Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 20 January 2015

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 20 January 2015 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order: 5:05 PM
2. 2 December 2014 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved.
3. Announcements and information: none.
4. Reports

A. Speaker of the Faculty

The Speaker introduced Pearson Hoak, the new Faculty Secretariat. Applause followed.

He reported that he attended a SACSCOC orientation meeting in Nashville in December with a party that included the President, Senior VP Steve Osbourne, Interim Provost Brian McGee, Presidential Assistant Debbie Hammond, and our then liaison to SACSCOC, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, Penny Brunner. Since that meeting, he reported, Penny Brunner has left the College to take up a position at Clemson University and that the President and Interim Provost are working on an plan to replace her as expeditiously as possible, given the large amount of work still to be done over the next 16-18 months in our reaffirmation, including determining and developing our new QEP, or Quality Enhancement Plan.

The Speaker noted that the President sent out a couple email calls for faculty input into the QEP in the fall, and the Speaker expressed hope that faculty did provide their ideas. There will likely be conversation and debate about the plan, he said. Our last QEP, he pointed out, was the institution of the First Year Experience program.

The Speaker reported that he attended the recent budget hearings, and he thanked the Budget Committee for their time-intensive and very valuable work in reviewing budget proposals, attending the lengthy meeting, and their ongoing involvement in the budget process. He thanked, as well, the President and Interim Provost for their involvement in the open process.

The Speaker encouraged faculty to participate in Dean evaluations. Most faculty will have received requests via email for their participation in the process. However, he added that Dean Tillis of the School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs, due to being in his first year at the College, will not be evaluated, as well as the Deans of non-line schools: the Honors College; the University of Charleston, South Carolina; and the School of Professional Studies. He observed that the Faculty Welfare Committee over the past few
years has been instrumental in ensuring the opportunity for faculty to evaluate their Deans and added that the Faculty By-Laws Committee will be looking at some Welfare Committee-proposed FAM language on these evaluations in order to address some of the present language’s shortcomings.

The Speaker announced that the College will again be participating this year in the “Great Colleges to Work For” survey, another initiative for which the Faculty Welfare Committee advocated, with the hope that we would regularize participation in order to gather a benchmark set of data to give us perspective on our campus climate and work environment. He urged Senators to participate and asked that Senators go back to their departments and encourage faculty colleagues there to participate, as well.

He also reported that the Welfare Committee has taken up the idea of reinstating the “Distinguished Professor” title, which was discontinued by the Board of Trustees, he said, in 2001. He deferred to the Interim Provost to answer any specific questions about this, but noted that it is being considered by the Interim Provost and in other venues as well.

The Speaker noted that discussions between faculty and members of the Charleston Business community convened jointly by the College and the Charleston Chamber of Commerce continue. Initially, these meeting, he said, were to take up discussion about the position that more advanced degrees are needed from the College to address economic needs in the region. However, those meetings, with sometimes upwards of 20 people in the room, he observed, were at times unwieldy and not very productive. Future meetings, thus, will be in smaller groups and over more targeted issues and concerns surrounding what the College is providing for students and whether or not changes could be made to better prepare them for a post-college life. He will be contacting those who have participated in past meetings, but also opened the door to anyone else who might wish to participate. Any one interested, he said, should contact him.

At this point, the Speaker took a question from Jason Overby, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM): what effect, if any, will the recent announcement that Clemson is building a graduate school annex at the old Navy base in North Charleston have on these discussions?

The Speaker, first adding that Clemson’s plans for the new facility have been known for quite some time, replied that Clemson’s planned offerings will have to be part of the conversation and may even end the conversation, if Clemson is seen as filling the perceived gap. [The Interim Provost also addressed Overby’s question: see below.]

