was "kind of harsh."

The President, however, replied, "it's not far off," given the history of the state as recently as the 1950s. He stated that the cultural history of the state is detrimental to higher education, and that the structural issues he outlined in his report also contribute a great deal to the problem: especially the constitutional weakness of the governor and the relative strength of the legislature. A board of regents, he asserted, also, would be superior to a CHE.

Kirk Stone, Senator - Department of Communication, asked the President what his thoughts might be on possibly being replaced by a public figure such as Chip Limehouse or Jenny Sanford.

The President asserted that we need a solid academic, and if this institution moves toward a research university model, then the President ought to be someone who has a research university background and who understands PhD programs and the slippery slope with regard to undergraduate program strength that he mentioned above.
Dan Greenberg, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee asked, given the abysmal market for law school graduates and the declining enrollments in lower-tier law schools, if the President could say more about the appeal of any kind of merger with the Charleston School of Law (CSL).

The President noted that in response to the challenges of New Charleston, professional schools, such as the CSL, and graduate programs could form part of the research university wrapped around a core, which would be the College of Charleston. Also, there’s an appeal in the homegrown nature of CSL, which seems more of a natural to join in with the College, than to be run by a for-profit chain.

There were no more questions.

C. The Provost

See the Provost’s Powerpoint slides.

The Provost noted that the African American Studies program proposal was placed on the consent agenda for the upcoming meeting of the CHE. He described the program as a "signature accomplishment."

The Lowcountry Graduate Center now has a new Director, Nancy Muller, who will start in November.

The search for a new Dean of the Libraries yielded 51 applications (there were only 25 in the last search). 12 applicants were interviewed via Skype, and the committee is now looking further into five of those candidates.

The search for a new Dean of the School of Languages, Cultures & World Affairs is being chaired by HHS Dean Jerry Hale. The other committee members are listed in a separate Powerpoint slide.

Questions: none.

4. Old Business

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

Motion to delete MBAD 500 from program requirements and to add MBAD 520 to program requirements for Master of Business Administration

Introduction

The Speaker reminded the Senate that the motion was a holdover from the September meeting.

Jon Hakkila, Chair - Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee, noted that the main concern in discussion over the motion in September was for the place of ethics in the curriculum (see September’s minutes, 3c(1)). He asked Jim Kindley, Director MBA Program, to speak on the motion.
Kindley noted that he has been teaching at the College for the last two years and has served as Director of the MBA program for one year. He apologized for not being in attendance at the September meeting, explaining that he was unaware that the curriculum motion was being brought before the Senate. He expressed his appreciation for the faculty’s concern over the motion and the attention shared by all, including the MBA program, to having the best programs possible. He explained the reasons for the proposed changes to the program.

• Talks with students in MBAD 500 revealed that they thought the content covered in that course was not worthy of a full semester’s treatment.

• Charleston School of Law students pursuing the dual degree program (MBA & JD) are, under the current program, required to take MBAD 500, which is a law course, and this did not make sense given the agreement governing the program.

• CHE has limited the MBA to only 36 hours. 27 hours are in required courses, with nine in an area of focus, which he emphasized, is "not very much."

• The MBA faculty committee determined that the charter of MBA program, which has a global orientation, was more effectively met by requiring MBAD 520, with its emphasis on global commerce, and shifting MBAD 500 to a possible elective. The decision was made after considerable debate and discussion. They also looked into the core curricula in aspirational peer schools, including William and Mary, Vanderbilt, and Kellogg, and the proposed change would make CofC’s program more closely parallel in the core to these schools.

• The committee took the proposed changes to the MBA faculty "in total, along with the department chairs, all of whom approved" the proposal, Kindley said.

• In January of last year, the proposal came before the full faculty of the School of Business at a faculty meeting and was approved by the full faculty, and Kindley noted, "we have the notes to those meetings," if needed.

