Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 7 October 2014

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 7 October 2014 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order: 5:04PM
2. 9 September 2014 regular meeting minutes were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and information
   See the Speaker's report below.
4. Reports
   A. The Speaker

   The Speaker explained that some items on his report at this meeting he intended to cover at the previous Senate meeting but did not for the sake of time.

   The speaker noted that this fall we are welcoming over 50 new faculty colleagues to our campus (36 on the tenure track or tenured and 15 in visiting lines). He specified that "new" in this context means "new to the institution," not new lines.

   The Speaker announced that the College has now received permission from the CHE to purchase a building and property on Lockwood Boulevard and has received some funding from the legislature to go toward its purchase. The College intends to move some administrative and operational offices there, creating more academic space at the main campus. The process may be lengthy, as there are still some environmental studies of the building that need to be done before we can purchase it.

   The Faculty Senate offices, the speaker noted, will be relocating very soon to the Education Center, occupying two spaces there: ECTR 227 and 228. These rooms will adjoin. One is a larger conference space than we had in Randolph Hall and will include a large monitor that can be used for projecting from laptops or electronic devices. Committees will be able to use this room for their meetings. The other room will be the office of the Faculty Secretariat and is roughly the same size as the space the Secretariat had in Randolph Hall. In it we will store the Senate's paper records for the use of Senators or whoever may need to consult the written record. This space should be ready within the next two weeks.

   The speaker reported that the ad for the Faculty Secretariat has now closed and he, the Faculty Secretary, and Ana Gilpatrick will soon begin screening the approximately 80 applications.

   The Speaker announced that on Wednesday, October 8, he will be hosting a forum for our adjunct faculty colleagues. Following a precedent set by former Speaker Lynn Cherry, this meeting and one or two more this year will bring together our adjunct faculty colleagues to discuss issues related directly to them. The 90-minute meeting on October 8 will be primarily dedicated to discussing the College's implementation of the
Affordable Care Act. Guests at the meeting will include Brian McGee, Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Sandy Butler, and Katie Walker.

The Speaker also offered a follow-up on the Board of Trustees/Faculty shadowing program begun by former Speaker Cherry. This fall, six members of the Board of Trustees have volunteered to spend time, roughly 1/2 to 2/3 of a day, shadowing six volunteer faculty members.

The Speaker reminded the Senate of the upcoming October Board of Trustees meeting, October 16 and 17. Committee meetings on the 16th, the speaker added, are open to anyone who has an interest.

Plans are now being made for a second meeting between faculty and the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, the Speaker reported. The intent is to broaden the conversation that was begun at the first meeting. This meeting will include school deans, who did not attend the first meeting. Among the dozen faculty who attended the first meeting, there were three senators (Larry Krasnoff, Pam Riggs-Gelasco, Kelly Shaver), five department chairs (George Pothering, Pam Riggs-Gelasco, Calvin Blackwell, Mark Del Mastro, Marian Mazzone), and chairs and previous chairs of faculty committees (Jon Hakkila, Bob Podolsky, Simon Lewis, Margaret Hagood, Amanda Ruth-McSwain). All of these faculty have been invited to attend the next meeting. But as the goal is to broaden the conversation, the Speaker invited any other senators who may be interested in attending the next or future meetings to contact him.

The speaker noted that our SACSCOC (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges) reaffirmation is coming in two years. Work towards this has already, of course, been underway, but much work remains. One particularly important item will be the development of our Quality Enhancement Plan or QEP, and faculty had a significant role in that process for the last reaffirmation.

The speaker noted that November 1 will see the public launch of our comprehensive fund-raising campaign, and he asked faculty to consider how we all might champion that campaign. The Foundation might take a bit of time at the next meeting to explain how we might do that.

The speaker remarked that he owes the faculty a newsletter, and this will be coming, most likely, early in November.

Finally, the Speaker noted that in order to become a bit more sustainable, he and the Faculty Secretary made a decision prior to the first Senate meeting to no longer mail the hard copies of the agenda to the campus community. We hope, he said, that the electronic publication we have been using via email and the website will be sufficient. But he did also mention that we may need to make a change to the bylaws to accommodate this new practice.

There were no questions.

B. The Interim Provost
Campus Diversity Climate Survey

The Interim Provost explained that a report scheduled later on the agenda will cover the survey and provide detailed information.

School of Professional Studies (SPS)

The Interim Provost deferred to Dean Godfrey Gibbison, whose report scheduled next in the agenda will address the proposed SPS.

He did add, however, that President McConnell has not made a decision on the SPS. The President wanted, first, the Interim Provost said, to provide an opportunity for Dean Gibbison to speak to the Senate, and, in addition to that, complete his consultation with all the relevant faculty committees.

Top Ten Percent Admissions

The Interim Provost reported that a great deal of work has been done to review how a pilot of the Top Ten Percent program might work. Following the review and after lengthy discussion of the results of the review, President McConnell concluded that there is not enough time for a fall 2015 rollout. 12 to 15 months will be required in order to ramp up for a proper pilot. Throughout this year, the administration will continue to work through the details of a pilot, with an eye toward implementation for admissions for the fall 2016 semester. The additional time will allow us to get the program right, addressing all concerns.

Later in his report, the Interim Provost addressed a concern about the proposed Top Ten admissions program raised in the September Senate meeting by Richard Nunan, Department of Philosophy [September minutes, p. 7]: Nunan argued that the program might be susceptible to equal protection lawsuits. The Interim Provost replied with assurances that “our legal basis for pursuing the pilot program is strong.”