Finally, the Speaker reported that, following a practice established by Speaker Cherry, he recently called a meeting of faculty committee chairs, in order to check the status of the committees’ work, share information, and to cross-pollinate ideas across the committees. The meeting was productive, he said. Minutes will be posted on the Senate website soon.
B. **Interim Provost** (Topics – [PDF](#))

**Preliminary Remarks**

Before beginning his report, the Interim Provost addressed the question raised by Senator Jason Overby (SSM) above, regarding Clemson’s presence in North Charleston. There has been no secrecy about their plans to develop a graduate center in North Charleston: they will bring a handful of faculty permanently from their College of Engineering and Science to North Charleston along with up to 200 graduate students to first develop programs in power system engineering and then add programs having to do with aeronautical engineering. They have a blanket permission, the Interim Provost said, from the CHE to bring any program in engineering to the Lowcountry they care to, provided that they have a market for it. Likely, they will maintain a relatively small presence and rely on the Citadel and the College to provide some of the core math and science education needed by their graduate students in applied disciplines. Means of collaboration between the College, the Citadel, and Clemson is being discussed right now, led by Dean Amy McCandless, and will ultimately involve and require the support of our faculty. There is no need to worry at present about Clemson’s graduate efforts in the Lowcountry duplicating our own, he asserted.

The Interim Provost wished Penny Brunner the best in her new post at Clemson and noted that a great team remains in place here in the office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, and he thanked them for their continued good work on behalf of the College.

In addition, he reinforced what the Speaker said about the Great Colleges to Work For survey, thanking the Faculty Welfare Committee for their leadership on this.

**Budget Hearings for Academic Affairs**

The budget hearings lasted around four hours. Presentations were made by the Deans, Associate Vice Presidents, and the Faculty Compensation Committee. The Interim Provost thanked the Faculty Budget Committee and its chair, Julia Eichelberger, for their many hours spent reviewing the voluminous documents associated with the budget hearings, representing faculty concerns at the lengthy meeting, and following up on the hearing. He thanked the Deans and the AVPs for their hard work on their budget requests, as well.

He reported that for the the Deans and the AVPs he characterized the College as a “stable and financially successful institution,” but not “particularly wealthy.” With modest state support, only incremental tuition increases allowed by the state, we can expect no large across-the-board appropriations. We will have fairly flat appropriations, with perhaps a few small gains in specialty areas. Philanthropic support continues to grow, but will not likely have a pronounced effect until many years from now. We have stable enrollments, but no growth expected. In short, there are no new sources of money
in large supplies, so we will have about the same numbers of faculty lines and staff positions next year as we have this year. Hard choices are on the horizon: many very good proposals will not get funded.

He added that as part of the budget considerations, current program fees (or, more specifically, course fees) are on the table for discussion. Most program fees are likely to stay the same next year, but some fees may go up incrementally because they no longer cover the costs of the programs/courses they support. Also under consideration is the possibility of school fees for those schools that are relatively more expensive than others, something the Senate considered late in the year of 2007. The most expensive schools per credit hour and which are tough to support financially are the School of Business and the School of Science and Mathematics, both of which have had enrollment increases in recent years. School fees are under consideration to see if they might offset higher costs, address needs in the schools, and also help us achieve strategic plan goals related to such things as undergraduate research, workforce preparation, and study abroad initiatives, among others. Fees might also allow for cost recovery for investments already made in those schools, and under consideration, as well, is providing some of the money from fees to be directed by students in the schools. Nothing has been decided yet on school fees, he said, and the conversation over this idea will include the Budget and Academic Planning Committees this spring.

December Commencement

The Interim Provost thanked all who attended, participated in, planned, and helped support December commencement this year, expressing deep appreciation for the support this shows our students and their families. But he reported that December commencement’s attendance has been going down significantly. Over 300 students attended the December ceremony 10 years ago. This year the number was less than 190. Graduation numbers haven’t changed, but more students are opting to attend the spring ceremony in the Cistern, instead, even if they have to wait for it, or they are choosing not to attend commencement at all.