The concern over the ethics issue, Kindley affirmed, is legitimate, and we would all agree that ethics "stands in the forefront of the school's and the College's charter." Furthermore, he stressed that faculty emphasize ethics as appropriate in the classroom. In addition, every syllabus is required to contain the honor code. "Ethical issues have not been pushed out in any possible way," he asserted.

Kindley also pointed out that the MBA program, though this is not in the course catalog, has a preterm program that is two and a half week's long and in which corporate governance, corporate social responsibility, and ethical issues are discussed. A panel of outside people come in for two to three full days of addressing these issues, which were at the core of the course being replaced in the proposal. The preterm program "sets the right tone for the year for what the faculty do with that issue."
Finally, Kindley expressed hope that he could allay any concerns that the MBA program is not addressing ethics.

**Discussion**

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if MBAD 500 has been eliminated from the core for the current cohort of students.

Kindley responded "yes."

Shaver followed up with, "before we have approved it?"

Kindley replied that he thought it had been approved, and he did not realize that the proposal had not gotten to the full Senate last year.

Marvin Gonzalez, Senator - School of Business, stated that he does not remember the proposal being approved at a faculty meeting.

Kindley replied that he checked the meeting notes, which verify that it was approved in a January faculty meeting with no objections.

Shaver asserted that minutes are not kept in School of Business meetings, stating that in his time at the College (since 2005), he has never seen minutes of a School of Business meeting.

Kindley replied that "they aren't published, but they are kept."

Shaver replied by saying, "if they aren't published, how is anyone supposed to know what happens?"

Kindley: "were you at that meeting?"

Shaver: "No, but I shouldn’t have to be. I would have voted against it then, but that's not the issue." Shaver went on to say that deliberative bodies holding public meetings need to provide a public record of their decisions in the form of minutes.

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM, pointed out that the honor code that Kindley noted is published on course syllabi, does not specifically regard ethics in business, and thus is not germane to the discussion. "Why," he asked, "are you removing the only course in the course in the curriculum, as I understand it, that deals with ethics in business?"

Kindley expressed regret that the program cannot offer more courses, but, he reiterated, the full MBA faculty felt that the global commerce course (520) was more important than the law course (500), and the MBA faculty are committed to covering ethics as appropriate in the classroom. This is important, Kindley asserted, and feedback from students, he noted, has pointed that out. In addition, Kindley stated that in his own classes ethics in context is important, as it is in faculty with whom he converses.

Kindley also asserted that, while it may not be present in catalog course descriptions, ethics is often mentioned in course syllabi.
Dustan followed up by stating that ethical problems in international business are a frequent topic of concern, and that "it seems" to him "that it doesn't matter what the students think," but that that ethics should be among the highest order concerns when it comes to international business.

Kindley clarified that he did not say that students thought that ethics were not a concern. The MBA faculty are committed, he noted, to addressing ethics in every possible way: through speakers' presentations, through panels, and within the framework of their courses, for example. "We feel like," he noted "it is woven into every class."

Andrew Shedlock, Senator - Department of Biology asked "does faculty approve the minutes of the previous faculty meetings?"

Kindley indicated "no."

Jen Wright, Senator - HSS, asked if there was an active effort to compensate for the loss of the ethics course (500) in other courses in the core, making sure that what was lost would picked up elsewhere. She said that might allay her concerns.

Kindley noted that MBAD 500 is not an "ethics course" but a "law course" in which ethics is discussed. The concern over ethics, he asserted, is brought to students in a number of ways, reiterating the importance of the preterm program and the treatment of ethics, as appropriate, in classes and their syllabi.

Tom Heeny, American Association of University Professors, asked what implications dropping the course might have for the MBA program's external accreditor, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business.

Kindley replied that the committee felt that the proposal more closely aligned the core with the program’s charter.

Heeny followed up by saying that Kindley's reply connects to the state-level CHE, asking again how the proposed change would situate the MBA program in relation to the national accreditor, ACASB.

Kindley replied that this concern is handled in the program's "assessment work."

Dan Greenberg, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, asked if the legal content of the course to be dropped from the core is covered elsewhere in the curriculum or programming.

Kindley responded that students spend a day in orientation talking about corporate governance and legal issues in a general sense. Additionally, MBAD 520, within its focus on global commerce course does cover legal issues, though not in great depth.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, noted that he was at the faculty meeting at which the proposal was approved. He also noted that ethics is discussed in the areas of focus in the MBA in relation to specific industries. He pointed out that the School of Business has five learning
objectives, and that the question of concern for accreditation is how the new class (MBAD 520) meets (or doesn't) these objectives.

Kindley noted that the MBA faculty committee and full faculty found the new course to be consistent with the learning objectives for the purposes of accreditation.

Todd McNerney, Chair - Department of Theatre and Dance, asked if MBAD 520 was not part of one of the concentrations, and if so, what might replace 520 in its concentration.

Kindley replied that another marketing course would replace 520 in its area of focus.

Kelly Shaver reported that he searched MBA program syllabi for four words: ethics, ethical, law, legal. He stressed that does not claim to know, however, what people actually discuss in their classes. The results of the search are:

- 502 - Accounting Issues for the Business Manager: "ethics" listed briefly, no reference to "law" or "legal."
- 504 - Managing and Leading in Organizations: there is a discussion of ethics, but nothing about "law."
- 505 - Creativity and Innovation: none of the words appear.
- 525 - Marketing Management: "ethics" appears briefly, but not "law."
- 590 - Integrated Capstone: "ethics" appears, but not "law."

Kindley responded by noting that the syllabi for next spring have not been published, and so he wondered how Shaver would have copies.

Shaver replied that the syllabi he looked at are available on the web on the MBA program site.

Tom Caroll, Senator - Education, Health, and Human Performance, asked Kindley if he could distinguish, briefly, between 518 - Global Economy and 520 - Global Enterprise.

Kindley described 518 as a macroeconomics course, whereas 520 covers global trade, supply chain, and so forth.

Phil Dustan expressed feeling in a bit of quandary in that he has not heard enough about the proposal to render a judgment, but at the same time, he wondered how much more information he could get from any other source, such as the committee that brought the motion.
Jon Hakkila, Chair - Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee, asserted that, having just joined the committee this year, he knows as much as Dustan does.

Dustan replied by saying that his gut feeling is to vote against the motion and to let the committee bring another motion forward that addresses the issues.

The Speaker clarified that if the motion were voted down, then the MBA program could bring a new motion to the Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee who could then vet that motion.

Moore Quinn, Senator - Department of Sociology and Anthropology, called the question, which was seconded and passed.

**Decision**

A voice vote was inconclusive, and members voted again by raise of hand.

The motion failed on a vote of 20 (against) - 13 (for).

A question was raised by Wayne Smith, Senator - Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, who asked what should be done regarding the current MBA students, since the change has already been implemented.

The Speaker stated that this is probably something that has to be worked out between the MBA program and the Deans of the Graduate School and the School of Business.

5. New Business

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

      (1) Program Proposal: Master of Science in Child Life

      **CHE Proposal**

      **Estimated Costs by Year**

      **New Enrollment Table**

      Course Proposals:
      - **CHLI 601** Introduction to Child Life
      - **CHLI 603** Death and Dying
      - **CHLI 604** Program Development and Practicum in Child Life
      - **CHLI 605** Psychosocial Aspects of Illness, Trauma, and Hospitalization
      - **CHLI 606** Family Issues
      - **CHLI 611** Working with Children with Special Needs/Developmental Disabilities
      - **CHLI 701** Child Life Internship

      **Introduction**
Jon Hakkila, Chair - Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee, asked Susan Simonian, Professor in the Department of Psychology to introduce the motion.

Simonian reported that the program has been in the works for a number of years and that there has been an ongoing collaboration with MUSC in Child Life for years. Child Life is a growing field, now moving beyond the context of children's hospitals, a traditional stronghold of child life programs, to include outpatient facilities and interdisciplinary healthcare centers. With the recognition of the importance of Child Life specialization in various contexts, the market for those holding an MS in Child Life is growing. The National Childlife Council, among other institutions, has stipulated that entry into the field should require a Masters level education. The field is interdisciplinary, and at the College we are uniquely suited to deliver an MS program, and the relationships with MUSC are in place to deliver the practical aspects of the program. The curriculum addresses established needs in the field and also looks toward future needs, such as training in working with children with disabilities. The program is very strong and may be a leader in the field in the near future.

The Speaker recommended discussion of and voting on the course proposals before considering the program proposal itself.

**Discussion of Course Proposals**

None.

**Decision**

All course proposals passed.

**Discussion of the Program Proposal**

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM, asked how much the program will cost and what the source of the funding will be.

Fran Welch, Dean - Education, Health, and Human Performance, replied that Associate Provost Beverly Diamond developed the budget in consultation with the business office and that the budget will be primarily tuition driven. The program should pay for itself, but a fair amount of money has been raised as well, and that fund raising effort will continue.

Dustan followed up by asking whether the program has all its faculty, library resources, and so forth.

Beverly Diamond replied that while some courses will be covered by existing faculty, some will require new faculty over time. Something like 1.33 faculty will be required to staff new courses. The fractional faculty will be teaching in other programs on campus. The budget included in the proposal estimates $142,000 in recurring expenses; the tuition brought in by the 20 students will be on the order of $176,000. There will be a request for new faculty, but tuition will easily cover the expense. Both Dean Welch and Dean Jerry Hale (HSS) have indicated that the MS in Child Life is at the top of their priority list.
Moore Quinn, Senator - Department of Sociology and Anthropology, asked where the program's students will come from: here or elsewhere?

Simonian replied that as they wait for the program's approval, they will collect data from our students through interest surveys on campus. Our students have been going to MS Child Life programs elsewhere, so they expect campus interest to be there. Once the program is established, they expect to draw from outside populations.

Jason Coy, Senator - HSS at large, asked if the budget numbers in the proposal account for recruiting fellowships or funding.

Diamond replied that the budget includes around $6,400 for one graduate assistant, but that fund raising will cover assistantships and scholarships.

Coy clarified that he was inquiring also about tuition abatements.

Diamond replied, that, yes, they did factor abatements into the proposed budget.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if there has been any talk in the planning group about what might happen in the case of a merger with MUSC.

Simonian replied that the MS in Child Life is an example of a cooperative program with MUSC. Child Life in MUSC is in a service division of the school, not an academic division, which makes the cooperative model so appealing.

Jen Wright, HSS at large, asked if there has been any thought about ensuring that a potential hire for the program has a Psychology PhD so that the clinical background is there.

Simonian asserted that Psychology is represented in the coursework, but under the aegis of Child Life, since the Psychology department has no graduate courses. Faculty from Psychology might be able to teach in the program.

The Speaker asked that the discussion on hiring be discontinued at the moment, since the proposal’s approval or disapproval would not likely be affected by it.

Decision

The motion was approved.

(2) Masters of Teaching, Learning and Advocacy (MTLA)

Program Changes - add existing courses to requirements of electives, delete courses from requirements or electives, add new emphasis.

Course Proposals:
EDFS 705 Reflective Practice and Professional Development
MTLA 604 Identifying and Sustaining Effective Learning Communities
MTLA XXX Literacies, Identities, and Pop Culture Texts (Literacy Strand):
Proposal, Syllabus
Hakkila introduced the motions and asked Christine Finnan, Director - Masters of Teaching, Learning and Advocacy, to speak on them.

Finnan noted that the MTLA has been in place since 2009. Given the rising popularity of the program, and the desire for particular concentrations, the program is morphing to provide, beyond the core courses, a strand on Diverse Learners and one on New Literacies. The latter they expect to grow in popularity due to the states new emphasis on literacies. Another strand with significant interest at present is in Math and Science. This context allowed the program to examine current offerings and locate redundancies or other problems. Hence, EDFS 705 and MTLA 604 are being proposed to be dropped from the curriculum.

MTLA XXXX is a new course proposed for the New Literacies strand.

Discussion
None

Decision
The motion was approved.

(3) Master of Public Administration: New Course
PUBA 617 Urban Transportation: Problems and Prospects

Introduction
Hakkila introduced the motion and asked Phil Jos, Professor - Political Science, to speak on it.

Jos noted that the course has been offered for some time, and this proposal would make it official. Students from both the Masters in Public Administration and Masters in Environmental Science are likely to be interested in the class.

Discussion
Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if permission from the instructor would allow entry for undergraduates majoring in the global transportation program in the School of Business.

Jos replied that he thinks so, specifying that, while he doesn't know what would be the specific GPA requirements, they do have a policy allowing select undergraduates in graduate courses, and he is sure that the MPA director would be amenable to that.

Decision
The motion was approved.

b. General Education Committee
(1) Motion to Replace Humanities Categories with Approval Criteria
**Introduction**

Bob Mignone, Chair of the General Education Committee, asserted that the humanities categories (around a dozen: literature, etc.) are a vestige of the old system and that the approval criteria are a better means of governing what is appropriate to count as a humanities general education course. For instance, a course might fit the approval criteria but not one of the categories.

**Discussion**

None.

**Decision**

The motion was approved.

(2) **Motion** to Approve Courses for General Education Status in Humanities

- DANC 290 - Special Topics in Dance
- DANC 330 - History of Non-Western Dance
- DANC 331 - History of Western Dance

**Introduction**

Mignone noted that the Dance courses on the approval list are re-certified courses.

**Discussion**

None.

**Decision**

The motion was approved.

c. Faculty Curriculum Committee

Course Proposals: new Courses in Psychology: PSYC 374, Sins of Memory; PSYC 461, Advanced Personality Psychology with Lab (add to major accordingly).

**Discussion**

None.

**Decision**

The motions were approved.

(1) Program Change in Urban Studies: **Add Existing Course (POLI 333) to Major**

**Discussion**

None.

**Decision**

The motions were approved.
(2) Announcement: New Deadline for Prerequisite Changes

Dan Greenberg, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, explained that a new deadline has been set (12-16-2013) for any changes to appear in the 2014-15 catalog, and he advised Senators to let their departments know.

Discussion

None.

d. Committee on Nominations and Elections

The Speaker, having consulted with Calvin Blackwell, Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, prior to the meeting, sought and received unanimous consent to group motions 2 and 3 (below) and to discuss and vote on those motions first and then address motion 1 (below).

Discussion proceeded in this fashion, but early in the first part of the discussion, Darryl Phillips, Senator - Department of Classics, raised a procedural point that these motions will have to go to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, and so the Senate will have another chance to discuss them prior to voting. Later, Brain McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Vice President for Executive Administration, reiterated Phillips’s point, adding that in the case of motions for By-Laws changes, the motion is automatically referred to the By-Laws committee. Accordingly, that was the disposition of all three motions: the By-Laws committee will now review the motions. The record below is focused on substantive discussion on the motions in the original agenda order.

(1) Motion to More Clearly Define Faculty Eligibility for Committee Work, Change to By-laws Article V, Section 1, K

Introduction

Blackwell noted that this motion is a little more contentious. A common question he gets as chair of the committee is from adjuncts or visiting professors who wish to serve on college committees. His answer, he said, has been in the negative, but it turns out that the FAM, while it stipulates that faculty serve on committees, does not actually define what is meant by "faculty." Early in the FAM, there is a definition of "regular faculty," but this is not a term used later in the FAM when it nails down who can serve on committees. Last year, he said, he asked the Chair of By-Laws and the Speaker, who both said to not allow adjuncts to serve on committees, and as this was also past practice, he followed it. The motion would clarify the situation, and should the Senate not pass the motion, he asserted, he will interpret faculty "this year in the broadest manner, which means [he] would allow adjuncts and visiting professors going forward to serve on these committees," except Tenure and Promotion, which requires that members are tenured.

Discussion
Brenton LeMesurier, Senator - School of Science and Math, noted, for consideration by the By-Laws committee, that he "would find it more readable if you actually put the words 'regular faculty' into each of the appropriate places so I don't have to read three pages before to know what a paragraph means."

Moore Quinn, Senator - Department of Sociology and Anthropology, asked if we have available what the definition of "regular faculty" is.

Blackwell replied in the affirmative, explaining that "regular faculty" are everyone who are tenure-track or a tenured professor, plus instructors, but not counting full time administrators (President and Provost, for example).

Quinn asked if adjunct faculty would be included under that definition.

Blackwell replied that they would not.

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, inquired how many adjuncts or visiting professors are asking to be on committees.

Blackwell replied that he can remember two adjuncts making a request last spring and one or two visiting professors doing the same.

David Moscowitz, Senator - HSS, asked, if this motion were to pass, would a committee that wanted to have an adjunct or visiting professor not be able to ask for one?

Blackwell replied that the committee slates are put together by his committee, then there's an opportunity for faculty to add to that through nomination and election, if needed. He added that, to his mind, there's no way for a committee to add to itself, other than going through a By-Laws change. There's nothing stopping committee members from inviting anyone to their meetings.

Marianne Verlinden, Senator - School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs, suggested that it would be a good idea to have adjuncts on some committees and expressed concern that the motion might prevent that from happening.

Emily Skinner, Senator - School of Education, Health and Human Performance, stated that on the Faculty Welfare Committee, of which she is a member, they are currently working on motion regarding having adjuncts serve on particular committees, a motion which should be finished soon. She asked if her understanding of the motion under consideration at the moment is correct: does it just define what "regular faculty" is.

Blackwell noted that this motion would, in effect, say "for the remainder of this section, which is like, 40 pages of the FAM, where it says 'faculty,' we mean 'regular faculty,' and 'regular faculty' means this..." So, if this motion were to pass and Welfare wanted to move that adjuncts could serve on a particular committee, the Welfare motion would need to say something like, "but for this committee, adjuncts can serve." And this would be committee by committee, and the motion under discussion at present would not preclude the foregoing.

Blackwell asked a procedural question: because his committee did not bring the motion to the Senate as necessary "the best" solution to the problem, but mainly
to clarify the situation, he asked if it is possible to change it once it comes back from By-Laws, without having to return it to By-Laws.

The Speaker replied that, based on a case from last year, motions brought to the Senate by the By-Laws committee can be debated and voted on.

(2) **Motion** to Exclude Faculty Members Currently under Review from the Post-Tenure Review Committee, Change to By-laws Article V, Section 3, B 15 a 5 &

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

**Introduction**

Blackwell explained that these two changes are primarily "housekeeping" in nature, formalizing past practice of the committee. Blackwell stated that, as the Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, he is uncomfortable telling faculty that they cannot do things not explicitly enjoined by the FAM.

**Discussion**

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM at large, asked if this could this be simplified into one statement: if you are going up for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review, you are not allowed to serve on these committees?

Blackwell replied by asking where such a statement might go in the FAM, which is uncertain. He pointed out that these motions are designed to follow the structure of the FAM, which defines what committees do one at a time and the rules governing those committees.

6. Constituents’ Concerns

   For the good of the order and the irony, Phil Jos observed that after the September meeting’s "hour and a half" or so of "self-flagellation," the very next day we were on the front page of the *Post and Courier* in a story on the September meeting’s Resolution that the Board of Trustees Conduct a National Search for the next President of the College and subsequent (see 10 September minutes, 3D).

7. Adjournment: 7:12 PM.