“Furthermore and more generally,” he added, the Senate has my confirmation of the College's commitment to and respect for the law... even as federal and state laws are revised by the legislative branch or interpreted by the judicial branch. For example, at the federal level, we recently learned from the 4th Circuit's Bostic decision that the denial of choice in certain intensely personal decisions can alter the course of an individual life and, hence, is a type of segregation not countenanced by the 14th amendment. I am no attorney, but my own assessment is that state agencies in South Carolina, including our own, may soon be compelled under the rule of law to accept a new understanding of Title 20 of the state's Code of Laws. We'll await additional guidance from state and federal courts on this topic.

Decentralization and Academic Affairs

President McConnell has placed an emphasis on decentralizing decision-making, including decision-making on budgets, as much as is possible. The Interim Provost specified four topics of consequence for decentralization.
• Decentralization of adjunct budgets to the academic schools

• Provisions for carry-forward of budget surpluses – there are units that do have year-end budget surpluses, and those units, smart use of carry-forward, with multi-year spending plans has management advantages

• Finding ways to get certain units more realistic budgets – some units are so under-budgeted relative to actual need that they are always in the red

• Decentralizing lapsed salaries – this is the hardest of these four areas because our budget model is not built to do that at all. It will take the most work, but it will make a big difference in how efficiently the Deans can manage their schools.

Budget Update

The Interim Provost reminded the Senate of the more transparent budget process outlined in the September Senate meeting [September minutes, p. 12]: building budgets in programs, departments, and schools and then having multiple hearings in Academic Affairs before a budget goes the President for signing in the Spring. He said he will perfect and distribute a memo with guidelines by the end of October to begin the budget process, which will give more time for the process than we have had in the past.

On the current budget, the Interim Provost addressed the requirement put on the College to spend $52,000 in teaching the US Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and Federalist Papers. The texts in this requirement are not accidental: there is a law on the books (59-29-120) specifying that each state university or college must provide instruction in these particular documents and, additionally that students must pass a test on the same in order to graduate. The law has long gone unenforced, but some legislators “have discovered it and are quite enthusiastic about it,” suggesting that we may be seeing more action on this in the future.

Nevertheless, we are, in fact, complying with the budget proviso (11.22), given that the coursework in many departments already deals with these documents. By Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience Lynne Ford’s count, the Interim Provost said, we spend about $577,000 in the fall semester alone on such instruction. Thus, we quite easily discharge the requirement.

Other Action Items in Academic Affairs

The Interim Provost noted that the definition of “graduate faculty” in the Faculty/Administration Manual has not changed in a very long time, and he has asked Dean of the Graduate School Amy McCandless and the other Deans, and will ask other faculty, to be involved in a review of this definition. The fact that a faculty member need not be a member of the graduate faculty to teach a graduate class or that we have many faculty listed as graduate faculty who have never taught a graduate class argues for the necessity of revisiting the definition for, among other things, SACS accreditation.
Additionally, the Academic Standards and Academic Planning Committees will be asked by Academic Affairs to review the requirements for the College's Dean's List, which has not been reviewed in a long time. The Interim Provost reported having some discussion on this with Student Government Association President Ryan Spraker.

Finally, the Interim Provost reported that a proposal for a Faculty Development Center developed by several administrators and faculty is being circulated and carefully considered.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

There were no questions.

C. The North Campus and the Bachelor of Professional Studies Program (PDF)

Godfrey Gibbison, Dean – North Campus

Dean Gibbison observed that much of his report from the floor is already contained in the document that was circulated with the agenda (see the link above).

He emphasized that the North Campus and the proposed School of Professional Studies (SPS) can augment revenue for the College while it also serves the community in ways that the college has not been doing already.

The Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) program has encountered a number of challenges.

The BPS is organized into concentrations and not majors, but employers, more familiar with the idea of a major, may not understand concentrations, per se.

Additionally there is market saturation. The North Campus is in a market already saturated by other, "loud" options, who can draw on significantly more funding for marketing than can the North Campus. "Loudness" has given these other options great prominence in an adult education market that the College had not been serving very well before the BPS.

There are also some perception problems. Dean Gibbison adduced a telling example: he spoke of meeting people who think that Charleston Southern University is a local four-year public institution and that the College of Charleston is a private four-year college.

He then turned to challenges coming from the way the BPS program is set up. While the BPS is a transfer student program, the standard GPA requirement for transfer students at the College of 2.6 may be somewhat high given the nature of the students being served by the BPS, who are not just transfer students, but returning students. Returning students, Dean Gibbison pointed out, are enthusiastic and motivated learners. He asserted that we should at least conduct research to see if the GPA requirement is detrimental to adult returning students’ degree completion. The Academic Standards Committee, he suggested, might weigh in here.

Another challenge is transfer credits. The more transfer credit students are granted,
the shorter their time to degree and the lower the cost for them. Dean Gibbison also suggested that we look into our transfer credit policies.

However, what Dean Gibbison described as the biggest impediment to the North Campus is having too few programs. He said that the College needs to make a decision: are we “in or out?” Our North Campus (NC) students and others in the community who might be swayed to become students at the NC want to study a range of subjects, and not just those currently offered in the BPS. The NC would be a compelling choice if the offerings were more robust and if students were able to make multi-year plans to complete their degrees, which can only happen, he said, with a commitment to more programs and courses at the NC.