In the fall, making the December 2014 commencement the last one was being considered, but the President decided that eliminating the ceremony with only a year’s notice might not be fair to students who may already be planning to attend the 2015 December ceremony. He also, the Interim Provost reported, wants to see what will happen to December numbers if we relax the requirements for participating in the spring ceremony, which is the current plan. The Interim Provost said that faculty and students can expect to soon receive an email that says that we are now allowing any student applying to graduate in spring of summer of 2015 the opportunity to participate in the spring ceremony, a meaningful change from current policy. The recent move to three ceremonies in the spring should provide room for additional students to participate. We will inform students that there
will be a December 15th, 2015 ceremony, but that we make no promises for a December 16 ceremony. We will evaluate whether to continue December ceremonies after the 15 December 2015 commencement. For historical context, the Interim Provost noted that the December commencement has not been a consistent tradition of the College.

**Updates to the Faculty/Administration Manual**

The Interim Provost thanked the Faculty By-Laws Committee and its Chair, Rick Heldrich, and all the committees and staff involved in continuing to update and improve the F/AM, whose most recent iteration is out with notable improvements in language regarding accommodating students with disabilities and attendance policy.

**Tenure and Promotion Review Process**

The tenure and promotion review process, the Interim Provost reported, is half completed in terms of the four levels of recommendation involved: departmental and Dean’s reviews are completed and we are now moving into the work of the faculty advisory Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review Committee. The Interim Provost pointed out the great deal of work done by this committee and he thanked the current committee and its chair, Mark Landis, for the work they are doing in reviewing the 43 files on their docket this year.

While it has been a long-held custom that the Provost sits with the committee during their deliberations (this is not required in by-laws), the Interim Provost noted that he will not be doing so this year. He said that he feels uncomfortable sitting with the committee in their deliberations, he said, when he does not also have access to all the other deliberative processes prior (such as the departmental review committees’ or Dean’s deliberations). Instead, he will conduct his own, independent review in light of his own reading of the materials and the three previous levels of review. He is interested in seeing if this “grand experiment of the Interim Provost” changes in any way how the Provost and the advisory committee see things relevant to past years. Granting that it will be hard to judge that from just one year’s practice, this is his strong preference for how to proceed this year and, he said, he wanted to make sure the Senate is informed. He expressed confidence that we will still have “the same high quality review we have always had thanks to the hard work of the deans and the faculty.”

**Comments on Today’s Senate Agenda**

The Interim Provost singled out the Curriculum Committee for their ongoing work, adding that it is easy for us to underestimate the importance of the work they do, which we may seem to be rushing through in Senate meetings. But the committee’s work, he said, has real consequences over time for the life of the institution, as evidenced, in part, he said, in trends over time in students’ choices of majors. He shared a list of the top 14 undergraduate major declarations as of the end of fall 2014 (such data he noted is al-
ways available on the institutional research website, and he discussed how these declarations evince the evolution of the College since it entered the public education system 45 years ago (see below). The following majors accounted for about 62% of declared majors in December 2014. Thus the 14 majors represent an outsized number of our total declarants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Management</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality/Tourism Management</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the top four majors in the list, all longstanding CofC majors, have been in the top four for many years, sometimes in different positions, Exercise Science, coming in at number five, is a fairly recent major. Public Health (number six) is a very new major. Of the 14 majors listed, only five were in existence at the College when it entered the public education system 45 years ago. “I think we’re charting,” he said, “the evolution and change at the College of Charleston through the work of its faculty and through the work of the curriculum committee and the Senate.” Six of the 14 majors, he specified, fall comfortably into the Arts and Sciences (29% of total majors), while the other eight might fit comfortably in the professional side of things (33% of total majors). He asserted that this is a “moment-in-time snapshot of who we are as an institution, thanks to the work of the faculty.”

