Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 9 September 2014

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 9 September 2014 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order: 5:04 PM
2. Announcements

Speaker Todd McNerney introduced himself, and reminded the body of the standing rules for the Senate: all are welcome to attend, and all are welcome to speak, and those who speak should identify themselves and their affiliations before doing so. The speaker also introduced George Pothering (Computer Science), who will continue to serve as Parliamentarian; Mike Duvall (English), who will continue to serve as Faculty Secretary; and Ana Gilpatrick (Academic Affairs), who is serving as a temporary Faculty Secretariat until we hire a replacement for former Secretariat Heather Alexander, who has left the post for graduate school.

The Speaker asked the body for unanimous consent to alter the order of the agenda in order to allow President Glenn McConnell more time to speak before departing to attend an important foundation event. With no objections raised, the Speaker moved the President's and Provost's reports ahead of the Speaker's report.

3. 1 April 2014 regular meeting minutes were approved as posted.
4. Reports
   A. The President (Outline PDF | Evolution of College Mission Statement - Documents PDF)

   The President thanked the Senate for the courtesy of changing the order of reports and welcomed the faculty back from the summer break.

   **Academic Freedom**

   The President reported on meeting with a group of faculty that included some in the audience, current Speaker McNerney, and former Speaker Lynn Cherry to discuss academic freedom. He said the he wants to “reaffirm” his “commit[ment] to the principle of academic freedom.” Faculty will continue to select their own texts and decide how to teach them. “Faculty at this college,” he added, “have been guaranteed academic freedom for as long as there has been a Faculty/Administration Manual....As the President and as a new member of this faculty, I share your beliefs about academic freedom, and I am committed to preserving this freedom.”

   **Men’s Basketball Program**

   The President noted that Earl Grant has been hired as the new head coach for the men's basketball program. Grant, whose credentials include five years as an assistant coach at Clemson University, the President said, will usher in a new era of excellence, teamwork, and success. Moreover, the President said, that academics and character are very important to Coach Grant, who will, the President stressed, “make the school
proud, bring excitement, and, eventually, a full house to the TD Arena.”

The President also expressed pride in the basketball players, who “showed tremendous resilience, and strength under very challenging circumstances” during the last two and a half months. “They composed themselves like gentlemen and represented the College with class.”

Finally, the President thanked the search committee for their dedication and sacrifice in selecting the right person for the job.

**Interim Provost**

Soon after the announcement of former Provost George Hynd’s departure to take the position of President of Oakland University, President McConnell began meeting with faculty to identify characteristics they would be looking for in an interim or permanent Provost. These faculty also identified action items to be immediately adopted by a new Provost. As a result of these discussions, the President identified whom he thought was the “best person for the job” and who could carry the action items out. On August 13th, he named Brian McGee Interim Provost and Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs. The President thanked Interim Provost McGee for taking the job.

The Interim Provost, the President said, by virtue of his prior positions, including Chair of the Department of Communication and Chief of Staff and Senior Vice President for Executive Administration, knows the College and its history very well, and having come up through the academic ranks, the Interim Provost is “one of you,” the President added, and is an asset to the administration, the campus, and the faculty.

The Interim Provost is at present, among other things, working with the administration to create a more transparent budget process.

The President said that McGee will serve as Interim Provost for the entire academic year, allowing continuity for faculty going through the tenure and promotion process. A search for a new Provost will begin after the conclusion of the search for the Executive Vice President of Student Affairs (EVPSA). The President expressed his appreciation for Jeri Cabot’s having served as Interim EVPSA over the last year.

The President will lay out a process for the hiring of a new Provost at the end of the fall semester. He invited comments, in the meantime, on the desirable qualities and characteristics for the next Provost.

**Vision for the College**

“My vision for the College,” the President said, “is that we will remain a premier liberal arts and sciences institution, marked by a deep commitment to serving undergraduate students. At the same time, the College houses a research university which will supply a growing number of graduate and research programs, including, eventually, targeted doctoral programs that will meet the needs of our community and state.”

This vision will be realized via

1. affordability, accessibility, and diversity
2. the University of Charleston
Affordability, Accessibility, and Diversity

These three items are intertwined. “You cannot have one without the other two: we must be more affordable before we can be more accessible, and vice versa, and we must be both affordable and accessible before we can be more diverse.” The President stressed that he wants “to make sure that we are providing opportunities for students from underrepresented populations or with low socioeconomic status to enter through our gates and have the chance to change the trajectory of their lives.”

We are going to have to offer more and bigger scholarships, which is why scholarships are a “top priority for our comprehensive campaign.” High-achieving students who want to come here often do not because they can get more generous scholarships elsewhere. Many students from disadvantaged backgrounds, he said, would also consider the College if we were more affordable. “There must be more scholarship opportunities for them, too.” Our comprehensive plan will address this.

We will also be looking for other ways to lower our cost to students, he added. Regarding diversity, the President emphasized that “our administration will treat all people with dignity and respect and ensure that our campus is a safe and welcoming environment for all. That is who we have been at the College, and we don't expect that to change. As a matter of fact, we are going to reinforce that.”

Steps we will take to increase diversity include recruiting more high school guidance counselors, particularly in areas where we have no representation, to recommend the College to their students, bringing counselors to the campus so that they can see it firsthand and meet our faculty and staff and bring that experience back to students who, he said, “would never have previously considered us as a viable option.”

We will follow this up, the President said, with the involvement of our African American alumni caucus, whom he praised for their “leadership and talent.” With “logistical support,” they can “engage with prospective students who come to this campus for tours.” We need to develop opportunities for members of the caucus to meet with and “develop a rapport” with prospective students in order to share with them their own experiences and why the College would be a good choice for them.

The President said that we will also “champion the SPECTRA program,” which serves to transition students into the College. “It is essential to our diversity efforts,” he stressed, by lessening the “culture shock” these students might feel and connecting the students, such that they “band together to encourage one another to succeed and to graduate.” They then become “ambassadors” for the College. The President praised “the camaraderie” among SPECTRA students and “how they cheer one another on.” “Everyone at the College can be proud about” the SPECTRA program, a “great success,” which he would like to see continue and grow.

The College will also collaborate with Francis Marion University (FMU). “I think the future of higher education is collaboration, not in competition and duplication.” Thus, if FMU comes to the Lowcountry, the President said he is “confident we will find many ways to help one another and better serve the people of the state.”

Finally, as concerns diversity, the President pointed to what “we are calling the ‘10%
pilot program;” which, he noted, was reported in the Post and Courier on August 26. The President hopes for faculty support in developing the program, which will include Charleston, Berkeley, Dorchester, and up to three or four other counties. The program will admit any applicants in top 10% of their high school graduating class. “We’re out for the high-achieving students;” who “may not perform well on the standardized tests but… have grades to prove they know how to apply themselves to achieve and to succeed.” The program will require the support of resources and tutoring in order to ensure that students succeed. The program will “open doors to schools from which we have rarely received a student.” A thorough assessment of the pilot program will reveal whether it is successful and whether we can expand it to other counties and, perhaps, to the whole state. The President reported “very positive feedback” on the program from both members of the campus and the Charleston community. The goal, he said, is “to remain an excellent liberal arts and sciences institution,” and, he pledged, “we can both be a premier liberal arts and sciences institution and, at the same time, meet the needs of this community and of the students” that this pilot program would bring to the College.

The President said he expects “there will be other ideas” to increase diversity, and “the best ideas may frequently come from right here in the Senate and from the faculty.”

University of Charleston

The President described the “main part of [his] vision” as “perserv[ing] our excellence in undergraduate teaching while offering advanced studies that meet the needs of our community. Our new ability to offer doctoral programs becomes the College’s insurance program that it will remain the College of Charleston with the University of Charleston, not the College at the university.” He added, “we are the only place I know of in America where the university is at the college; the college is not at the university.” This is a specific legal arrangement in the State of South Carolina, and it “allows us to thread the eye of the needle in this regard.”

The President reminded the Senate that the faculty received an email from him on July 23 and again on August 25 that announced the new and revised mission statement for the College approved by the Board of Trustees. Documents posted on the Senate website prior to the meeting, he also noted, show the evolution of the College’s mission statement since 1994. The new mission statement, he reported, “has been the vehicle by which we sought approval from South Carolina Commission on Higher Education [CHE] for the University of Charleston, South Carolina [UCSC] to offer targeted doctoral degrees.” The Academic Affairs Committee of CHE approved unanimously the new mission statement on August 26. The full CHE voted in favor of the mission statement on September 4.

UCSC can now offer doctoral degrees approved by our faculty, SACS, and CHE. “However,” he added, “I still plan to work with members of the General Assembly [GA] to pass legislation next year that will permit us to offer the targeted doctoral degrees,” which may, he noted, seem unnecessary, since the CHE has spoken, yet the President added that he has “some Constitutional concerns about the delegation of authority to CHE from the [GA], and under the Constitutional setup, the [GA] has plenary power, and as a result,” he said, “I don’t need a trial lawyer a few years up the road in a lawsuit
raising the issue of whether or not we are able to do what we’re doing.” Going down “both paths,” then, will assure there is “no confusion or roadblock” to the College’s “constructing its balanced future. I want to be very clear: the College solidifying its control of its own destiny to avoid consequences from those who may know little about us or who may not be as focused [on] our greatness, as we are. We still decide who we are, who we want to be, and how we’re going to get there. It’s as plain and simple as that.”

The President added that UCSC “will never be a Clemson or a Carolina or any other comprehensive university: it will be an enterprise of the College; it is a component of the College, and it will be very targeted and very focused.”

Currently the talk about UCSC doctoral degrees centers on Computer Science, Information Management, and Supply Chain Management and Logistics, but, the President emphasized, no programs will go forward without extensive discussion and proper vetting at all levels, and the discussion needs to start with the faculty. It must also “continue across our entire campus, our community, and our interested business stakeholders.”

The President reiterated that the College’s new, CHE-approved mission statement “does not change our undergraduate name, our academic courses, or our staffing,” nor does the new mission statement “mean that we will be offering the doctoral degrees in the near future.” He likened our “new status” to a “permission slip to explore new opportunities and to go where we collectively want to go and need to go.”

As a result of our new status, “merger is a moot question.”

The President reported on a meeting with MUSC in August that produced an agreement that the two schools set up a “collaboration council to identify ways that our two schools can work together to move our community forward.” Collaborating, we will be “better stewards of state money and show the [GA] we do not need them to legislate our future.”

The President also reported on a meeting between members of the College’s faculty and the Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce. He described it as an “uplifting experience with dialogue that was constructive and informative for all parties.” He expressed hope that the meetings would continue. He shared what he called “the best takeaway from the meeting”: a direct quotation from an employer who said, “‘when I’m hiring employees in Computer Science and they have a degree in English, it enriches my attraction to them.” Liberal arts degrees attract the attention of employers, who value applicants with those degrees more highly. This is “a message,” the President said, “we asked the business community to send back to their membership and to talk about why we are relevant to the business community and to Charleston and why our degrees are a great asset.” This, he said, was an “great affirmation that here at the College of Charleston we holistically educate people, and we prepare them for careers in a very complex and global environment.” It is a message he asks that the business community repeat often, and that we stay in a “continuing dialogue” with them in order for us to “stay connected” and that they “understand what a wonderful thing the College of Charleston is in this community.”
The President stressed that any new doctoral programs would require new funding, which will include “very significant private contributions from businesses and others.” “We will not,” he emphasized, “offer doctoral degrees without the requisite funding earmarked for those programs. I will not pull resources from our undergraduate mission. Remember, our goal is to secure the future of the College. It is not to weaken it.”