We might also have a serious conversation, Dean Gibbison asserted, about upgrading from concentrations to majors. The Curriculum Committee and the Senate could “take ownership” over developing the BPS and programs at the NC. It might also be time, he argued, to talk directly with departments who have relatively popular degrees that might be offered at the NC in evening, night, and weekend classes to a broader segment of students.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

Phil Jos, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), asked what "brand" the Dean wants the North Campus to project that might bring us success, given the kind of investments we would need to make. Also, would this brand involve distance education, in addition to traditional classroom education?

Dean Gibbison replied that that brand would have to turn on "quality." We would seek to deliver the academic rigor that may be lacking in our competitor’s offerings. Distance education has to be part of the package, too, however, in order for us to reach populations of students who may not always be able to participate in a traditional classroom-based education. Students who work for big manufacturers in the area, for instance, may work on shifts that can change from month-to-month. Or they may work in businesses that periodically require mandatory overtime. The mix of face-to-face and online modes of instruction, some research suggests, is what works well for adult returning students.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, asked Dean Gibbison to discuss the BPS in the context of the current 2+2 program that has students completing two years at Trident Tech and then coming to the College. These students face certain challenges. How do the challenges faced by BPS students compare?

Dean Gibbison responded by relating an experience he had recently at Northeastern University, where he learned that they attribute a good part of their success in the professional studies program to building strong connections with two-year colleges. Students completing an associate degree feel a sense of accomplishment, and the Professional Studies program can articulate itself directly with these two-year programs.
The situation with students at Trident Tech for two years, he argued, is not quite the same. Entering into a major like Hospitality and Tourism at the College, he said, students from Trident will often not have courses accepted for credit, and because of this their time to a four-year degree is more like five years. These students, instead, may take their credits to USC-Beaufort or the main campus in Columbia and complete their work in four years.

Dean Gibison said there's an opportunity to build a link between the BPS and two-year schools. Such a link would benefit students, and with the relationship established with Trident Tech, we could work in tandem on making sure that the curricula from the two schools line up.

Roxanne DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, pointed out that Dean Gibbison left a misimpression about the Hospitality and Tourism program at the College, which is a business degree, quite unlike the degrees at Beaufort and Columbia. Dean Gibbison affirmed the distinction between the programs that DeLaurell pointed out.

Idee Winfield, Senator - SHHS, noted that from the Dean's report, it sounds, she said, as if there might be a BPS with a concentration in History that would have a different curriculum than the BA in the History offered at the downtown campus.

Dean Gibbison responded by saying that what he was trying to suggest is that we might be able to deliver a BA in History at the North campus in the evenings. It would have the same requirements, but meet the needs of a different population of students.

Winfield followed up by asking about the School of Professional Studies. If a BA in History would be within the School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), where does the SPS come in?

The Dean replied that the SPS would provide a structure and faculty resources to support the BPS. The SPS would create a "cohesive academic unit" with some faculty that can build the BPS and build majors within the BPS to meet the needs of a particular kind of student.

Winfield responded by asking how those BPS majors would be different from majors in SHHS.

Dean Gibbison replied that students entering into the BPS, since it is a degree completion program, have to meet certain stringent requirements as to age and number of credits, etc.

The SPS, Dean Gibbison added, would allow for more development of the BPS programs.

Brian Lanahan, Senator - School of Education, Health, and Human Performance (SEHHP), asked for clarification: "are we talking about adding concentrations to the BPS or are we talking about adding majors to the North Campus?"

Dean Gibbison replied that he would like to see two separate things occur:
1. More concentrations added to the BPS to appeal to a broader set of students
2. The offering of popular majors, such as History and Psychology, at night. These would still be HSS degrees with the same requirements as are in place now.

**Jason Coy**, Senator - SHHS, observed the emphasis on "faculty resources" or "personal resources" in the Dean's characterization of the SPS. This could be potentially problematic. Coy asked a series of questions: does the Dean want a budget to hire adjuncts?, a budget to employ adjuncts already working on the main campus?, money to incentivize current faculty to teach for a different audience at the North Campus?, or, he asked, was the Dean talking about faculty lines devoted to the SPS? In the case of the latter, Coy expressed grave concern: who would do the hiring and evaluating (such as in tenure and promotion processes) of such personnel and what might their relationship be to faculty not in the SPS?

Dean Gibbison responded that he is, in fact, talking about having faculty lines devoted to the SPS. He already, he said, has a budget to hire adjuncts, and some professors at the downtown campus have taught on the North Campus. We might want to add devoted faculty to the SPS. An example, he said, might be if we wanted to add a program in healthcare management. We have few people at the College right now who are credentialed to teach in such a program.

Coy replied that the scenario described would run into the problems he was talking about. Added to this, Coy expressed concern about the limited number of roster lines available on the whole. We are already in a situation, he pointed out, where roster faculty are stretched thin. Furthermore, how would tenure and promotion be handled?

Dean Gibbison replied that the Provost is not likely to support lines being allocated to the SPS unless the need and the tuition dollars to support lines have been amply demonstrated. He went on to say that the SPS would start off as a non-line school. Should it shift to a line school, the discussions around that shift during an extended transition period, he suggested, would help resolve the issues Coy raised.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, expressed interest in what Dean Gibbison said about a potential program in healthcare management and asked what the Dean envisioned being in the program.

Dean Gibbison described a few potential courses, but having not actually proposed a program at this time, suggested that he and Shaver continue their conversation online.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator – Philosophy, expressing agreement with Coy’s position, said that the transition from a non-line to a line school raises issues as to how faculty will be evaluated and whether or not they will be held to the same standards that are now in the FAM. Those published standards represent what we judge as "quality," Krasnoff said, expressing concern with how the Dean used the word "quality" in his earlier reply to Jos. Since our "quality" is represented, Krasnoff argued, by students being taught by faculty that can meet the tenure and promotion standards, departing from
these standards in anyway as a cause for worry.