**Discussion/Questions/Comments**

**Phil Jos**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), asked if he would be correct in assuming that, given that overall enrollments have been flat for some time and that majors have proliferated at the same time, that the Provost’s office, in assessing the relative success of attracting majors, would not be comparing us to an era in which there were fewer majors competing.
The Interim Provost responded by saying it would be fair to say that Academic Affairs is trying to ensure that every major has robust roster faculty staffing, support for high-quality student advising, and that students can graduate in four years with a range of options for courses and are well-served at the beginning, middle, and end of their major. Some programs, he said, are having difficulty meeting these goals due to growth. Some majors have declined over time incrementally, perhaps, he said, because there are more major options or students are finding other majors more attractive. We may have to make some tough programatic choices, the Interim Provost said, because we cannot expect enrollment growth or added state money to solve our problems. This may mean faculty reallocation over time, as lines become available, or that scarce new lines will have to support growing programs. In short, he said, in Academic Affairs, the mission is to ensure that programs have the resources they need to succeed, and the Deans, in the budget process, were fairly clear about what those needs are.

George Pothering, Parliamentarian, asked if there has been a change in the number of double majors over the period that the Interim Provost has been discussing.

The Interim Provost noted that he has only looked at the past few years in terms of Pothering’s question. Right now, he said, around 250 students graduate in a typical spring with double majors, and so we need to think carefully about whether the growth in some majors is a function of double majoring. In some majors, there is a high incidence of double-majoring. Dance, for instance, had 33 out 50 majors double-majoring. Most of the large-size majors, he observed, do not show such a high percentage of double-majoring, but the trend toward double-majoring, if there is one, would certainly explain smaller declines in some majors, with simultaneously larger increases in others.

In fact, the Interim Provost pointed out, even the numbers he shared are a bit distorting for some majors. For instance, Computer Science would say it supports multiple majors, of which Computer Science is but one. The same goes for Biology.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked the Interim Provost to discuss what conversations he is having with the Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review Committee, given that he is not sitting with the committee. The practice of the Provost sitting with the committee was, Krasnoff noted, to encourage shared standards across the College. How, he asked the Interim Provost, are we going to keep such standards?

The Interim Provost replied that, with regard to shared standards, the committee and he are having ongoing conversations and the committee knows that they have access to his input on standards whenever it is needed. The standards are the center of many conversations in the written documents.
produced in departmental and dean-level evaluations. Thus, there is a wide-ranging and ongoing conversation about standards and their meaning. If the committee needs his input on a standards question, he said, he will respond as rapidly as possible.

**There were no more questions.**

C. **Faculty Educational Technology Committee – Chair, David Desplaces**  
Recommendation to Adopt Yammer ([PDF](#))

The committee has taken up, among many agenda items, the need for an alternative to the listserv system, and in the process of working on this, Desplaces reported, discovered that IT had also been working on alternatives to the listserv system and evaluating options for a different project. The committee, coordinating with IT, conducted an independent evaluation of Yammer, a Facebook-like, cross-platform communication application that works on both computers and handheld devices. It allows individuals to create and join discussion groups, "follow" individuals and/or topics, search for relevant information shared by any group or any individual, etc. Yammer could be used for any number of communication functions: disseminating information, gathering information, encouraging discussion and participation, answering questions, and so forth.

In addition, Desplaces added, Yammer operates in a secure way and would come to the College at no additional cost, since it is included in the license for a software suite we already run.

After testing the system and considering it carefully, the Faculty Educational Technology Committee (FETC), on behalf of the faculty, recommend, he said, that the college adopt Yammer as a replacement for the listserv system, pending additional review that the College needs to undertake on a few issues, including FERPA compliance.

Finally, he added that members of the College will be able to opt out of discussions on Yammer if they so chose. There will still be a few listservs to be used by the College to disseminate emergency information, important HR information, and the like.

Desplaces opened the floor for questions and discussion, and invited Andrew Bergstrom, Director of Web Strategies, and Robert Cape, Senior Vice President and Chief Information Officer, also present at the meeting, to join in the discussion.

**Discussion/Questions/Comments**

**Jason Overby**, Senator - SSM, agreed that Yammer looks like a good system, but he asked how, within the new system, we can enforce using appropriate channels for communication of certain kinds of content. He noted that a good number of people regularly abuse the faculty and staff listserv for disseminating or requesting information on things outside the listserv's designated purview: cats, roofing contractors, blackberries, ham, condos, apart-
ments, sofas, and so forth. How can we insure people will use Yammer in a way consistent with the designated purpose of each channel?

Bergstrom answered by way of some history: a previous FETC recommended that the College go from the listserv system to a web forum system, which was adopted, but which ended up not working out for a number of reasons. Meanwhile, the College consolidated some of the existing listservs into the current faculty and staff listserv and in the process terminated many of the existing listservs. This, added to the failure of the web forums, opened the faculty and staff listserv to an overload of messages that are not appropriate for the list. In short, he said, when there are not enough channels, information flows to those that are open, regardless of appropriateness.

Yammer, he said, is not subject to that kind of restriction problem. Users may post to and read from public and private groups, but Yammer also features metadata, which is not supported by listserv. In Yammer, metadata creates topics, and users can follow persons, groups, and sets of topics, allowing for cross-talk across different groups, another feature not available in listservs.

He also pointed out that when the listservs were originally put in place (around 2005), the College never articulated an acceptable use policy. Yammer allows for an acceptable use policy to be put in place that users, on their initial sign-in, have to agree to in order to participate. Such a policy would spell out responsibilities and consequences for abuse. Bergstrom hopes that this will help cut down on potential abuse.

Desplaces added that, as in Facebook, one has to opt in to groups in Yammer.

**Roxanne De Laurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked three questions:

- If Yammer is like Facebook, can’t interested parties simply use Facebook, and if so, why do we need a new software program?
- Will Yammer compile data on users?
- Will we have to look at ads?

Bergstrom explained that there will be no ads: Yammer is part of a closed network at the College. He further noted that Yammer is covered in the enterprise agreement that the College has with Microsoft, which also entitles us to a suite of services called Office 365, which the College is currently evaluating and which uses a redundant and secure cloud system. The cloud system would still allow users to have access to core software, in the event of the College having to go offline for any reason. That would be the case for Yammer, too, but also, eventually, perhaps, for Microsoft Exchange, the email system.
Bergstrom also stressed that there will be no tracking with Yammer. This is specified in the contract with Microsoft, just as it is with our contract with Google for Google Apps: there is no data mining or tracking.

As to the question about Facebook, Bergstrom said that Yammer will work in a closed system and our contract with Microsoft gives us control over Yammer. This would not be the case with Facebook.

DeLaurell observed that the closed system would mean that the college would have liability for what happens on Yammer.

Bergstrom agreed: The college is responsible for its content; individuals are responsible for the content they post.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, asked if Yammer would be open to our alumni, specifying that in his program they use a listserv to contact alumni.

Bergstrom replied that the plan for Yammer is to maintain a closed network. It would not be open to alumni. He explained that Yammer is an enterprise social network whose members are here at the College. Listservs, on the other hand, come into play with colleagues and individuals outside the College who do not have an authenticated account to work with us (listservs may still have a role in these cases). Additionally, we have what are called “distribution lists,” which are collections of email addresses created inside Microsoft Exchange (such as all enrolled students, all faculty, all staff, etc.) from which one cannot opt out.

All three modes of communication described above will be in place and their use will depend on the application.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked, given that all three modes of communication would remain in place when Yammer is adopted, if it would be permissible to use a distribution list to announce an event, and to be sure, thereby, that the announcement reaches everyone, even if everyone may not want to get such a message.

Bergstrom noted that distribution lists are regulated by individuals who have control over what can and cannot be posted on them.

Some of the listservs, on the other hand, were initially set up so that everyone was automatically enrolled and individuals would have to opt out if they wished to no longer receive messages. However, this automatic opt-in policy was discontinued when it created storage problems in the cases where messages piled up in untended email folders. Thus, a voluntary opt-in policy was adopted instead.

Currently, the listservs, Bergstrom pointed out, do not reach all the people one might think they do. The faculty/staff listserv does not reach everyone on the faculty and staff.
Krasnoff asserted that he didn’t think many faculty would opt out.

Interim Provost McGee replied that there are a thousand fewer individuals reached by the faculty/staff listserv than there are by the administrative information distribution list.