**Shared Governance and Transparency**

“This administration,” the President said, “will be one of collaboration, shared governance, and transparency. We will welcome constructive criticism and creative solutions. We are a stronger College of Charleston when all of us engage with one another, try to learn from one another, and support this institution and one another in moving this institution forward.” He asserted that he is “about building consensus with faculty, the Faculty Senate, and this community.”

He said that he hopes an example of this collaborative governance can be found in his treatment of the proposal for the School of Professional Studies, which he is putting through the proper vetting process, and which, he noted, the Provost will touch on in his remarks. The President is “not against it,” he added, “but before things go forward,” the faculty needs to be included in the process.

**Faculty Compensation**

The President announced a recommendation that there be increases in the raises awarded with tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor (from $5,000 to $5,500) and from Associate Professor to Professor (from $6,000 to $6,500). The Board of Trustees has yet to approve this, but the President said that he, the Interim Provost, and Executive Vice President of Business Affairs Steve Osborne will be working with the Board to make these changes, which, if they go through, will mark the fourth straight year of increases for these promotions. The President stressed that he hopes this is taken as evidence of “the seriousness with which we are taking faculty compensation and recognizing the work of those who have given years of service to the College as members of our faculty.”

---

The President closed by saying “it’s a privilege to serve with you. I’m excited to have an opportunity to work on the future that I described. Jointly, our dedication, our energy, and our ideas can take this college forward.” He added that, as he told the Board of Trustees, having gone to the College of Charleston himself, along with four of his siblings, the College is in his “DNA” and is “part of [his] family.” Each day on the job, he said, he has a “closer connection to this institution.” He said, that, looking around the room at the faculty Senators who have volunteered to serve, he “hope[s] that [the faculty] do get excited about the balanced future this institution has.” We have, he said, “the ability, with the tools we have, to transform our vision into reality in the years ahead and keep the College of Charleston, the College of Charleston.”

**Questions / Discussion / Comments**

Phil Jos, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), specified that in the
past discussions we have had about moving towards a comprehensive university versus a liberal arts college, there was an idea of a trade-off: the move was considered necessary because the liberal arts model, particularly one that calls for a significant number of out-of-state students, might not earn much support from the General Assembly (GA). He asked the President for his read of that body’s attitude. Is it changing? How do you envision our “threading the needle”? 

The GA, the President replied, sees the Lowcountry as an “economic unit in competition with other economic units,” and that we have many jobs we can’t fill, and so we people bring in from out of state to fill those jobs.

The people who come from out of state to the College, he said, we hope will stay in our community and fill the jobs. The President vowed to repeat to the GA what he heard from the employer he cited in his report above, how “a liberal arts education teaches you how to think. We are not a trade school. Never will be.” He added that he thinks the GA will support us if we are “good stewards” of state funding, which the President noted that he’s trying to do by keeping an eye on spending.

He emphasized that there is no initiative he is aware of to make the College a comprehensive state university. The GA, he said, is “satisfied” with the idea of targeted doctoral programs, but we should remain vigilant about where the support is coming from for any proposed programs, asking if the data is reliable and if what it is said that we need will need in the future is what, in fact, we will need in the future. “It would be wrong” to go out and raise money for programs that do not truly meet a need.

Furthermore, he reiterated that any new graduate programs would require a concomitant strengthening of our undergraduate program. He added that he “is going back to the [GA], for instance, on one program [to] ask them for additional money to enrich our undergraduate experience here with that program, allow[ing] us to hire more professors and to go forward.”

He also pledged to work with other Presidents of public schools in the state to advocate for public education. “One of the greatest dangers to public education [in the state] right now, K-12 and higher ed[ucation]” he asserted, “is this debate that you can fix the roads of South Carolina without a gas tax. All of the other things come back to the general fund. The general fund was set up for education, and for law enforcement, and for health. It was never set up to fund roads....You could rob every new dollar out of [that account] for the next ten years and dump it into roads, and it will have as much effect on filling that 29 billion dollar deficit as a rain drop will out here in the harbor.” We need to make ourselves heard: the GA has to “re-engage” with public education.

Richard Nunan, Philosophy, asked about the 10% pilot program, expressing some concerns. While it might work in the short term in the local area, it might also fairly quickly engender lawsuits from parties elsewhere in the state who also graduated in the top 10% of their high schools’ senior classes and, on failing to be admitted to the College, could claim discrimination because the 10% program did not apply to them.
Such an equal protection lawsuit might arise from a white student, given the plan’s stated intention of increasing diversity. A loss in such a lawsuit, which is likely, Nunan asserted, would force us to go statewide with the program, whether we want to or not.

Raising another concern, Nunan noted that the President stated in his report that he would like to see the program go statewide, yet, Nunan argued, the numbers might be a problem. That is, with a statewide automatic acceptance of the top 10% of graduating seniors at all schools (granted that some will not come) and given that we enroll a relatively high percentage of out-of-state students whose much higher tuition dollars we use to essentially subsidize our in-state students, would this not create a serious financial problem as incoming in-state students might crowd out incoming out-of-state students?

The President, responding first to the implied 14th Amendment implications, stated that the courts have “consistently said that you can distinguish between different groups based upon objective criteria,” such as class-rank achievement. There are already other programs in South Carolina that rely on objective-criteria basis, such as guardian ad litem programs. On this basis, despite the chance that someone might file a racial- or socioeconomic-discrimination suit, the President said he has no fear of losing an equal protection suit in court for the 10% program.

Replying to the numbers concern, the President acknowledged Nunan’s observation that out-of-state students’ tuition dollars are important, but the President said that the program is not trying to drive the percentage of out-of-state students down, nor does he think it will have that effect. He emphasized that the result of the program will be a chance to enroll students from low-socioeconomic areas who are talented and who can be successful here, but who otherwise might not come.

The President reiterated that we need to run the program first as a pilot and then follow up with careful analysis of its outcomes. The only way to know if the pilot will be successful, he said, is to first run it. With its reach into counties and areas we do not typically draw from, particularly if we can provide scholarships, the program, he stated, has a chance of helping us “begin to reverse the regression that we’ve had.” It is not only important in its own right, but, he added, it may also garner us “high marks” in the GA and more support from them, as a result.

Nunan followed up. Assuming that lawsuits will not be a problem and the program is so wildly successful in the pilot that we go statewide with it, he said, what happens when you look at the numbers, and it seems that we will get flooded with applicants who are guaranteed acceptance? Would you, Nunan asked, then be prepared to lower the 10% figure to 5% or something else?

The President, first noting that success would also likely cause Clemson and USC to join in with the plan, said, yes, the percentage might need to be reduced in the scenario Nunan described. We need to be flexible, he said. The pilot will allow us to see how it works. The selection of the three other counties is critical: they need to be significantly different from the tri-county area in order to indicate how such a program might work statewide.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked if the administration could share some
data with the faculty that might help contextualize the pilot program, such as the current percentage breakdown of in-state versus out-of-state incoming first year students and the percentage of South Carolina students that we accept who are not already in the top 10% of their high school graduating classes. What the President seemed to be saying, Krasnoff observed, is that with the program, we would essentially trade the in-state population: it would be “demographically different but numerically similar.” The data requested could be revealing.

The President replied that he “would love” for the faculty to have this data, which he said, may suggest that in some schools we’re already getting some of the students that the program targets.

Krasnoff followed up, adding that he commends the program’s commitment not just to accept students but also to actively recruit them and support them financially and academically.

The President concurred, saying that programs like SPECTRA, tutoring, and so forth will help such students succeed. As for the financial end, the President adduced the upcoming fund-raising campaign, with its emphasis on scholarships, as an example of how groundwork is being laid for the program. He added that the model in which tuition is continually raised is untenable, as raising tuition can reach a point where it backfires. We have to be careful, he cautioned, about out-of-state tuition on this score.

Scott Peeples, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), asked the President about faculty compensation beyond the needed step-ups on promotion that he talked about in his report. We lag behind our peer institutions in salaries, Peeples noted, especially at the the Associate and full Professor ranks: are any efforts being made or is there a strategy to address salary compression via future merit increases and/or market adjustments?

The President replied that he is attending to how money is spent for compensation at the College, beginning with the compensation for administration, making sure that administration is not growing out of proportion to our student population. He noted that to look into faculty salary, for his first two months in office, he had all the faculty pay forms coming to his desk for his personal sign-off. By this means, he said, he has begun to educate himself on what people get paid in relation to what they do at the College. He said he “was stunned at some of the amounts,” how low they were. He is aware of the problem.

As for specifics, he said that such a large amount of his time upon arriving on campus was taken up with disentangling “the mess down at TD Arena,” that it crowded out the opportunity, among other things, to make a closer study of faculty compensation. Faculty compensation is, he said, on his agenda, and he welcomed any input faculty might have. “For the College to remain competitive, we have to attract good faculty and we’ve got to hold on to them,” he said. With a generally improving economy, he asserted, the GA needs to make some investments in public education.

The President reiterated that he is staying on top of financial matters and, in that vein, he brought attention to an example of repeated and senseless expense in the leaking roof in one of our buildings, which has apparently required 50 visits by contractors in
five years and major work, raising questions of accountability. The President said that he wanted to insure faculty in that building that the problem is being addressed.

He asked faculty to bring ideas to him on financial matters, including controlling costs. In fact, the President said, the step-up increases for promotions was an idea brought to him.

---

The President, at this point, had to depart, and so questions and discussion closed.

B. The Interim Provost (Outline PDF | Proposed School of Professional Studies - Memos PDF | Presentation Slides PDF)

The Interim Provost thanked the Senate for the opportunity to address the body in his new role. He expressed gratitude for the President’s leadership since taking his post in July, at a time, the Provost noted, “when some members of our community, frankly, wondered whether we were committed to treating our students with dignity and respect, and I think that question has been answered finally and fully by the events of these last seven weeks.”

The Provost also thanked the members of the Office of Academic Affairs and all the Deans for their kindness and courtesy as he moved into his new position. He also shared his appreciation for the kindness on his departure of the team in the President’s office and also for the many faculty and staff who contacted him individually with their encouragement and well wishes.

The Provost began by observing that the new mission statement, of which the President spoke, is “still quite consistent with the strategic plan that was carefully and fully framed back in 2009...with ample and full faculty input. The elements of that strategic plan are fundamentally not changed.” Constants are “respect for the College’s historic liberal arts and sciences tradition” and “respect for our public mission, with a belief that high quality and access are not incompatible and that an exceptional education is not reserved to the few but must be available to the many.”

_The Provost presented slides (linked to above) and discussed them: information below is in addition to that which is already provided in the slides or which represents significant elaboration on the content of the slides._

The Provost noted that the enrollment figures he presented are tenth-day figures and are, thus, still subject to change while we are still in the drop/add period.

The “SC Origins” figures in slide 2 demonstrate, the Provost argued, that we are in no way turning our back on the local community. “Holistic Admissions” in the same slide refers to a shift at the College from number-based admissions practices (in which a high SAT score, despite a poor GPA, for instance, might earn an applicant a spot) to a balanced focus on multiple indicators. But, the Provost mentioned, if you wanted a single metric that _might_ predict success, it would be high school GPA. The holistic
approach, the Provost noted, has had the effect of a slight decline in ACT and, particularly, in SAT scores for incoming students. The average SAT score is now in the 1100s, but this is not at all a matter for concern, so long as students are succeeding.

In the overall enrollment picture, we are down in undergraduate enrollment slightly from last year and are up slightly compared to 2010. Graduate enrollment is down a bit from last year. Out-of-state numbers are slightly down, while in-state numbers are slightly up. This "makes our legislature happy," but, he noted, also "makes it a little bit harder to balance our books."

The Provost praised the new facility for the North Campus and Lowcountry Graduate Center, a grand opening of which is scheduled for September 10.

The new facility at Harborwalk, which is also a very nice, he noted, will have a long occupancy by the College, since it will first provide swing space for the Rita Hollings Science Center renovations, which will be followed by Harborwalk’s service as swing space for the Simons Center renovations. The Provost thanked all who were involved in the development of the facility, singling out Steve Osborne and Alyson Goff in Business Affairs, Dean Michael Auerbach, and the department chairs and faculty most affected by the transition.

The Addlestone Library has now added flex space with multiple media screens and flexible configuration, which allows the hosting of large events and smaller events and meetings, as well. The Provost encouraged faculty to visit it and to think about how they might make use of this "21st century learning space" with their own classes.

The Provost also provided a calendar for the upcoming SACSCOC (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges) reaffirmation. The upcoming ten year reaffirmation visit will require, as he put it, “an enormous amount of work” by Assistant Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning Penny Brunner and her group, the administration, and the faculty.

The Provost asked Brunner if she had anything to add. First, she noted problems with the Provost’s slide’s information, which he promised to fix [the link to the slide deck above is to corrected slides]. She also noted that QEP will be coming up in the fall, and when the on-site review occurs in Spring of 2017, it will be scheduled somewhere between January and April.

This concluded the Provost’s discussion of items in his slides.

**Collaboration**

The President’s comments about collaboration and shared governance, the Provost said, “has brought home an old conversation about how to make sure that we have a true spirit of shared governance at the College.” The Provost referred to a 2005 faculty newsletter produced by then Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone, what the Provost
called a “somber reflection on the importance of faulty involvement in institutional decision making processes and an expression of concern that faculty were being marginalized by the events of that day.” While our situation may be different now, the Provost found the following words of Mignone still compelling:

“With improved communication, there may be a greater likelihood that broad faculty input will be sought before key institutional decisions are made, and there will be more opportunities to remind the administration why this is important.”

The Provost asked Mignone if the statement “still works for [him],” garnering the reply from Mignone, “Yeah, it does,” to which he further added, “that note, by the way, led to the biggest chewing out I ever had in the President’s office [President Higdon].”

The Provost noted that he is entirely in support of the statement quoted above, and that to his understanding, President McConnell is as well, and both he and the President, the Provost said, hold it as a goal to see that the tradition of faculty governance be “fully and properly restored.” Since it is likely that a new President and a new Provost will at one point or another, in the minds of faculty, “screw up, sooner or later.” “All I ask,” the Provost said, “is that you cut us a little slack along the way, but also, I would submit, that many mistakes are going to be avoided if we make a commitment to communication and input from our diverse constituencies.”

The Provost noted that for this reason, he has reinstated the Academic Forums, but not just for deans, but for department chairs and chairs of major faculty committees for an ongoing conversation with the Academic Council, which will convene in a few weeks. The Speaker of the Faculty, in connection with this, has been spending a good deal of time in the offices of the Provost and the President. The Provost is also looking for ways to consult with staff and students.

**Budget**

People are concerned about transparency in the budget process, especially in Academic Affairs. The process the President has asked for, the Provost specified, begins in requests from programs and departments to the schools and then from the schools to Academic Affairs. This is the same as prior processes, except there will be added to this “a first public hearing where all of those budgets at the school level and the administrative office level in Academic Affairs will be presented to [the Provost] as well as to the members of the [Faculty] Budget Committee, if they are willing.” This will provide an opportunity for anyone who wishes to hear budget priorities across units in summary form. This will be a “public hearing of what’s coming into the Provost’s office.” An initial, draft budget will be presented by the Provost to the Budget Committee in another public meeting. This will be a “transparent process, with budgets that have been keyed to strategic plans at the school and institution level and with the opportunity for input and expressions of concern about whether or not we got it right.” This will not assure, of course, that budgets submitted to the President will make everyone happy, but it does make for transparency and openness in the
development of the budget.

**School of Professional Studies**

The Provost noted that the School of Professional Studies (SPS) was created in June, but, “unfortunately, it was created in a process that did not make a large number of people aware of its creation.” Memoranda circulated between President Benson and Provost Hynd laying out the rationale for the school were provided to the Senate in a document that also includes a later memo from President McConnell to Provost Hynd delaying the creation of SPS until late in September. The Interim Provost stated that the delay does not imply a criticism of those who developed the SPS, but recognizes the need for faculty input in a significant matter, and “that the process of creating the last few schools at the College was contentious...[,] and] the best way to make sure that there’s an opportunity to assess the wisdom of the creation of the school is to give the faculty of the institution every opportunity to say what they think about that school and its prospects for success.” The present Faculty Senate meeting, the Provost said, provides an opportunity for feedback, as the President promised in July.

The Provost, at this point, expressed his willingness to take questions on any or all of the items he and the President discussed in their reports, also adding that, if faculty or guests prefer, they can also address their questions and/or concerns directly to him via email.

**Questions / Discussion / Comments**

**Bill Olejniczak**, Senator - History, following up on a question he asked President Benson at the final meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2013-14 academic year (see minutes, 3. B., “Questions/Comments”), asked where we stand in terms of the 100 new roster-line faculty that are called for in the strategic plan to be added by 2020, and if we can get from the Provost at the October Faculty Senate meeting an actual number for the hires we have made toward this goal.

The Provost said that at the upcoming October Faculty Senate meeting he will be happy to answer the question with as much precision as he can. However, to “be completely candid,” he added, “since 2009, when that plan was approved, the model that was supposed to fund those 100 faculty vanished in smoke. State appropriations have been flat, at best,” added to which there has been and will be no added growth in undergraduate enrollments. The funding options, thus, are slight: it would have to come from philanthropy, new state support, and/or on enrollment growth in areas where we can grow (graduate, evening or weekend enrollments here or at the North Campus). None of these seem promising. He will give a progress report, said the Provost, but he was not sanguine about the likelihood of our reaching the goal.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, said that as he
understood the Provost’s report, the budget process will become public and transparent once budgets leave the schools. The Provost concurred.

Shaver then suggested that, since, as he put it, “department chairs are the people really in charge of where the rubber meets the road,” the process should be open and transparent first at the department chair level.

The Provost asked Shaver to clarify: “is the suggestion that we ought to have transparency between the chairs and the faculty within the schools so that everyone in the school can know what was submitted by every department?”

Shaver replied, yes, that would be one way. His concern, he said, “is that decisions can be made at the level of a school that will not be transparent if the department chairs in the school are not somehow represented in a prior aspect of the process.”

The Provost promised to have a conversation with the deans, but he noted that he thinks the idea sounds reasonable. The Provost sought the opinion of deans at the meeting, but too few were at that point in the room to get a good sample of opinion. He then asked if any department chairs in the audience had a “problem” with the idea.

Scott Peeples, Chair - Department of English, said that he is not sure how much he needs to know about other departments’ budgets but that he would like to know more about how decisions are made. Shaver’s idea seemed reasonable, he said.

Beth Goodier, Chair - Department of Communication, said she likes the idea of deans making clear how priorities are decided upon and sees no problem with more transparency at the departmental level.

The Provost reiterated that the idea seems reasonable to him, and he will take it into consideration.

Irina Gigova, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), thanked the Provost for the discussion of collaboration and faculty governance, and asked a question about the proposed SPS and the North Campus. What are the enrollments now on the North Campus and in the Bachelors in Professional Studies (BPS) program? Is the North Campus actually making money at present, and is it worth continuing our investment, given how short funds are throughout the College?

The Provost noted that the BPS was created relatively recently, and he feels it is his obligation in his role, as it is with all new programs, to give the program every opportunity to succeed. Regarding all the offerings at the North Campus, he said, calculating cost and return on investment to the downtown campus is important, but, he stressed, the same scrutiny should be applied to all our programs, not singling out only those at the North Campus.

Godfrey Gibbison, Dean - North Campus, replied that the North Campus meets the
needs of many types of students, among them BPS students. The BPS has recruited in the range of 50-55 students in its first year, which is a respectable number, given that the program first needed to be explained to the public and, indeed, to the faculty prior to that. Dean Gibbison said that the program has had good feedback and he expects it to grow, though he also expects that a couple adjustments may be needed along the way, with the input of faculty.

Beyond the BPS, a number of departments offer courses at the North Campus. Around 600 students each semester are enrolled to take courses and are supported at the campus. Several hundred students manage to get all their undergraduate credit hours at the North Campus every semester.

Also, despite the College having, as Dean Gibbison put it, “pulled a number of its old graduate programs from North Campus,” the graduate program is growing and doing quite well. “When we [CofC] had [those prior] graduate programs at the North Campus,” he noted, they were “at least generating on the order of several million dollars a year.” Dean Gibbison then asked Associate Provost Diamond to address budget concerns.

Beverly Diamond, Associate Provost, said that “it would be a little bit premature to be looking at the [BPS] to see if it’s generating a program that is, more or less, self-supporting,” but the College’s North Campus can and is being analyzed for costs right now.

To this end, she said, she has been looking at last year’s budgets and looking at the revenue that’s generated via student credit hours offered at the North Campus. Additionally, she reported having met with the Provost, with Associate Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning Jim Posey, and with Priscilla Burbage and Sam Jones in Business Affairs. These discussions are helping to establish the methodology for cost analysis and for developing an overhead figure. Overhead figures are used in analyzing programs on the main campus, like the Summer School, in order to capture facilities costs and the student support costs. The North Campus presents a different case, however, in part because there are a number of staff located there to provide ongoing student support in advising, financial aid, and admissions, for instance. Yet we still need to arrive at an overhead figure.

The Associate Provost reported that she is currently working on “tak[ing] the student credit hours that are associated with the education courses and a portion of the adjunct and permanent faculty costs and separat[ing] the costs associated with what they teach on this campus from what they teach on the North Campus.” This is, in effect, “combining the cost analysis approach we used a few years ago to determine a cost of the program, where we pull the cost of the student credit hours to the unit, but were also adding in all the facility costs, and then looking at all the tuition generated.” The Associate Provost said that the results of the analysis will be passed on to the Provost, the Chief Financial Officer, and the President, and to faculty.
The Provost added that he will try to provide a “yes, no, or maybe” response to Gigova’s question at the October meeting.

Gigova also asked if we can continue discussion of the SPS in October, instead of ending discussion after this meeting.

The Provost replied that “ultimately, the President’s memo said end of September. I can’t extend that or change it; that’s his decision,” but the Provost said that the President would certainly take under advisement anything an individual wished to communicate to him, including suggesting that he give more time to the assessment of the SPS.

Beth Goodier, Chair - Department of Communication, commended Dean Gibbison on the BPS’s students and the work the program is doing in filling a vital need in the community. But she noted that with the creation of a new school, department chairs get understandably concerned about lines. With the creation of the BPS, she said, it was clear that department chairs would be hiring and credentialing faculty in the program. With the proposed SPS, though, she said, the line issue needs to be clarified.

The Provost replied that President Benson’s memo does not clarify the issue but, rather, “kicks it down the road.” On the one hand, the proposed SPS would be created “expressly” as a non-line school, which would, like other non-line schools (the Graduate School, the Honors College), “have to go out and get faculty elsewhere credentialed,” which is “consistent with the way this body created the [BPS] program, and the way, frankly, that the North Campus has been operating” for some time. On the other hand, the SPS as proposed also created “a way to move forward with hiring faculty, including roster faculty who might even be tenure stream with a notice provision.”

The Provost asserted that he is not sure if this was the right way to do it, but it does open the door for discussion about this issue. “It’s one thing to create a school. It’s another to say it can hire faculty.” While the school as created by President Benson would not, the Provost said, “change the game,” we do need to have answers addressing “what would change the game?,” and this is a question we might ask not only in regard to SPS, but also in regard to our existing non-line schools, the Graduate School and the Honors College.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, also expressed concern about the notice provision, which struck him as “very weak.” It stipulates that “at any time the Provost may choose to initiate a transition for the School of Professional Studies to line-school status...,” which, Krasnoff observed, does not mean to “initiate the deliberations on”: instead, the transition can simply be put into motion by the Provost.

Also, the notice requirement sets notice at “six months to the date of the appointment of the first roster faculty member,” which could be August 15, but a search for this faculty member would very likely begin a lot earlier than six months. The Provost
could, then, give notice, Krasnoff pointed out, after the hiring process was already underway.

Thus, he suggested that there needs to be different language about the initiation of a change to line status and a longer period for notifying of the change. Very serious issues, Krasnoff argued, are opened with the shift to line status: will the standards of tenure and promotion be those in the FAM? If so, this could be a problem for the faculty hired for a school of this nature. If not, how would SPS faculty be evaluated? Until these issues are resolved, Krasnoff argued, the idea of switching to a line school is a “crazy” one.

The Provost summed up Krasnoff’s position and suggestion thusly: “if this goes forward, there ought to be a longer lead time and a separate trigger for a concrete faculty discussion in this body.” Krasnoff agreed.

There were no further questions.

C. The Speaker

The Speaker noted that the feasible, but perhaps too optimistic timeline for hiring a Faculty Secretariat to replace Heather Alexander would have a new secretariat in place at the October meeting.

The Speaker noted that he could use the assistance of the Senate in pointing out to him, the Faculty Secretary, and/or the Faculty Secretariat errors in and problems with the Senate webpages or pages that connect off of the Senate webpages.

The Speaker reported that our budget was set in June. The state legislature took a strong position on a tuition increase, capping it at 3.2%. This modest boost added approximately 4.5 million dollars to the budget, but accounting for the state-mandated 2% cost of living raises across the board, which took about 2 million dollars, and accounting for inflation, which took an additional 2 million dollars out, the remaining net gain from the increases is around .5 million to fund strategic initiatives and new programs.

In terms of faculty lines, the state approved for the College around 30 new lines but did not fund them. Two new faculty lines were approved through this year’s budget. One, in the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs, is a conversion from foundation funds to budget funds, and the other is to create the new Director of the Master’s in Child Life.

In his report, the President discussed a meeting between a group of faculty and the Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce. The Speaker noted, that because the order of reports were rearranged, some of the context for the President’s remarks was missing. The Speaker filled some of this in.

The President, he said, was surprised to learn that there had not been any meetings between the Chamber and faculty at the College, so he asked the Speaker to put
together a group of faculty to meet with the Chamber on August 19. The Speaker pulled together a group of 13 faculty members: one from each school, with more than one from schools which had been publically discussed as possible homes for future PhD programs. The Speaker found it an “enlightening experience” that was often affirming of what we do at the College. The President mentioned one employer’s comments: the speaker added that another IT entrepreneur at the meeting said that he hires lots of CofC students, particularly music majors, and if all they have is a minor in Computer Science, that is fine. The Speaker said that, as does the President, he hope this is the beginning of a continuing dialogue. The Speaker added that he will share with the faculty via email a list of those faculty who were in attendance at the meeting, in case anyone would like to contact them for more information about the meeting.

The Speaker concluded his report here.

D. The College’s Athletics Program: A Report to the Faculty Senate (Powerpoint)

Vincent Benigni, Faculty Athletics Representative

Benigni presented slides (linked to above) and discussed them: information below is in addition to that which is already provided in the slides or which represents significant elaboration on the content of the slides.

Athletic programs have done very well in the Colonial Athletic Association (CAA), but Benigni added, that the academic footprint of the conference was the most compelling reason to join the conference.

“Major clustering” on slide 3 refers to the tendency in some colleges and universities for athletes to cluster in a relatively small set of majors. That is not the case at the College: we have student athletes in all our majors.

While “academic progress rates” is a heading on the third slide, Benigni opted not to discuss it, for reasons of time.

The fifth slide lists schools in the CAA, and Benigni argued that these are schools the College might “benchmark with,” in a number of areas, including faculty salary.

Benigni thanked Trisha Fold-Bennett, Dean of the Honors College, and Andrea DeMaria, Health and Human Performance, for taking 10 of our students to the CAA research conference to present their research. Academic Affairs funded the presentations, and Benigni expressed hope that the funding will continue long term.

Cougar Trail events will be in Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, and New York to meet with alumni, prospective students, and donors. We will be trying to build our school brand across these major markets. The outreach should help us develop and keep the interest of prospective out-of-state students.
E. Faculty/Administration Manual Changes (PDF)
Rick Heldrich, Chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual

Heldrich noted that materials had been posted on the FAM changes and offered to answer questions.

There were none.

F. Progress Report: C of C’s Adjunct Faculty Policies & Practices (PDF | Word)
Presentation (PPT | PDF)
Julia Eichelberger, Faculty Administrative Fellow in the Office of Academic Affairs

Eichelberger presented slides (linked to above) and discussed them: information below is in addition to that which is already provided in the slides or which represents significant elaboration on the content of the slides. Her report (linked to above) is also posted on the Senate website.

Eichelberger explained that her report is based on work she has done in Academic Affairs as a Faculty Administrative Fellow.

By headcount (slide 4), the number of adjunct faculty may seem somewhat high, but that is due to the fact that we’re counting individuals who are adjunct faculty, versus roster faculty in full-time positions. Counting by percentage of undergraduate student credit hours (slide 5), we have a more meaningful number. When we compare the College’s adjunct use to national trends (slide 6), we have comparably favorable adjunct teaching data.

Regarding slide 7, if adjuncts teach a course that is more than three hours, their pay is prorated accordingly.

As the data in slides 7 and 8 demonstrate the College is paying an average adjunct wage, which is not to say, Eichelberger cautioned, that this is a good wage.

Affordable Care Act (ACA) coverage (Slide 12) is mandated for employees working 30 hours or more, and one has to qualify within a certain period, but many adjuncts will qualify for ACA coverage, which is a major improvement since 2013. The College has, Eichelberger noted, set aside funds to offer ACA coverage, and it will not cut hours of adjunct teachers in order to avoid mandated coverage. Eichelberger described ACA coverage access as a “game changer” for qualifying adjuncts.

Improved hiring procedures (Slide 13) move adjuncts into their jobs much more quickly, so that they can get paid as soon as possible. Nor do adjuncts get disconnected immediately from access to email when their terms end, a recognition that many adjuncts continue working for the College in successive semesters.
Professional development programs (Slide 14) “make individuals in departments better connected to their adjunct colleagues, they also support adjuncts in their teaching, strengthen their performance, and show respect for them.” These programs are a “big step forward.”

There is now a greater visibility for adjunct faculty (Slide 15) than there ever has been.

In slide 17, a “+” next to an item signifies progress in that area. “++” signifies significant progress. Those items without pluses are areas in which we have made no progress.

The recommendations specified in slides 19-25, Eichelberger stressed, are her own recommendations and not sponsored by or policy of Academic Affairs.

When departments request new lines, Eichelberger noted, it is to fulfill some instructional need and/or to acquire an expertise they do not already have. Departments, therefore, are not likely to ask for lines specifically to reduce adjunct dependency, but the Provost could (Slide 20).

Slide 22 represents the first page of an AAUP report supporting the inclusion of adjunct faculty in faculty governance.

Should adjunct faculty be represented in the Senate (Slide 23), Eichelberger said she thinks the President and the Provost would be receptive to creating stipends for those adjuncts who serve. She also offered, pursuant to the last item on the slide, to talk with any faculty or senate committee about adjunct issues and welfare.

Some departments, Eichelberger noted, already have hiring and evaluation processes comparable to those for roster faculty (Slide 24), such as hiring committees and consultation between the department chair and a hiring committee. Staffing plans in departments would account for how best to use adjuncts, how many adjuncts the department will think they need over time, and would help a department see how they are doing over time with adjunct staffing.

**Questions / Discussion / Comments**

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, asked if some departments had figured out how to pay adjuncts more or if that is not allowed.

Eichelberger noted that “there are a very small number of cases where individual adjuncts do get more.” Eichelberger said that she doesn’t think higher pay is disallowed, however. She deferred to Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker**, Associate Provost, noted that some departments with higher adjunct pay have made an argument about the market for the special expertise the adjunct has. There are two different situations, she said. In one, “a handful of
unique individuals make more because of the particular courses they can cover.” Then there are departments that have negotiated a slightly higher per-course rate, $2700, in at least one science department and in some departments in the School of Business.

**Krasnoff** also added that the kind of adjuncts we are talking about matters. We are not particularly concerned for the adjunct who works professionally but has also been teaching part-time for 10 or 15 years, whereas we should be deeply concerned for the cases in which an adjunct has been teaching full time for 10 or 15 years without any raises and so forth.

Eichelberger concurred, noting that the latter case is exploitative and has been featured in recent news stories in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and elsewhere. She would like, she said, to get a clearer picture of who our adjuncts are at the College.

**Krasnoff** also asked what the prospects might be for the expansion of instructor lines for those who have been serving in long-time, full time employment as adjuncts. Would departments balk at that, given that in most cases, when a department asks for an instructional line, it’s a tenure track line, typically?

Eichelberger agreed that departments tend to not ask for instructor lines. With our senior instructor lines and even visiting instructor lines, she replied, we come closer to best practices. An instructor, after all, is essentially an adjunct with a decent level of pay and an annual contract, things like that.

**Rick Heldrich**, Senator - School of Science and Math (SSM), noted that in the Chemistry department, instructors and adjuncts are defined quite differently. Instructors participate in curriculum development and are leaders of courses and labs, and adjuncts are temporary, part time, and, intentionally, are not invited to develop the curriculum, which they are not in the position to do. Nor are they qualified to do so.

**Phil Jos**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), commended Eichleberger for her work.

There were no further questions.

5. Old Business
   None

6. New Business
   A. Election of Speaker Pro Tempore

   The Speaker opened the floor for nominations.

   Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, nominated Irina Gigova, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS).
As there were no other nominations, without objection and, thus, with unanimous consent, Gigova was elected Speaker Pro Tempore.

6. Constituents’ Concerns
   None.

7. Adjournment: 7:12 PM