He also expressed concern that in the Dean's discussion, "quality" at times seems like it means what would bring in the most students and the most revenue. From another angle, Krasnoff said, the Dean suggested that we need to lower admission standards. Krasnoff also referred to written texts by the Dean that assert that "faculty on this campus, the main campus, use the term of 'quality' to exclude a certain population" and argue thereby "that we need to lower that standard of quality to the extent that more students would come in." Quality, Krasnoff stated, cannot be determined along the lines of what brings in the most students and the most revenue. He concluded by saying, "once we give you lines, and once we let you go outside the standards of the regular tenure and promotion process, I think we are going in a scary direction. That's the deep-down concern you are hearing in this room."

Dean Gibison replied, returning to the entrance requirements for the BPS, by asserting that it makes sense to study whether or not it is good practice to have different entry requirements for adult returning students and traditional students. The former group often includes students who might have completed their degrees when they were younger, but for the impediments of major life events that intervened and had a negative effect on their GPAs. Thus, it is worth taking the time to study different GPA requirements.

The Dean further explained that, to some extent, he feels it necessary to speak of revenue. In the September meeting of the Senate, he noted, the Interim Provost was asked directly whether or not the North campus was making money [September minutes, p. 14], leading to the impression that there is some concern about the financial viability of the unit. "When we are asked those questions, we become very conscious that we can't do anything that does not succeed financially because if we do, it will come back to haunt us." The BPS does not get the same leeway in this regard as other programs: Physics and Philosophy, he said, do not make us any money, but we teach them nonetheless for other reasons. In the end, he argued, his unit, by contrast, has to launch programs that, for better or worse, are viable in the marketplace.

The Interim Provost entered the discussion at this point to add that, with regard to the SPS, the issue at hand is limited to moving from calling the North Campus “the North Campus” (where the BPS and certain other classes are taught) to a School of Professional Studies with the BPS located at the North Campus.

The President and the administration, the Interim Provost assured, are not at this time considering launching the SPS as line school. Any such move would take some time and would be thoroughly vetted by the faculty. Furthermore, any changes to curricular programs at the North Campus will have to come through the committee structure and the Faculty Senate and, thereby, be thoroughly vetted by the faculty.

Roxanne DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked if the Senate is being asked to sanction an SPS as a non-line school and whether or not there was to be a vote at the meeting to that effect.
Dean Gibbon asked the Interim Provost to take the question.

The Interim Provost replied that all that is before the Senate is a transition from saying the North Campus houses the Bachelor of Professional Studies to saying the BPS is a program, like all others, housed in a school and supervised by a dean. This is, he pointed out, a far narrower territory than the range of issues Dean Gibbison has raised. The Dean, he stressed, was giving an informational report for the purposes of discussion. There is no vote.

There were no further questions.

D. Campus Climate Survey Update (PPT)

Hollis France, Political Science, presented information on the survey on behalf of the Diversity Climate Study Committee (DCSC), of which she is a member. She noted that some information on the survey has already gone out in emails from the Interim Provost and from Associate Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning Jim Posey, who sent the executive summary of the results.

France added a date to those presented in the first slide. Town Hall meetings open to the campus are scheduled for Friday, October 10, 10:00-11:30 and 1:00-2:30 in the Stern Student Center Ballroom. Sue Rankin will be there to present the results of the survey.

Open community forums to develop action initiatives will be run by DCSC committee members. The action items will aim to insure that our campus is an “welcoming, safe, and inclusive space.” France emphasized the need for participants to read and think about the survey results and come prepared with action items. The forums are designed with that end in mind. Locations are to be determined.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

Scott Peeples, Senator – HSS, asked for a clarification: do the community forums all have the same agenda?

France replied in the affirmative and noted that having the forums at many different times and dates is designed to maximize opportunities for input.

There were no further questions.

5. Old Business
None

6. New Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee (webpage)

[All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deactivated) or changes to programs will be voted on as a single group, unless a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote. If they wish to do so, Senators should contact the Faculty Speaker or the Faculty Secretary in advance if possible, but this action can also be done on the floor of the Senate.]

Steve Jaumé, Department of Geology, represented the Faculty Curriculum Committee (FCC) and offered to take questions.

The Speaker explained, as the italicized passage above from the agenda indicates, that any of the proposals could be separated from the group for separate discussion and consideration and voting, and he asked if anyone would like to do so. There were no requests to do so.

The Speaker then asked for unanimous consent to approve the entire set of proposals, and without objection, all proposals below were approved.

1. African Studies Minor: Changes to the Minor (PDF)
2. Teacher Education
   a) Concentration Changes
      1. Early Childhood Education (PDF)
      2. Elementary Education (PDF)
   b) Course Changes (PDF for all courses)
      1. EDEE 327: Learner Development and the Context of Learning
      2. EDFS 303: Human Growth and Education Process
   c) New Courses (PDF for all courses)
      1. EDFS 200 – Special Topics in Education
      2. EDFS 300 – Special Topics in Education

B. General Education Committee (webpage)

Karen Smail, Chair of the General Education Committee (GEC), introduced the slate of courses proposed for general education status, noting that these particular courses were approved by the GEC last spring, but not in time to have them approved by the Faculty Senate last year.

Following the same arrangement as with the FCC proposals, the Speaker asked for unanimous consent to approve the entire set of proposals, and without objection, all proposals below were approved.

1. Motion to Approve for General Education Status (PDF)
a) Social Science (PDF for all courses)
   1. URST 320: Town and County Planning
   2. URST 360: Land Use Law
   3. URST 399: Special Topics

b) Humanities: URST 398 - Special Topics (PDF)

C. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual (webpage)
   1. Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Manual to add Adjunct Representation to the Faculty Welfare Committee, Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, and the Faculty Compensation Committee (PDF | Word)
   2. Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Bylaws to add Adjunct Representation to the Faculty Senate (PDF | Word)

The Speaker explained that as proposed changes to the FAM, the motions require a 2/3 majority vote to pass. Parliamentarian George Pothering noted for the record that, while it was not the case prior to an by-laws amendment two years ago, motions from the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual (BLFAM) can be voted on in the same meeting in which they are presented. The Speaker added one more note on the history of these motions. They were presented by the Faculty Welfare Committee last year [see December 2013 minutes, p. 12] and moved to BLFAM for further vetting and to work out the particular language.

Rick Heldrich, Chair of BLFAM and Senator - School of Science and Math (SSM), introduced the motions, explaining that the separation of committee and Senate representation made good sense to the committee, given that they seem to raise separate issues. He offered to answer questions about either of the motions and/or the committee's deliberations.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

Daniel Delgado, Senator - Hispanic Studies, asked if adjunct faculty representatives are not typically compensated for participation in faculty governance.

Heldrich replied that the committee discussed this, but discovered that adjuncts cannot be compensated for such service at the College because it raises health insurance issues related to salary.

Irina Gigova, Senator – SHHS, asked about how, pursuant to motion 2, adjunct Senators would be elected to the Senate.

Heldrich replied that the committee had much discussion about representation. The committee concluded that there was no way to guarantee representation of discipline and, similarly, thought it would be hard to account for representation along the lines of “service” (part-time vs. full-time). The committee also rejected the idea of having adjunct representatives for each school since that might increase the level of votes
dedicated to adjuncts to a level that some might feel is too high.

The committee went with the fixed number of Senators, with a proviso that they have to come from at least two different schools and at the least three different departments.

**Simon Lewis**, Department of English, placed the motions in the wider context of the “national scandal” of how contingent or adjunct faculty are treated around the country. While the problems at the College are not as acute as elsewhere, a third of our courses are taught by adjunct faculty, around half of introductory courses are taught by adjuncts, and “those faculty have no representation whatsoever.” While the motions appear complicated, he said, they are simple and begin to address the problem.

Adjunct Senators will represent adjunct concerns, not their departments or their schools. Likewise, on key committees (the Advisory Committee to the President, Faculty Welfare, and Compensation), they will represent adjunct concerns.

A survey conducted in 2011 (it has taken a long time to get these motions to the Senate) revealed how dedicated are the adjunct faculty to the College, and yet they also felt very undervalued by the College. These motions are a way to show that their voice matters. He urged the Senate to pass the motions.

**Jason Coy**, Senator – SHHS, thought splitting the motions was a good idea. While he supports the first motion (committee representation), as the committees named do work that concerns adjuncts, he said he does not support the second motion (Senate representation). If it is OK for adjuncts to be in the Senate and deal with all the issues before the Senate, including T&P, he argued, then why not have them on all committees? The first motion makes a sensible distinction that limits adjunct representation to a few select committees, and this is undermined by the second motion, as the Senate takes on all issues.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator – SHHS, urged voting in favor of both motions. She agreed with Coy that the committees in the first motion are committees particularly significant to adjuncts, but she said that it is realistic and practical to have a few adjuncts serving on those committees and a few serving in the Senate. At this time, if all committees were open to adjunct service, she speculated, it might be hard to find enough adjuncts willing to serve. The limited number of committee slots seems appropriate at this time, as we are just beginning to include adjunct representation at this time. We can also, she suggested, if it makes sense in a few years’ time, add adjuncts to other committees. This is a “reasonable gesture” at this point, and there is no reason for concern about undue influence of a few adjunct votes. But it matters that we hear their voice on committees and in the Senate.

**Kathleen Janech**, Adjunct Instructor in Biology, noting that she has served as an adjunct for the past nine years, offered thanks for the efforts of those who have worked on the issue of adjunct representation over the past few years and for the Senate’s consideration of the motions. She urged Senators to vote for both motions.
Adjuncts are often thought of as temporary employees who teach their classes and then vanish, she said, but there are many adjuncts who work full time and are very deeply invested in the College. These adjuncts would very much appreciate having a voice in how things are run, as this bears directly on their lives.

The Interim Provost asked Senators, however they may vote, to take into careful consideration as they deliberate that adjunct faculty are now the only employee group on campus that does not have an “official mechanism of any sort for being reached out to or for engaging in outreach of their own.”

The Speaker, asked that, given that the motions are separate, that discussion at this point be confined if possible to the subject of the first motion: adjunct committee representation.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, stated that he agrees with Coy’s point and supports the first motion, as it does provide a voice. A lot of what the Senate and committees do boils down to voice, he said, since we do not have, in many cases, any legislative power. The first motion provides voice on relevant committees for adjuncts.

*** The question was called, seconded, and passed.

The first motion, “Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Manual to add Adjunct Representation to the Faculty Welfare Committee, Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, and the Faculty Compensation Committee,” passed on a unanimous voice vote.

---

Discussion now turned to the second motion, “Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Bylaws to add Adjunct Representation to the Faculty Senate.”

---

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, pointed out two functions of the Senate. It serves as an advisory body that deliberates and may send a message to the institution, which may or may not be taken up. But the Senate is also, to a small extent, a legislative body, with control over parts of the FAM, curriculum, and, presumably, tenure and promotion standards. But “are we committed to adjuncts deciding things?” The first motion “suggests not,” Krasnoff asserted, because we are not also asking adjuncts to sit on other committees. We might ask why adjuncts should decide on curriculum if they do not also serve on the curriculum committee, or general education, if they are not on that committee, and so forth.

Perhaps, he suggested, the impetus for the motion is to make a gesture showing that adjunct’s opinions are valued. But could this not be accomplished, Krasnoff asked, by having three adjuncts serve as non-voting members of the Senate. They would be present and their voice singled out. There needs to be an argument, he stated, for why the representation needs to include voting, since many salutary effects can be secured
simply through non-voting representation.

**Scott Peeples**, Senator – HSS, replied that adjuncts already have a kind of non-voting representation as guests of the Senate, just as anyone can come to the Senate and speak without voting. “Being a non-voting member of the Senate,” he said, “is pretty much the same as not being a member of the Senate at all.”

Not so, Krasnoff countered, as they would be elected. “Elected to basically be guests,” Peeples replied. Krasnoff replied that the position would entail a responsibility to attend all Senate meetings. Even, so, Peeples responded, the privileges of a non-voting member of the Senate are the same as that of a non-member of the Senate. The only meaningful Senate membership, he asserted, is a voting membership.

Peeples added that it is hard to distinguish precisely what business the Senate votes on that would not be of concern to adjunct faculty. They are involved in delivering the curriculum, so curriculum is of concern to them. From a different angle, Senators may not teach in departments on whose curriculum they vote. The distinctions between adjunct faculty and roster faculty, thus, begin to blur. Peeples argued that he thinks adjuncts have “as much right as anyone” to vote on issues in the Senate.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator – SSM, seconded Krasnoff’s concern. She adduced the Senate’s lengthy consideration earlier in the meeting about line versus non-line schools as an example of something that would not concern adjuncts. She asserted that only a small part of curriculum development would be of concern to adjuncts. The same, she argued, is true for tenure and promotion. Most of what the Senate has power over, she said, is not of concern to adjuncts. She went further, saying that even a non-voting Senate seat doesn’t make sense because, as she put it, “why would an adjunct sit here for two hours?”

**Scooter Barnette**, Senior Instructor – Health and Human Performance, voiced her support for the motion, adding that adjunct instructors are some of the best instructors in the College. Granting them a voice and vote is the least we can do.

**Jason Coy**, Senator – SHHS, said that a very good list has emerged in the discussion of things adjuncts would not be concerned with or would not be qualified to vote on. Tenure and promotion is an example. In the Senate, he noted, we had a T & P issue a few years ago that ended up in a vote of no confidence in the President. This had nothing to do with adjuncts.

He further expressed concern that not supporting the motion might be misconstrued as disregard for the contributions adjuncts make to the College.

Coy argued that the committee assignments voted on in the first motion were chosen for a very specific reason: “to exclude adjuncts from decisions that they shouldn’t have a say in.” He asked if it was ever discussed if adjuncts should be on the Tenure and Promotion committee.
Simon Lewis, Department of English and former member of the Faculty Welfare Committee, said that in drafting the first motion, there was never an argument about exclusion. Rather, given that adjuncts are already overtaxed, the plan was to give them representation where it would matter most – in the Senate and in specifically targeted committees. It was never a question of excluding the other committees. In fact, Senate seats allow them to weigh in on the work of those committees on which they are not seated.

As to T & P discussion and the vote of no confidence mentioned earlier, Lewis stated that not very many members of the Senate had read the documents in the tenure and promotion case with which these were concerned, but we voted on the resolution of no confidence, nonetheless. Adjuncts would have been no less well-equipped, Lewis asserted, to render such a decision than most Senators.

Coy replied that we vet T & P language in the Senate, as well, and therein might lie a difference.

Nevertheless, Lewis replied, adjuncts are invested even in such issues as T & P language because these issues bear on the nature and values of the College, to which they are strongly committed.

Julia Eichelberger, Senator – SHHS, pointed out that the American Association of University Professors, among many other organizations, holds it as a best practice to have adjunct faculty participate in the full range of academic duties. A “healthy institution,” she said, does this. Exclusion of adjuncts from the Senate is not, on the other hand, a best practice.

Nor did she find compelling the argument that adjuncts shouldn’t be voting members of the Senate because there are matters with which they do not have direct experience. “They are part of this academic institution. They contribute to our common work.”

Evan Parry, Senator - Theatre and Dance, expressed full support for the motion and suggested that many of us, as roster faculty, might have lost track of concerns adjunct faculty have, particularly in approving General Education courses.

He also said that it is important not to devalue or trivialize the gesture in the motion.

Kathleen Janech, Adjunct Instructor in Biology, said that, while she understands the argument being made against the motion along the lines of certain areas of Senate concern being outside the interest of adjuncts, she distinctly disagrees. While adjuncts will not come up for tenure, matters of promotion policies are of significant interest to them.

Tom Kunkle, Senator – SSM, asserted that there is no reason to fear three adjunct Senators as a cabal. The relative power of their vote would be small.
Ryan Spraker, President of the Student Government Association, said he finds it interesting that the group that makes up 30%+ of faculty at the College are not represented. As to the idea that adjuncts would be voting on items that don't concern them directly, it is the job of representatives, at times to do so. Spraker adduced an example here of Seniors voting in the SGA Senate on meal plans. Voting on issues that do not directly concern you is a matter of making sure our college works, he said.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, replied to Kunkle's remark by noting that three votes could be very meaningful. Her recollection, she said, was that in the last General Education reform, a majority was secured with only one or two votes.

Tim Johnson, Senator - Classics, noted that a vote is a central characteristic of a democratic system. Adjuncts are excluded from voting, even though they account for 30% of our courses, they have a symbiotic relationship to the College, and their welfare is affected by everything we decide. The motion is not an empty gesture. Rather, it is important to include perspectives that matter in our decision-making. He used his own faculty as an example. Adjuncts in Classics are not only shouldering much of the teaching load, but they bring in perspectives from other schools at which they have taught and seen legislation conducted. There is no risk of competency here.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, reiterated a prior point he made: to a large extent, the Senate only has voice. One could say that without a vote, there is no voice, but if that were true, he argued, then we would have to say that in about two-thirds of what we do in the Senate, we have no voice. There is a narrow slice of things the Senate has a vote on, such as matters of curriculum and new majors. "It may seem exclusionary," he said, "but the idea of faculty control is that we want decisions made by the people who have passed through the various tests of quality that are defined by the tenure and promotion process."

Krasnoff moved to amend the motion as follows. In the section labeled “MOTION 1c: To change Article IV, Section 2, A,”

“and 3 Adjunct Faculty Senators with voting privileges.”

would be changed to

“and 3 Adjunct Faculty Senators without voting privileges.”

Krasnoff’s motion was seconded.

---

Discussion now turned to Krasnoff’s motion to amend the “Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Bylaws to add Adjunct Representation to the Faculty Senate.”

---

Iana Anguelova, Senator – Mathematics, said that the amendment is a good one because it keeps the gesture intact. She also argued that, while she values the work of adjuncts, unlike full-time faculty, whose loyalty is to the College, adjuncts may be
working at more places than just the College. There may be a problem, therefore, with competing interests, in which case, it might be peculiar for them to have voting privileges.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, stated that the amendment allows us to have a vote that does not contaminate the vote on the motion itself and does not risk losing the two-thirds majority on the basis of peoples’ feelings on this particular issue.

He argued against the amendment, saying that he thinks there are things that we vote on that do, in fact, really matter to adjuncts in “a way that has not been considered yet.” As an example, he raised the possibility that adjunct budgets might be at stake in a future Senate vote over the SPS becoming a line school if funding the school means further stretching our existing budget. Adjuncts might want to vote on this, and there are many other cases one can imagine, he asserted, in which adjuncts would be directly vested in a Senate vote.

**Scott Peeples**, Senator – HSS, spoke against the amendment and in favor of the main motion. He asserted that, according to the FAM, instructors, which he took to also mean “visiting instructors,” are allowed to serve in the Senate. Why, he asked, would we enfranchise such instructors, but not adjuncts?

**Beverly Diamond**, Associate Provost, clarified that the term “instructor” has a very specific meaning in the FAM. It means a person hired into a position that can lead to promotion to senior instructor position, and who is subject to third-year review and comes up for promotion but cannot stay as an instructor if the promotion to senior instructor is not earned.

**Daniel Delgado**, Senator - Hispanic Studies, noted the wide array of positions and ranks of faculty in the Senate: Senior Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor. He asserted that adjunct faculty should also be included.

**Rick Heldrich**, speaking not as Chair of the Committee bringing the motion, but as Senator – SSM, said he favors the amendment to the motion. The nature of adjuncts varies from department to department. In his department, Chemistry, he pointed out that adjuncts are never invited to department meetings. While they are qualified to teach, they are not, he said, qualified to vote on curriculum matters. There may be something of a disconnection if a department does not allow adjuncts to vote on curriculum, but they can in the Senate.

Heldrich argued that, while he values adjuncts and their work, the motion is “an attempt to put a bandaid on a problem that makes us all feel bad, but it doesn't solve the problem: the bleeding doesn’t stop. The adjuncts are still not getting paid anything.”

**Simon Lewis**, Department of English, encouraged the Senate to vote against the
amendment because without the voting privilege the motion is pointless.

**Evan Parry**, Senator – Theatre and Dance, added that perhaps if adjuncts are members of the Senate we can begin to address some of the endemic problems they face.

---

There was no further discussion, and **a vote on the amendment to the motion failed**.

---

There was no further discussion on the main motion: ““Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Bylaws to add Adjunct Representation to the Faculty Senate.”

A vote was taken and **passed by a show of hands, 25 “yes” to 10 “no.”**

D. **RESOLUTION** to support Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 and call upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and appeal for the SC Legislature to create a position within the Board of Trustees to be held by the President of the Student Government Association. ([PDF](#) | [Word](#))

**Joe Carson**, Senator – School of Science and Mathematics, introduced the motion, noting that it is in support of a resolution passed unanimously last April by the SGA Senate and that was penned by Zachery Sturman, SGA Senator, a student in attendance at the Senate meeting.

The resolution does not specify the nature of the position, voting or non-voting, and so forth, but it does ask that students be given a place at the table and allowed to voice their opinions to the Board of Trustees (BOT). It helps ensure a dialog between the BOT and students and would foster transparency. The majority of schools in the US, he said, have students on their governing boards: the College is an “outlier.” No compelling arguments have been made against having a student on the BOT at the College, he asserted. While the Senate has no power to create such a position, it is important that the Senate support the students when they demonstrate that an issue is important to them, as they have through their unanimous vote on their resolution.