Krasnoff asked if, in his reply, Bergstrom was essentially saying that the listservers to be used in the way he (Krasnoff) was describing are going away, which Bergstrom confirmed.

Bergstrom said that Yammer works through mobile applications, web interface, and through email. All Yammer interactions can be handled through an email client if the user so chooses. One can email to a group or to an individual, which will create a post in Yammer.

Krasnoff asked for a clarification: will the possibility for an individual to contact everyone be built into the Yammer system?

Bergstrom responded that the listserv groups we had in the past will be built into Yammer: classified ads, events, and so forth.

Krasnoff asked if a faculty and faculty and staff group—the ones everyone posts to—will be built.

Bergstrom confirmed that those groups can be built in Yammer but that there’s no guarantee that everyone will join them.

Krasnoff, granting that some may find messages currently going out on the faculty and staff listserv annoying or of no interest to them, the ability for an individual to reach a very large group is desirable. In some cases, using the faculty and staff listserv, people have opened conversations of what might be called a political nature, which, he granted, could be toned down a bit, but as they relate to the educational enterprise at the College, he argued, are a very good thing.

The changes to the communication systems by IT and administration, he asserted, have the effect of indicating that the administration does not want us to have such discussions and wants to actually shut down such conversations. He said that he would prefer that such conversations be allowed to continue, despite the fact that they sometimes get out of control or off topic and the user may have to delete many unwanted messages. It’s a part of our community we need to maintain, he said. While there are many advantages to the Yammer system, the discussion so far has not revealed how the possibility for the kinds of discussions he has been talking about will be maintained. Collective conversation doesn’t seem to be a priority: what is being done to maintain that?, he asked.

Desplaces responded to Krasnoff by pointing out that the committee felt it important that the individual opt in or out of discussions. This is a responsibility we have as individuals and members of the community, he added, and
one which has already been exercised by around a thousand people, as the Interim Provost has noted, he said.

He also said, to add perspective, that IT did not bring Yammer to the committee. The committee was working on a solution to the problem of the listservs and, in contacting IT for help thinking about tools, discovered that they had been reviewing Yammer for another initiative.

The Interim Provost offered a summary of Krasnoff’s position, with which Krasnoff agreed: opt everyone into the Yammer equivalent of the faculty/staff listserv and let them opt out, rather than the reverse, which would demonstrate the presumption that everyone is a participant in the community and can make their own decision about whether they wish to participate or to opt out.

He also noted that last spring a very explicit and critical faculty and staff listserv conversation about politicians and trustees elicited no public statements from administrators that the conversation should stop. If there were any desire by administration to silence conversation, he added, that would probably have been seen last spring.

The Interim Provost expressed hope that Yammer be accepted or rejected on its merits, but that its adoption has nothing to do with quashing speech. Rather, its adoption would create convenience for the community, to allow for something like we had with listservs in the past (open discussion, classified ads, faculty, faculty and staff, etc.) but with powerful, Facebook-like tools.

**Roxanne DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, returned to the thread of acceptable use policy. We will gain with Yammer an acceptable use policy that users will have to agree to, but how will the policy be enforced? Who will monitor the Yammer conversation and decide when there has been an infraction, “cats don’t belong here: cats gotta go...”?

An unidentified Senator or guest responded with a faint “meow.”

Bergstrom replied that an acceptable use policy has not been established yet.

DeLaurell said that, presumably, there will be some mechanism to hold users accountable to the policy they accept when they sign on to Yammer.

Senior VP and CIO Robert Cape asked “is that what is wanted?” to which DeLaurell replied that is not wanted by her, since she would prefer to allow anyone to talk about anything.

**Margaret Cormack**, Senator - Religious Studies, said that ultimately Yammer will have to work on an honor system in which people use the groups as intended. We will probably have to put up with some posts going to the wrong groups, but hopefully not as much as we do now.
DeLaurell asked Cormack if she thinks Yammer will stop group-inappropriate posts. Cormack reiterated that it should be an improvement over the situation we have now with the faculty-staff listserv.

Jason Overby, Senator - SSM, agreed: right now, he said, “it’s one size fits all.” When all the different kinds of messages—condos for rent, political discussion, and so forth—come across the same list, it produces noise.

DeLaurell replied that Yammer might not reduce noise but actually might increase it. But, she said, her question is not about the noise, but about who is going to enforce the acceptable use policy and enact penalties, such as taking away privileges.

Speaker McNerney asked if Robert Cape or Andrew Bergstrom wished to answer DeLaurell’s question.

Bergstrom replied that IT will not be the enforcers of the policy.

Cape agreed. IT will not, he said, be reading and interpreting posts and coming to conclusions about them and applying penalties: “never have, never will.”

DeLaurell replied, “so what will we gain with Yammer?”

The Interim Provost replied that we will gain a technology superior to the existing listserv technology and that has a full suite of functions. Adopting Yammer would also allow us, he said, “to push reset” in order to allow for a community that is talking about the things they want to talk about, while not getting posts on what they do not wish to talk about. He noted that there are universities with no listservs at all because, he said, of conversations like the present one. He also added that there are people on campus who would like to shut down the listservs altogether, but he is opposed to that, as, he said, he thinks most of the Senate is.

He agreed with Cormack that most of us will gladly self-policing, with rare instances of abuse of the policy, which we will tolerate unless it becomes a serious problem. Abuse that makes the community feel threatened or presents an endless annoyance might ultimately result in some privileges being taking away, but this is something the Interim Provost said he could do right now. But we are not doing that right now, instead preferring to let things go along as they are, while we work toward a better solution, in which IT will not be “the content police,” we all have better tools to manage our communication, and an understanding of what counts as acceptable use. He said that DeLaurell’s point is well taken: it’s critical to get clarity on the acceptable use policy. He recommended that the FETC take that up next.

Jon Hakkila, Chair - Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs, suggested that if it’s the policy we are concerned about, then we ought to put a policy in place before we make the move to replace the technology. If, instead, it’s a technology concern, then we might want to think about whether or not Yammer will become obsolete in the
On the issue of opting in and opting out, he added, it is important that users understand what is available to opt into in the first place, a list of some sort. There are many things that come across the faculty and staff listserv, he said, that he wouldn’t go looking for, but when he sees them, he is interested. Knowing what is available would be helpful.

Bergstrom noted that there is a search function in Yammer, as well as the ability to look at streams or feeds, and there is a feed for everything that goes on in Yammer that is publicly available. You can search, for instance, for a particular topic in the “all feed.”

Hakkila asked “how many feeds are there?,” to which Bergstrom replied “as many as there are topics.”

Kelly Shaver, Senator – Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if there is a way on Yammer, as there is on smart phones, to block particular senders.

Bergstrom replied that in Yammer, you can chose whom you wish to follow, but he said he will have to check on whether or not you can choose to block a user.

Elaine Worzala, representing the Dean of the School of Business’s office, asked if Yammer will require a sign-in every time you open it.

Bergstrom explained that if if you are accessing Yammer via an Outlook client, you would not have to sign in to Yammer, but that if you are accessing it through a web client, you would. If you are using the mobile app, you sign in the first time you use it.

If you are accessing Yammer via Outlook, you will get messages that indicate they are from Yammer and from a specific group. A reply to the message will go to Yammer and add a post to the wall in the thread of that conversation.

In broader way, Bergstrom said, IT is working on identity and access management, particularly on cutting down on the number of systems to which we have to sign in. Currently we do not have a true single sign-in system.

Desplaces encouraged Senators to test Yammer out on their own, though he did caution that, at present we only have access to a demo version that will be reset, which means that any groups set up in the demo will eventually disappear.

Yammer can function as a tool, he stressed. For example, suppose you have forgotten the deadline for graduation is. You may have received an email from Academic Affairs with that information but deleted it in your own email, but you can search Yammer for the information. Or, he said, you could use Yammer to pose questions to certain committees or to the Senate,
or groups could use it to more efficiently address questions that may come in to them. He gave an example from the University of Rhode Island in which a question sent to the Registrar’s Office, with a system similar to Yammer, can be answered efficiently by whomever is staffing the desk at the time of the question.

Daniel Delgado, Senator - Hispanic Studies, noted that he finds the listservs somewhat intrusive and that he finds the web forums more appealing. He asked what the problem is with the web forums.

The Interim Provost explained that no one wanted to sign in and use the web forums, so they had very low usage. There were other problems as well.

Delgado asked how this will be different with Yammer.

The Interim Provost replied that with Yammer, you can subscribe to the groups you wish to and direct the messages to flow to your email. This will work for the user, essentially, as things do with the listserv system. Users who want more functionality and a community forum experience can use the Yammer interface.

Amy McCandless, Dean - University of Charleston, South Carolina, asked if Yammer, a Microsoft product, will be compatible with Apple products.

Bergstrom replied that Yammer works well with iOS and has a rapid update process to accommodate new versions of iOS, Android, etc.

The Speaker asked Desplaces for a clarification at this point in the conversation: is the FETC presenting a report or offering a resolution? Desplaces explained that the committee is offering a report and a recommendation, but not a resolution, so there’s no vote by the Senate required.

The Speaker suggested that Senators test Yammer for themselves, and observed that the concerns raised by the Senate have been heard by both IT and by the Interim Provost.

Krasnoff asked the Speaker if he could add one last statement, and the Speaker agreed.

Krasnoff said that when we shifted to the web forums, people did not sign in to them, and, as a result, people posting did not find enough of an audience for what they wanted to talk about or to announce. People responsibly posted to the forums, he said, without much effect, and so people began using the faculty and faculty and staff listserv, instead. This could happen again with Yammer, Krasnoff said: if not enough people join the classified ads group, we may begin to see classified posts in the faculty-as-a-whole group. Yammer may not solve this problem.

Krasnoff also responded to the Interim Provost’s representation of Yammer as a new and better technology. Krasnoff asserted that email is a good technology itself, capable of a wide range of uses across numerous platforms.
While there may be problems in the way people use it, it is not clear, he argued, what is wrong with the technology itself.

Bergstrom replied that if the College goes offline because of a hurricane, for example, listservs no longer function. We also pay for the listserv license, which is money we can recoup if we discontinue its use. Listserv cannot be augmented with integrations via APIs. There is more opportunity to build on Yammer than there is with listserv.

There were no further comments.

5. Old Business
None

6. New Business
A. Faculty Curriculum Committee (webpage)
Corrected Course Proposals: Geology (PDF)

Steven Jaume', representing the Faculty Curriculum Committee, introduced Geology curriculum documents to replace incorrect documents presented at the December meeting.

There was no discussion.

The Speaker asked for a motion and second from the floor, a vote was taken, and the motion passed.

B. Resolution: Nous sommes Charlie (PDF)
Kelly Shaver, Senator – Management and Entrepreneurship

A Resolution: Symbolic Support for Freedom of Expression

WHEREAS tragic events in France have once again illustrated that religious beliefs can be used to justify attacks – both literally and figuratively – on freedom of expression, and

WHEREAS freedom of expression and inquiry have all too recently been threatened at the College of Charleston,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON ASSERTS

“Nous sommes Charlie.”
Shaver explained that the pictures at the bottom of the resolution were taken on a day in Washington, DC on which 3,000 people marched carrying signs reading “Je suis Charlie.” He urged consideration of the resolution for the reasons given therein.

Shaver’s resolution was seconded.

**Discussion/Questions/Comments**

Joe Carson, Senator – SSM, noted a typo in the document that was corrected.

Wayne Smith, Senator – Hospitality and Tourism, asked if the French grammar was correct, and Shaver assured him it is.

**Decision**

The resolution was adopted on a voice vote with nine abstentions and no “nays.”

6. **Constituents’ Concerns:** none.

7. **Adjournment:** 7:19 PM

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary