

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 10 September 2013

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 10 September 2013, at 5:00 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium)

1. Call to Order: 5:07PM by Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty
2. [2 & 9 April 2013 Minutes](#) were approved as circulated.
3. **Reports** (The Speaker, Brian McGee (in lieu of President Benson), and Provost George Hynd)

A. The Speaker

The speaker welcomed all new senators, welcomed back all returning senators, and introduced the senate officers: Mike Duvall (Faculty Secretary), Heather Alexander (Faculty Secretariat), and George Pothering (Parliamentarian). She also reminded faculty of the rules for speaking:

- It is an open meeting, so anyone can speak. However, only senators can vote.
- Speakers should identify themselves and their affiliations before speaking.
- Speakers should speak up so everyone can hear.
- Robert's Rules of Order limit the number of times a person can speak on the same topic/issue to two times, though the Speaker can allow latitude as needed, so long as precedence is given to those who have not spoken.

Mike and Heather will be trying a different way of producing the agenda with the goal of going paperless (or at least an agenda that uses less paper).

The speaker asked that senators please provide feedback on the tobacco-free campus policy recently circulated by the President and to encourage colleagues, staff, and students to do so as well. The deadline is Saturday, Sept. 28.

On the Presidential search, the Speaker reported that she spoke with Greg Padgett, Chair of the Board of Trustees, on Friday (September 6), who indicated that there will be a process for the search, the Board will be seeking the service of a consultant, and that the Chair is hoping to finalize this decision soon. The search will be a national search. There are no targeted individuals: all interested parties will have to apply and go through the search process. Faculty will be included in the process, although the Chair has not yet made decisions regarding the specific composition of the search committee.

The speaker also noted a change to the evening's meeting agenda. In lieu of the President making his report, Brian McGee will present a report on the results of the Great Colleges to Work For survey done last year. The President will speak at the October meeting.

B. Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Vice President for Executive Administration

Before starting the presentation on the Great Colleges to Work For survey, McGee noted that we have had a successful submission of our fifth-year interim report to our regional accreditor, SACSCOC, and he thanked many in the room who made contributions to the effort.

He also explained that very few members of the senior staff, regrettably, were able to make it to the annual welcome back picnic due to obligations representing the College elsewhere and, in the case of the President, illness.

Finally, he offered to address questions anyone might have about the tobacco-free policy after his presentation.

Great Colleges to Work For: 2013 Results ([Presentation Slides](#))

Note: please see the presentation slides accompanying the report at the meeting. See below for moments at which McGee offered significant context, amplification, or remarks that go beyond the slides' content.

McGee pointed out that the College of Charleston is not listed in the *Chronicle of Higher Education's* report on the Great Colleges to Work For (GCTWF) because, like the majority of colleges surveyed, we are not recognized as a "great college to work for" in any one of the survey's 12 categories.

The survey, however, also provides information that the College itself can use to make improvements.

The survey group (227 institutions) amounts to about 20% of four-year colleges and universities in the US, a number that is somewhat down from prior samples, perhaps owing to attrition from institutions unhappy with not appearing in the lists of great colleges to work for.

Sam Houston State University's web site provides an example of how some colleges use the survey to promote themselves, but also how a college might solicit positive survey feedback and thus potentially sully the results. We ran a clean survey in this regard by asking faculty and staff to respond to the survey without prompting for how they should respond.

The President and the Provost, acting on a Faculty Senate resolution, agreed not only to participate in the survey, but to pay for additional services (about \$7,000), including access to all the data generated for our own analysis. We had a slightly above average response rate to our survey in comparison to other institutions participating.

The College did not score as "high achieving" in any of the survey categories. We tend to score in the average or slightly below average range in multiple comparison groups. Some school sample sizes at the College may have been a little too small. The adjunct faculty response rate was "really, really terrible," and it's an open question how to improve that for the next round of the survey.

Scores reported on the first 2013 Survey Results slide (Strengths) are the addition of "strongly agree" and "agree" scores. In the "Job Satisfaction/Support" category, "job satisfaction" labels an intrinsic quality ("I love the work I do," etc.). The "support" element actually pulled the category score down. There was less satisfaction with support, relative to the reported intrinsic benefits of the job. Also, the "Professional Development" score, while strong, referred to "opportunities" but not to resources, which, had that been the focus of the prompt, might have generated perhaps lower numbers.

In the weaknesses slide, "senior leadership" is defined as the President and those who report to the President, yet open-ended comments in the survey indicate that, for some respondents, "senior leadership" includes the Board of Trustees, and for some of the respondents, it included Deans and Associate Provosts and others who do not report to the President.

The slides labeled "2013 Comment Results" convey the result of McGee's content analysis of responses to the two open-ended questions in the survey.

All the data from the survey are available to anyone who wishes to review them and/or do further analysis on them. A flash drive with the data will be given to the Speaker and another to Ashleigh Parr, Chair of the Staff Advisory Committee to the President.

As context for the next steps, salary and benefits, during 2012-13, the College had 4.5% to use for faculty raises. and considering AAUP salary data from spring 2012 to spring 2013, some positive shifts are evident in faculty salaries, especially at the Associate and full Professor ranks. Also, last year and the year before, step increments for promotions were increased, and this year the President has approved a third increase in the promotion increments.

The President hopes a staff recognition program somewhat analogous to the faculty recognition program can be put into place in the near future. The President also intends to push for benefit enhancements.

At the presentation's conclusion, there were no questions.

C. **The Provost** ([Presentation Slides](#))

Note: please see the presentation slides accompanying the report at the meeting. See below for moments when the Provost offered significant context, amplification, or remarks that go beyond the slides' content.

The Provost noted that, since there was a recent forum on the ongoing conversations on collaboration/merger between MUSC and CofC, his presentation will not speak to that issue.

Academic programs listed on the third slide have been approved or are in the pipeline to be approved.

Exercise Science, at a little over two years in, has around 250 students enrolled, and the programs in health education and health promotion are attracting many students.

Archaeology is successful.

African American Studies is soon to be approved and will be only the third such program in a state institution in South Carolina.

Bachelors of Professional Studies is to be officially launched soon.

The School of Business will be breaking apart their bachelors degree is Business Administration and carving out two majors: Finance and Economics. They have also developed a 2+1+1 relationship, in which Law students at the Charleston School of Law take two years of Legal Studies, then enroll in an accelerated MBA program at the College for a year, and then return to the School of Law for a year, and in the process they an MBA and JD.

Senior Project brings rising high school seniors (primarily students of color and first generation college students) for a five-day summer experience in which they live in our residence halls and learn about how to apply for college, about financial aid, how to take the SAT, tour CofC, MUSC, and the School of Law. The program encourages students to pursue a college education, it serves to recruit students for the College, and is an investment in underserved groups.

Honors College information reflects numbers yet to be finalized. More students than ever are pursuing the William Aiken Fellowship.

The figures under the "Making Progress" header on the fourth slide refer to external funding. The percentage of external funding that is federal is shrinking somewhat over the past few years. 67% of external funding goes to the School of Science and Mathematics.

Out-of-state applications, compared to in-state applications, suggest that admission to the College is highly desirable among prospective students all over the country. We have a rising national visibility and respect.

Our first-year retention rate is very good among our peers.

Georgia, North Carolina, New Jersey, and New York contribute the most out of state students to our student body.

Items with an asterisk in the slide on the campus master plan are projects that are underway. Within three years, if all goes according to plan, the campus will be transformed with new facilities.

At the presentation's conclusion, there were no questions.

D. **Vince Benigni**, Faculty Representative for Athletics ([Presentation Slides](#))

Note: please see the presentation slides accompanying the report at the meeting. See below for moments when Benigni offered significant context, amplification, or remarks that go beyond the slides' content.

Trisha Folds-Bennet has agreed to be the College's leader for the Colonial Academic Alliance's (CAA) program for undergraduate academic research.

At the presentation's conclusion, there were no questions.

3. New Business

A. Election of Speaker *Pro Tempore*

Jen Wright, Senator - HSS, was nominated and elected by acclamation.

B. General Education Committee (GEC)

(1) Motion to Approve Courses for General Education Status

Introduction

Bob Mignone, GEC Chair, explained that the courses up for approval did not make last year's deadline and thus have come to the Senate's first meeting this year. He also explained that the GEC evaluates courses for general education status for alignment with both the approval criteria and the assessment standards.

Humanities courses up for approval

[CPLT 200](#) - Special Topics in Comparative Literature

[CPLT 390](#) - Special Topics in Comparative Literature

[ENGL 226](#) - Survey of World Literature

[JWST 245/ENGL 191](#) - Introduction to Jewish-American Literature

[JWST 335](#) - Modern Jewish Politics

[LATN 305](#) - Medieval Latin

[LTAR 220](#) - Modern Arabic Fiction

Social Science course up for approval

[HONS 167](#) - Introduction to Sociology

Discussion

A couple corrections were made to prefixes in the documents ("LATIN" was changed to "LATN" and "CLPT" to "CPLT")

Decision

All courses were approved.

(2) Motion to Approve New Forms For General Education

Introduction

Mignone noted that once approved, these forms would be on the website and available for proposals this year.

Forms submitted for approval

[Foreign Language](#)

[History \(Pre-modern and Modern\)](#)

[Humanities](#)

[Math/Logic](#)

[Natural Science](#)

[Social Science](#)

[Writing](#)

[Form for courses proposed to be removed](#) from general education status

Discussion

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Department of Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if the forms could be made so that they can be filled out, saved, and submitted online. He asserted that as many campus forms as possible should be converted to electronic forms.

Cathy Boyd, Registrar, indicated that some faculty forms for student records (grade change, etc.) are going to go electronic only in the near future.

Dan Greenberg, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee (FCC), noted that the FCC has proposed to Checkpoint, a post-Battery committee having jurisdiction over this issue, to have FCC forms made electronic.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, said that the Office of Academic Affairs has committed a leader to the FCC forms project, though to her knowledge, the project has not yet been scored for priority. If the score is high enough, Academic Affairs will do what they can to keep the project moving

forward.

Greenberg said the project scored 86, to which Caveny-Noecker replied that a number of projects have that same score.

The Speaker said that the answer to Shaver's question is that we are trying to convert forms on many fronts.

Shaver asked if GEC forms could be made in Microsoft Word format instead of PDF because he could at least fill those out on the computer. Mignone replied that the GEC forms under discussion could be provided Word format.

The Speaker asked Mignone to work with the appropriate parties to make the forms electronic, and he agreed.

Brenton LeMesurier, Senator - SSM, that PDF files can be filled out on a computer or tablet as well.

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, pointed out that the History form has an error at the bottom of the form: in one instance, it says "Modern" where it needs to say "Pre-Modern." Mignone noted the correction.

Decision

All forms approved.

C. Graduate Education Committee

Introduction

Jon Hakkila explained that motions under consideration were put together by last year's committee and that he was not on the committee at that time. He said that he could not speak to the motions.

(1) Master of Business Administration

[Motion](#) to delete MBAD 500 from program requirements and to add MBAD 520 to program requirements

Discussion

The Speaker asked if anyone from the School of Business might be able to speak if there are questions.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, spoke against the motion. He read the catalog description of MBAD 500, the course to be deleted:

"A study of legal and ethical issues regarding the structure and operation of corporations. Topics include the corporation as a legal and moral 'person'; legal and ethical responsibilities of directors, shareholders and officers in the U.S. and

internationally; and government regulation of corporations, securities markets, and fair competition."

Shaver asserted that a careful reading of the syllabuses in the eight other core courses for the MBA looking for the words "law" or "legal" reveals no references to either word in any of the core course syllabuses, besides MBAD 500. Doing the same for "ethics" or "ethical," neither word appears in four of the core course syllabuses, brief references appear in two, and some "minor discussion" of these appear in the remaining two. He expressed grave concern that if the motion passes, the College of Charleston will be seen as eliminating the teaching of ethics in business in its MBA program. He encouraged like-minded senators to vote against the motion.

Jen Wright, Senator - HSS, asked if Shaver's review of syllabuses included MBAD 520's, the course in the motion that replaces MBAD 500, and queried whether 520 would fill the gap.

Shaver said that we do not have a syllabus for 520. 520, he said, is currently part of the Marketing concentration in the MBA. Raising another issue, he said that moving the course from the concentration to the core allows students pursuing the Marketing concentration to "double dip."

Phil Jos, Senator - HSS, noted that a typical rationale given when a course in ethics is removed from a curriculum is that, rather than locate the concern for ethics in a single course, it is infused throughout the courses in the curriculum. Does anyone know, he asked, if that is the logic in this proposal?

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, said that he teaches in the MBA program and, while he cannot speak to the non-Hospitality courses, ethics is a "big part" of every course in the Hospitality concentration. He added that a discussion of ethics is embedded in a course he regularly teaches.

Shaver replied that he didn't look at the concentrations but exclusively at the core, but that one should expect a coverage of ethics and law in the core.

Paul Young, Senator - Mathematics, asked if anyone could speak to whether these concerns were expressed in the Graduate Education Committee when they were considering the motion or if this concern is being expressed for the first time now.

Amy McCandless, Dean of the Graduate School and *ex officio* member of the committee, emphasized that there was a great concern for the importance for ethics and its infusion throughout the curriculum. She also noted that the substitution of 520 for 500 was due to concern for effective course sequencing within the face-paced MBA program.

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM, asked if the present motion could be tabled until someone could come and speak on it. With advice from the Parliamentarian, Dustan moved that discussion of the motion be postponed until the next Senate meeting. The motion was seconded.

Discussion of the motion to postpone discussion

Shaver said that he would vote against the motion to postpone as well, since he thinks the issue is clear.

Decision on the motion to postpone discussion

Discussion postponed until the October meeting.

(2) Master of Arts in Teaching

[Motion](#) to delete EDEE 664 from program requirements and to add EDEE 690 to program requirements

Discussion

Beth Lloyd, Senator - Teacher Education, offered to speak on the motion. 664 covers physical education, which is a valued area of instruction, but a survey of students showed that they needed a classroom management course more. The objectives for 664, the course to be deleted, have been moved into the syllabuses of the other courses in the program.

Decision

Motion passed.

(3) Master of Science in Environmental Studies

[Motion](#) to add new course, EVSS 669, and permission to cross-list EVSS 669 with GEOL 469

Discussion

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM, asked if GEOL 469 is an existing course and how long it has been taught.

The Speaker asked if anyone from Science might be able to address the question.

Dan Greenberg, Chair of FCC, said that GEOL 469 is in the catalog as "Advanced GIS - Environmental and Hazards Modeling" but that he could not speak to how long it has been taught.

Dustan then asked how the graduate course differs from the undergraduate course.

Jason Overby, Senator - SSM, called attention to the proposal itself, which states that the "graduate-level GEOL 669 will be structured separately and students

will be assessed and evaluated under a different set of rubrics as those in the undergraduate-level course."

Decision

Motion passed.

- D. [Motion to Approve a Resolution](#) that the Board of Trustees Conduct a National Search for the next President of the College: Christian Coseru, Senator - Department of Philosophy

Introduction

Christian Coseru, Senator - Philosophy, sponsor of the motion, asked the Speaker, whose report indicated that the Presidential search will be national, how certain it is that it will be. He also asked Todd Grantham, Chair of the Department of Philosophy and author of the resolution, to introduce it.

The Speaker said that when she spoke with Greg Padgett, Chair of the Board of Trustees, that is what he said. She added, however, that she thought it was appropriate to discuss the motion on the floor and, if the Senate is so inclined, for it to be approved.

Grantham said that he drafted the resolution working with others, including department chairs across the institution. At the time, there were stories in the news about the search and about the interest expressed by local politicians in the Presidency, and at that time, not having any of the current information about the search, he thought it important that the faculty express its wishes that a national search be done to secure the best qualified candidates. Another focal point in the resolution is inclusivity in the process, with faculty and other constituents being on the search committee. And because of the need for inclusivity, communication to all constituencies should be a priority as well, and this is reflected in the resolution.

The motion was seconded by Scott Peeples, Senator - HSS.

Discussion

Scott Peeples, Senator - HSS, argued that considering the motion was still worthwhile and that if it affirms what Padgett has said, that's perfectly fine. But the resolution actually goes a little bit further, adding that candidate should have significant higher education experience, and it's important to voice that.

Jason Overby, Senator - SSM, asked for a clarification: were faculty included in the two previous national searches? And, was there a motion like this for previous searches? It seems, he asserted, that the resolution might be out of bounds, considering the prior searches.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker said that in the two prior national searches, the Speaker

was in conversation with the Chair of the Board of Trustees. In the search from which President Higdon was hired, then Chair of the Board, Joel Smith was sensitive to having good faculty representation on the committee (the Speaker and two other faculty members). In the next search, her recollection is that faculty needed to push harder for the number of representatives desired. In the second search committee, there were more board members and less representation by other groups, which showed in the decision. One thing to remember, she added, is that in searches, boards tend to emphasize fundraising and legislative relationships. Faculty have an additional and important perspective: we want academic leadership or at least respect for the academic leadership of the Provost, the Deans, and the faculty. She cautioned that, while she appreciates the resolution, it will take much more to ensure our voice is heard in the process. We can't underestimate the importance of our having a voice at every stage of the hiring process. It is our collective responsibility, she added.

Brian McGee pointed out that the resolution calls for staff representation, and that addition does mark a material change from past practice. Also, the Association of Governing Boards recommends a broad and inclusive search committee that includes not just faculty and staff, but also community members. He added that he knows the Board of Trustees are aware of that statement, though that is not necessarily an agreement to abide by the statement.

Caveny-Noecker suggested that the resolution might need a change, the addition of "committee" in the fourth paragraph of the resolution, but since she is not a Senator, she could not offer it as a friendly amendment.

Coseru, taking up the suggestion, offered a friendly amendment to the resolution as follows:

Original:

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The College needs to find a dynamic, visionary, and highly qualified person to lead us toward our envisioned future. Toward this end, the Faculty Senate recommends that the Board of Trustees organize a national search for the next President of the College that includes representatives from all stakeholders, including faculty, staff, alumni, students, and administrators; and

Amended (added language underlined):

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The College needs to find a dynamic, visionary, and highly qualified person to lead us toward our envisioned future. Toward this end, the Faculty Senate recommends that the Board of Trustees organize a national search for the next President of the College with a search committee that includes representatives from all stakeholders, including faculty, staff, alumni, students, and administrators; and

Brenton LeMesurier, Senator - SSM, observed that the resolution might also need to include "community members" in its list of stakeholders.

Jon Hakkila, Department of Physics and Astronomy, suggested that "stakeholders" is an inclusive label under which "community" might be expected to fall.

Phil Jos, Senator - HSS, argued to include "community members" in the list following "stakeholders" because if the Board of Trustees, our audience, is already thinking about including community members, then we'll send a signal that we appreciate that or that it's consistent with the faculty's view of an inclusive committee.

Jos offered the above as a friendly amendment, which was accepted by Coseru, and resulted in the following:

Amended (added language underlined):

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The College needs to find a dynamic, visionary, and highly qualified person to lead us toward our envisioned future. Toward this end, the Faculty Senate recommends that the Board of Trustees organize a national search for the next President of the College with a search committee that includes representatives from all stakeholders, including faculty, staff, alumni, students, administrators, and community members; and

Phil Dustan expressed skepticism about the addition of "community members" as too much of a "catch-all" term. It could be interpreted to mean any number of communities.

Darryl Phillips, Classics, objected to the friendly amendment of adding "community members" to the resolution as above on the grounds that it is a substantive change and not merely something that might have been inadvertently left out of the original.

The Parliamentarian at this point instructed the Senate that the amendment would need a second for discussion to continue.

A second was offered and discussion continued.

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, argued against the amendment because the stakeholders already listed have particular knowledge of the College, and outside community members may not know enough to render a good decision.

Brenton LeMesurier, Senator - SSM, mentioned that we ought to in some way consider in the search process the the community of future students we might serve as well and the addition of "community members" would allow for that.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asserted that he would be amazed if the Board of Trustees would think "community members" to include potential students. The phrase can be so easily misread, he added, that it should not be in the resolution.

Coseru argued that "community members" simply further specifies that there could be other parties not include in the specific list following "stakeholders." This would allow the statement to be inclusive, without nailing it down too narrowly.

Dustan replied that "stakeholders" has a special meaning, while "community

members" is too broadly construable and might allow the inclusion of parties that we might not have considered stakeholders.

David Moscovitz, Senator - HSS, asked if the addition of "community members" is essential to central purpose of motion.

Jos replied that it is not.

Morgan Koerner, Senator - German and Slavic Studies, noted that the resistance to the amendment that would add "community members" to the list of stakeholders seems to be coming from fear of what possibilities it might open.

Coseru replied with a suggestion that we might further specify the phrase's meaning via a phrase like "community members at the College of Charleston."

Overby called the question and it was seconded and passed with no discussion.

The motion to amend the resolution to add "and community members" to list of stakeholders failed.

Tony Leclerc, Senator - Computer Science, said that the language of the resolution is bloated and wordy, and that it offers statements that would be hard to test in terms of measuring outcomes.

Grantham argued that, for what it's worth, the resolution, worded as it is, is what we have before us, and that if senators like the sentiment, they should vote for it. The senate floor, he added, is not a good place to wordsmith.

Decision

The motion for the resolution passed, as below:

A Resolution that the Board of Trustees Conduct
A National Search for the next President of the College

WHEREAS: Public Colleges and Universities in the United States are facing complex challenges, including: lower levels of State support, rising tuition, rapidly changing technologies for delivering course content on-line, and increased State and Federal oversight aimed at increasing accountability and controlling costs; and

WHEREAS: The Faculty, Administration, and Board of Trustees of the College are all committed to enhancing the quality of the graduate and undergraduate programs we offer; and

WHEREAS: The By-Laws of The Board of Trustees do not explicitly state any procedures for how to search for a new President.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The College needs to find a dynamic, visionary, and highly qualified person to lead us toward our envisioned future. Toward this end, the Faculty Senate recommends that the Board of Trustees organize a national search for the next President of the

College with a search committee that includes representatives from all stakeholders, including faculty, staff, alumni, students, and administrators; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: In order to successfully lead our institution in this challenging environment, well-qualified candidates must have significant administrative leadership experience in higher education (or must have both significant leadership experience and a thorough understanding of the current challenges facing institutions of higher education); and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED THAT: The organization and progress of the search be communicated to the campus community in a timely fashion.

E. Re-envisioning the Faculty Senate: Heath Hoffman, Chair of Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Heath Hoffman noted that in his experience of serving in the Faculty Senate for two years as a Senator at large for the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, he too frequently found the senate to be operating as a reactive and rubber-stamping body. The operations are often terribly inefficient, as exemplified by the prior 20 or more minute discussion and wordsmithing of the resolution just passed. He expressed concern that we need a better system, though he qualified that by suggesting that we have a culture problem. System changes won't necessarily change culture, but they might help. He named some specific areas that we might address, including the need to trust in the work done by our colleagues on some of the committees, notably the FCC, rather than having them laboriously present already thoroughly vetted proposals for approval on the Senate floor. He also singled out the practice of delivering reports on the Senate floor as time-consuming and inefficient. We might consider, instead, having reports provided earlier, asking Senators to review them ahead of time, and to reserve the Senate's floor time for questions and discussion. In the end, he asserted, we seem to be spending too much time on things that don't much matter and less on our many significant issues.

Questions/Discussion

Jen Wright, Senator - HSS, asked how we can go about making substantial change.

Hoffman reiterated that we will need a cultural shift to see substantial change, but that we might consider having more delegation, even the creation of ad hoc committees, in cases, for instance, where the language of a motion or resolution might need to be changed. Not only was this meeting's resolution debate an example of such a moment, but, to his mind, debate last year over suggested Faculty Administration Manual (FAM) language regarding diversity training as evidence for effective teaching was as well.

Small steps and small changes could help form a better culture.

Meg Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, expressed strong support for the sentiment of Hoffman's presentation but felt that we need to be cautious in cases

like language of the FAM. The language changes in that document seem significant enough to warrant some floor debate and changes, if needed.

The Speaker clarified that the FAM-language debate was over a resolution. The Senate does not have jurisdiction to make changes to the FAM.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, pointed out that the Faculty By Laws Committee is tasked with ensuring the FAM is kept in good shape. The Provost has authority to make changes to certain parts of the FAM with or without faculty approval, so it's essential that we always be in conversation with Academic Affairs over FAM matters.

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM, expressed agreement that we need to be in an ongoing conversation with the Provost, but he added that a central problem is a lack of truly shared governance. If the faculty had greater say and authority, the Senate would be more proactive. As things are, however, the faculty does not have much say.

Hoffman noted that faculty committees are getting things done, and to that extent, at least, we are sharing governance.

Darryl Phillips, Senator - Classics, noted that he has served in the Senate going on nine years, including a year as Speaker, and he expressed full support for Hoffman's analysis. He thinks there's a real problem, and the present meeting was a clear example. He asserted that Senators, those making reports or motions, and committee chairs and representatives shepherding work through the Senate need to come prepared and need to understand the procedures (Roberts Rules).

Scott Peeples, Senator - HSS, expressed agreement with Phillips and noted that a few years prior there was an effort to make the Senate more efficient, the signal achievement of which was to make it a smaller. The present meeting served as evidence that the efficiency effort was not completely successful. We need, he asserted, to take the job more seriously, and he asked how we might reconstruct our processes.

Hoffman reiterated that culture is really hard to change, and changing a few rules won't do it alone.

Mary Beth Heston, Senator - Art History, pointing out that many in the room were clearly tired after a long meeting following a long day, asked if we should invite colleagues to contact Hoffman to get a conversation started outside the Senate.

Susan Farrell, Senator - HSS, said that part of our problem is the "endless" reporting. We could go a long way toward improving conditions by cutting the reporting.

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, indicated that one of the most positive features of the Senate is the chance it affords faculty to develop a broader understanding of the

larger issues afoot at the College and to have conversation with colleagues across schools, departments, and programs. We should try to retain that valuable element of service in the Senate as we think of changes to make. Also, she agrees that reports could be posted ahead of meetings, read by members before the meeting, and that members could be prepared to ask questions.

Evan Parry, Senator - Theater, noted that he agrees with many of the ideas circulating in the discussion. But he offered a note similar to Gigova's. After a year of conversations and debate on general education reform, the votes on which went against his own position, he said that he initially felt let down. Yet, he asserted, that the process was of great value to him, and he thinks, to the faculty, in his realization that across different organizational units and departments, we sometimes have very different viewpoints and modes of thinking. The Senate, even at a contentious time, has value in that way.

Jason Overby, Senator - SSM, said that while he applauds Hoffman for his candor, the bigger issue is shared faculty governance: what do we have power over?

Closing the discussion, the Speaker noted that there seems to be consensus around the issues and ideas Hoffman raised and asked Hoffman if he would be willing to keep the conversation going outside the senate and to keep her in the loop.

4. Old Business
None

5. Constituents' Concerns

Brian McGee offered his thanks and appreciation for the work done by Jim Posey and the IT staff for all their work on the Great Colleges to Work For survey.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:17PM