Carson, with unanimous consent of the body, amended the resolution. He explained that the last “whereas” statement turns out to be factually incorrect. It claims that the composition of the BOT can “only be modified by legislative action.” However, Carson said, a South Carolina statute exists that says in specific situations the BOT has the power to amend their own by-laws and may create a “non-voting” member, which seat will be filled by the president of the student body. Since the last “whereas” statement may be inaccurate, his amendment struck it entirely.

The amendment also included two modifications to the “resolved” section of the resolution to bring it in line with state statute described above.

1. Adding “if necessary” after “calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and”
2. Changing “President of the Student Government Association” to “student body president.”

The resolution, at this point, read as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution to Support Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 and Call upon the Board of Trustees to Publicly Support and Appeal for the SC Legislature to Create a Position within the Board of Trustees to be held by the President of the Student Government Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHEREAS, on April 8, 2014, the Student Government Association unanimously passed SR-10-2014, calling for a position to be created within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the President of the Student Government Association;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEREAS, according to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, “more than 70 percent of public institution boards include one or more students”;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEREAS, the inclusion of a representative of the student body as a part of the final authority and governance of the College of Charleston is a logically tenable way to better satisfy the goals set forth by the respective governing documents of the Student Government Association and the Board of Trustees;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEREAS, the inclusion of the Student Government Association President as an official member of the Board would help ensure mutual respect between Undergraduate students and the Board of Trustees;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEREFORE, be it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support, and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the student body president.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **Parliamentarian** offered some guidance for the discussion and vote on the resolution. This should begin with the “resolved” clauses. If there are any amendments, then they should be made to these statements first. After that point changes could be made to the “whereas” statements. Then there should be a discussion of the whole document and a vote on it.

**Phil Jos**, Senator – SHHS, asked if the ambiguity implied by “a position” is intentional, with the details of the nature of the position to be worked out later, in another venue. Carson replied that the student resolution (SR-10-2014) does not refer to voting or non-voting membership. That decision would be separate from the Senate resolution at hand.
Rick Heldrich, Senator – SSM, asserted that the matter of voting or non-voting membership has to be decided for the Senate resolution, given the lengthy discussion the Senate just had on this distinction with regard to adjunct representation in the Senate. The faculty has no vote on BOT. Why would we have a student position with a vote, when there is no such position for the faculty?

Lance Foxworth, SGA Senator, stated that the intent of the resolution is to support the students' case for having a member on the BOT, voting or not. The Faculty Senate might make their own resolution for a voting membership on the BOT. The BOT is the governing body of the College and should have representation from all groups. He urged the Senate to adopt the resolution.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, noted that the faculty does have representation on the BOT through the Speaker of the Faculty, though this is a non-voting representation. He said that the Senate should support the resolution. Finally, he added that he was surprised that those who in the prior matter were so insistent that representation without a vote is meaningless were now “very quiet.”

Matt Rabon, Senior in Philosophy and representing Fight for CofC, noted that he as an individual and Fight for CofC as a group are deeply conflicted about the resolution. While they fully support having students and faculty in a voting capacity in the BOT, they worry about the student representative being filled by the President of the SGA, which might politicize that position too much. Rabon also expressed concern that voting on the resolution might give the Senate the impression that it has “discharged responsibility with regard to what happened last year.” The resolution speaks of a loss of trust in the BOT, but Rabon suggested that the cause of the mistrust be named: the Presidential search last year. The symbolic action of having a student on the BOT will not alone, he asserted, remedy the trust problem. He urged the Senate to either strengthen the resolution through amendments or to vote it down.

Ryan Spraker, SGA President, also expressed reservations about the Senate resolution and the SGA resolution passed last year. There are requirements to be a Trustee that are perhaps not being acknowledged. Notably, Trustees are appointed by the state. While there may be some flexibility in the law, as pointed out in the amendments, state action of some sort would be required to add a student representative to the BOT.

Also, he observed, the resolution is only a statement: it has no force.

The Speaker of the Faculty and the SGA President attend BOT meetings but are not allowed in executive sessions, which is where far-reaching decisions are made.

He urged that the Senate pass the resolution, but coupled with more investigation into the issue and also pushing for a faculty vote on the BOT.

Zachery Sturman, SGA Senator and author of the SGA resolution, thanked Carson for bringing the resolution on the table to the Senate and thanked the Senate for
considering it. Sturman noted that when the BOT went into executive session last year and decided therein on the next President, the students had no seat at the table. A full membership in the BOT would mean a membership that would include attending and voting in executive sessions.

More than 70% of schools, he asserted, now have students on trustee boards. Having the SGA President serve as the representative on the board is standard practice. Furthermore, the South Carolina Code of Laws specifies that such a position would be held by the student body’s president.

He disagreed, he said, with the argument that the resolution doesn’t get at the heart of the problem. The SGA resolution, on the contrary, he argued, is the only thing substantive that deals with what happened last year. We would have a little more comfort, he said, with a student there representing students’ interest.

Iana Anguelova, Senator – SSM, moved that discussion be postponed until the November meeting. The motion was seconded.

The Parliamentarian noted that the motion to postpone is debatable and requires a 2/3 majority vote.

Jason Coy, Senator – SHHS, pointed out that the remaining Senators may not comprise a quorum.

---

There was no discussion of the motion to postpone. A voice vote was taken and it passed.

The resolution will be on the November meeting agenda under “Old Business.”

6. Constituents’ Concerns
   None expressed.

7. Adjournment: 7:21 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary