Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 15 September 2015

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday 15 September 2015 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order
2. 7 & 14 April 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and Information

Speaker McNerney noted that a total of four copies of the Senate roll for the meeting were circulating for Senators to sign in, and he encouraged Senators to sign one of these. If after the meeting any Senator discovers that she may have not signed the roll, he added that she can contact the Speaker, the Faculty Secretariat, or the Faculty Secretary.

The Speaker announced that George Pothering has agreed to serve again this year as Parliamentarian. Applause followed.

The Speaker also went over the standing rules for speaking in the Faculty Senate.

- Everyone attending has speaking privileges when recognized by the Speaker. Non-senators, too, may ask questions and/or speak on a topic.
- When recognized, the participant should identify herself by name and department and specify whether or not she is a Senator—and at all times speak loudly and clearly.
- An individual should not speak on a single topic more than twice and not for longer than five minutes.

He noted that he has not enforced speaking limits in the past, preferring to allow conversation and discussion, but he said he may invoke the rules if the meeting seems to be going long or if many individuals wish to speak on an issue.

Finally, the Speaker asked for and received unanimous consent to change the order of business to allow the President and Interim Provosts to deliver their reports and take questions prior to the Speaker’s own report.

4. Reports

A. President McConnell

The following is a transcript of the President’s report as delivered.

Good afternoon to all of you.

I am glad to be here with you today. If you are like me, you are probably feeling very energized by the start of the school year.

This semester is off to a great start. As some of you may know, we have finished the field research stations at Dixie Plantation. These are beautiful, state-of-the-art facilities, and I can’t wait to see how our professors and students collaborate out in the field at this new facility.

We are also in the last 10 months of our Boundless campaign, and we have tremendous momentum going into the home stretch now. I thank those of you who have contributed to this philanthropic effort.
Through this campaign, we have been able to create and award more scholarships than ever. Since FY 2011, we have grown student aid and scholarship support from the College of Charleston Foundation by nearly 70 percent – thus making the dream of a College of Charleston education a reality for many of our students.

Regarding state appropriations, the state legislature has shown a great deal of support for our vision to bolster programs that benefit the Lowcountry and South Carolina. We received nearly $600,000 in recurring funds over and above what we normally get in the budget bill for our Computer Science and Supply Chain Management programs. Plus, they gave us $1.75 million for the renovations of the Stern Student Center for repurposing the pool area.

In addition, we also secured CHE approval to offer the College’s first terminal degree: an MFA in Creative Writing. This new degree will take full advantage of our incredibly talented faculty in the Department of English. Also, the MFA will set the stage for future university offerings that will benefit the College.

These achievements are just the tip of the iceberg of all the great news, activities and initiatives that are shaping our academic culture at the College.

... Today, I want to talk to you about two topics: our process for reaffirmation of regional accreditation and our opportunity to move the College in a new direction, one that I feel will make the College more financially stable as well as expand and better deliver on our promise of being a student-focused community.

As many of you may know, our 10-year SACSCOC reaffirmation visit will take place in March 2017. While that date may sound far off in the future, I can assure you that it is not that distant. There is much to do, a great amount to do.

As we prepare for that visit from SACSCOC, the College is responsible for undertaking a thorough review of its programs, policies and procedures.

We will submit a Reaffirmation Compliance Certification Report in September 2016 and a Quality Enhancement Plan in February 2017.

As several of you know firsthand, our current review is underway. Dr. Divya Bhati has joined the College as Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Planning. She is a very highly talented professional and has hit the ground running at full speed. In order to help her team, I have appointed some of you and other faculty, staff, students and trustees to serve on various working groups and to help develop our Quality Enhancement Plan.

These working groups are writing narratives and attaching the supporting evidence of the core requirements, comprehensive standards and the federal requirements as defined in the SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation.

Everything needs to be in order, such as correct course numbering, faculty credentialing and college policies.

I want to thank in advance the many people who are serving on our various working groups and QEP teams and everyone involved with our reaffirmation process. This is a large undertaking and a top priority not only for this administration, but for this entire campus. We can only achieve our reaccreditation by working together. I greatly appreciate the additional time and attention you all will put into making our 10-year reaffirmation operation successful.

Interim Provost Brian McGee will touch more on this important topic in his report.
Now, I want to switch gears and discuss a new vision – both academic and financial – for our College of Charleston.

Over the past year, the College’s leadership team has taken inventory of our institution, we’ve engaged in fact finding about who we are, studied our financial model, looked at our recruitment data, and we have reviewed trends and practices in higher education.

Analyzing the data reaffirmed that, first, we do an incredible job at teaching at the College and truly provide a student-focused community that enriches the mind and prepares our students to be successful leaders in whatever fields or industries they choose. And the world is taking notice of our accomplishments.

In the rankings released by US News & World Report just last week, the College was named one of the best undergraduate teaching institutions in the South. While rankings do not necessarily showcase a university’s true value, it’s nice to see this continuing recognition of our excellent academic reputation.

Whatever the rankings say, I know we are truly blessed at the College to have countless faculty who teach exceptionally well and invest in the personal, educational and professional development of our students.

The personal connections you form with your students last a lifetime and are something they will remember and cherish. Students feel like there is no place else they would rather be because of YOU. And I thank you for all you do for our students.

The data, however, also alerted us to some sobering truths about our enrollment and budget.

Each year since fall 2012, we have missed our student enrollment projections. While our total student population has not changed greatly, our mix of resident and nonresident students has.

Due to the substantial difference between out-of-state and in-state tuition, which is $17,500 per student, missed projections with regards to the makeup of our student body can have serious budget implications.

When we compare our current fall 2015 numbers to fall 2012, we are down 359 non-resident students and up 262 resident students. While a difference of just 97 students may not seem significant, and at face value it’s not, trading 359 non-resident students for 262 resident students creates a current tuition revenue gap of $7.4 million.

While additional revenue has been generated through tuition increases and other sources, to date, the real cumulative revenue impact of these successive missed projections and lost students over the last three years represents a nearly $5 million reduction to our bottom line.

We have been able to cover this shortfall by pulling dollars from our enrollment reserve fund and by other administrative savings. However, these solutions are designed and intended to address short-term variabilities in revenues, and based on the data before us, we now need long-term solutions.

For example, last year (Fiscal Year 2014-15), we drew nearly $1.8 million from the enrollment reserve and shifted additional one-time administrative savings to fill gaps where needed.

For one year, this is a perfectly acceptable practice, but we are now in our third year of having to make mid-year adjustments to our revenue forecast. And this year, the available enrollment reserve is not sufficient to fill the gap. The anticipated total
revenue shortfall for the current fiscal year is $2.5 million, which is nearly $500,000 more than our available enrollment reserve.

In an effort to appropriately right-size the budget and protect a portion of the enrollment reserve, I have asked our budget team to prepare a budget reduction package of $1.5 million. Ultimately, the College’s leadership will decide how these reductions will be portioned across campus and then have the various divisions manage the specifics.

While the goal is to shore up our current budget, it is my plan to do it in a way that will protect our academic mission.

The rationale for going beyond the structural shortfall is twofold: one, after successive years of revenue adjustments, it is clear that what we hoped was an anomaly is now a trend. Thus, any temporary solutions are insufficient. And two, the enrollment reserve does have purposes beyond filling unusual revenue deviations. Each year the bulk of the unused enrollment reserve is used to fund maintenance and capital projects at the College.

Multiple years of fully exhausting this reserve will have real and visible effects on maintaining our buildings and our classrooms. We simply cannot have another year in which we have no enrollment reserve funds available to carry over into the building maintenance fund.

Now, let me talk a little about out-of-state recruitment and its challenges.

You may be thinking that the simple solution is just to find more non-resident students, and I must admit that is where I was just a few months ago. But I now agree, I do not think the hope for more of these students is a responsible plan.

For our freshman class and transfers, the applications from out-of-state students were the same number from last year, but we did not yield the students we needed. Competition for these students and price cutting of out-of-state tuition by our competitors has flattened this enrollment.

Other states, such as Georgia and Florida, have negatively impacted our recruiting numbers by offering better lottery scholarships in order for their students to stay home. Added to this, in some of our prime recruiting areas, we are seeing fewer high school graduates. For example, in the Northeast, there is a projected net loss of 25,000 high school graduates between 2012 and 2022.

That means competition for those students will be even fiercer in the years to come.

It is clear that our current revenue model relies on an unsustainable enrollment strategy. Until now, we’ve expected out-of-state students to make very significant contributions to our total revenue picture. A reduction of that dependence is now inevitable.

The bottom line for us is that we cannot solely depend on out-of-state students. This is economic quicksand, and we must not get sucked under.

Roughly, if nothing else changes, we can potentially increase our tuition about 3.25 percent each year, which barely covers inflation and fixed costs, but nothing else.

The landscape has changed, ladies and gentlemen, for many reasons, and we must change with it or be changed by it. We must now look at other opportunities to secure more revenue for the College and, thus, shape for ourselves who the College will be.

I do want to make clear that there are many positive things going on in our recruitment efforts. While our out-of-state numbers are not where we like or want
them to be – which is an unsettling trend affecting many universities across this country – our in-state numbers are doing great. In fact, this year, we brought in the largest in-state class ever! We also had the largest number of in-state applications that we have ever seen.

Students from all over want to come to the College. In terms of the power of place, few universities in the country can match us. However, there is a more important reason our students, both in state and out of state, are coming here and that’s our academic reputation and academic excellence. Our education is the key building block of the College of Charleston experience.

Our schools – no matter the discipline – prepare their graduates to be successful: successful in their careers, successful in their civic engagement and successful in their lives.

But we must also remind ourselves that as a public institution, we have a very specific purpose, a very public mission.

We must provide our education in a way that:

1. Is affordable to diverse groups of people.
2. Recognizes that the families’ ability to pay for an education will not grow over the next decade.
3. Provides a mix of majors in the liberal arts and sciences and in professional disciplines.
4. Engages in active learning.
5. And makes decisions using evidence-based assessments of learning outcomes.

Some of you may have seen the cover story in Forbes Magazine’s August edition that touts a liberal arts education as the golden ticket to success in the new economy. It’s great that the business community is realizing today the power of a liberal arts education, something we’ve known here at the College of Charleston since the 1700s. As industries streamline more tasks and automate more and more jobs, a creative mind will always be the leader in change and innovation.

And that’s what we develop here at the College: minds that can handle and respond to change. And as an institution, we must do the same.

We must be more creative moving forward. We must tap into our liberal arts approach and apply it to our own institutional decision-making. We can’t just raise tuition to raise more revenue. That plan won’t work long term.

As we are seeing in the surveys and in the actual numbers, today’s college student is more tuition aware and debt adverse. These students and their families want to ensure a return on investment for the amount of money they are paying for their education. So, we can’t keep raising our tuition year after year. If you are a climatologist, you might describe our situation in terms of reaching a tipping point – a tipping point between being a best-value university and an overpriced luxury.

It’s clear from statistical and strategic points of view that we need to make a course correction in how we move forward.

At the Board of Trustees’ retreat in June, the board charged me with developing an academic and financial vision that enables the College to invest in our students’ academic enrichment and our faculty and staff’s excellence. The deans have played an integral role in shaping the possible outcomes of this charge and giving input, and
we look forward to their ideas as we go forward. As to where we go, I will continue to work closely with the deans and with every one of you to achieve this.

The College’s leadership wants the institution to be able to maintain and expand our competitiveness well into the future. That’s something that I think we all can agree on.

As the 13th oldest institution of higher learning in the country, we have been on a long, hard-fought journey to where we are today. We started as a small, private college, became the country’s first municipal college, then became a private college again, and then a state institution in 1970. Through all of that change, all that uncertainty, we got stronger. Change and evolution are in our institutional DNA. We protected our core mission while we grew and changed.

When I was a freshman here 50 years ago, the College was very different. Except for Randolph Hall, the Cistern Yard, Sottile House and 10 Green Street, the College looks nothing like it did back in the late sixties. Our student population has grown – both in size, ethnicity and nationality – we’ve added more facilities, and our degrees have changed. Yet, we have remained a student-focused institution centered around the liberal arts and sciences while growing our professional undergraduate and graduate programs.

We have evolved daily, weekly, monthly and yearly into who we are today. Some of this transformation took big changes and others were slight tweaks here and there along the way.

We now operate under both a College of Charleston and a broader University of Charleston, S.C. banner. This distinction allows us to create a firewall around our liberal arts and sciences core while addressing specific programming needs of the Charleston community.

We can change again while still protecting our core and our student-focused brand.

On any journey like this, there are pivotal moments when you must choose a path that may fundamentally affect your future. And for the College, we have an opportunity right now. I believe now is the time for the College to control its destiny.

First, we do this by strategically targeting non-traditional students who never received or who are trying to finish their degree. According to the national numbers, these community college transfers and adult degree completers represent nearly 20 million people nationwide.

These types of students are here now and are also moving into this region daily because of the evolving diversification of Charleston’s economy. For example, our tech economy is growing 26 percent faster than the national average. And our per capita wage growth is almost double the national average. In addition, the Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce estimates that 43 people move to Charleston every day; that’s more than 15,000 coming into the area every year.

Of these newcomers, 27% are non-traditional students. They are mostly part-time students – 22 and older; working full- or part-time jobs. This is largely an untapped segment for the College and one that is only growing in size.

Most of these students have little interest in being a part of our downtown campus. They want to take classes closer to where they live and work, which is good for us because our growth is limited on the peninsula. And as you know, we have agreed to keep our enrollment here at 11,000 and under on the historical footprint.

These non-traditional students would enable us to focus our growth outward at our North Campus, perhaps in Mt. Pleasant, and also outside of Summerville close to the
Nexton community, between I-26 and I-95. These satellite operations can meet an important and growing educational need while making a financial contribution to the College.

In no way does pursuing these students weaken our core mission of educating our more traditional students – full-time 18–21 year olds. Rather, it generates revenue not only for possible extension campuses, like the North Campus, but for the College as a whole. As the market data shows, degrees – not courses – drive demand.

In order for us to attract these non-traditional students, we will need to expand program and degree offerings through our School of Professional Studies. And I’ll need your help in this particular endeavor.

Dean Godfrey Gibbison will have a set of academic policy reforms for you to review for approval that will simplify the matriculation process for transfer students and provide even more options for degree completion.

Some of these reforms are:

Reducing the age of admission into the School of Professional Studies programs from 24 to 21 as many promising students are younger than 24.

Allowing the transfer of students who have earned college credit elsewhere with a 2.0 GPA into the School of Professional Studies. Currently, students must have a 2.6 GPA, a minimum GPA that we have learned is not realistic.

Addressing the minimum number of credit hours a student must have to transfer into the BPS program.

Creating an admissions committee for the Bachelor of Professional Studies, so that we can better assess the whole person, rather than relying on a GPA cut-off.

Adding additional concentrations within the BPS program.

Offering additional undergraduate certificates in such topics as project management and procurement and contract administration.

Adding new evening classes in several disciplines. The possibilities for these courses include offerings in Computer Science, Accounting, Education, Psychology and Corporate Communication.

Enrollment growth in the BPS program will be facilitated by more online, night and weekend courses, and I hope that roster faculty will remain open to meeting the needs of our students for such courses.

Next, we must expand our graduate programs according to market needs. Matching real-world demand to student demand and offering these at non-traditional and traditional sites will enhance our student populations as well as our bottom-line financial position.

Our broadened educational approach will prevent other institutions – both public and private, for-profit and non-profit – from coming here to set up shop and eventually compete with us for the traditional student base.

In addition, we must continue to pursue hybrid and distance education and pursue them more aggressively. We must continue to join with other universities in collaborative programs to bring much-needed offerings to our area. This can be cost-effective and financially beneficial to all.

It is my hope that this approach to educating more diverse student populations will have us involved with more executive education, more certificate education, more hybrid-distance education, and embracing the anticipated needs of the community.
in graduate studies, involving, for instance, such disciplines as Supply Chain Management, Computer Science and Information Management. There will be needs in other disciplines and fields, of course, that we do not yet anticipate.

The College must also embrace the concept of school fees for higher-cost curriculums so that lower-cost majors and minors do not have to subsidize higher-cost academic programs.

We are also initiating now a more robust international recruitment strategy. Over the next several months, our admissions team will be working with many of you – deans, other faculty members and staff – to develop a plan, both the structure to bring the students here and to support their success on campus. We see this having both a short-term and long-term impact on our recruitment numbers as well as a positive effect on our campus community.

Together, these changes diversify our academic and financial portfolio, so to speak, which will keep us competitive and strong.

This is not about disruption, but about connection. Our tradition and curriculum are about growth and change. We must be focused on a future that brings the humanities, the arts, the sciences, education, business and languages together in a way that enriches our liberal arts degrees and presents our students not just as employable, but as the most desirable additions to any company, nonprofit or graduate programs.

In order to best protect and strengthen this institution that has given so much to so many students, faculty and staff, we have to adapt now, we have to change now, we have to innovate now. It is the best way to preserve this remarkable and storied institution for future generations.

Further, it is the best way to ensure you – the faculty – have the competitive salaries and resources you need to continue to be effective and excellent teachers, researchers and leaders in your fields.

This evolution, if you will, does not mean drastically altering the experience we provide at the College or even the mission of our institution. It simply means altering how we fund our institution and how we make-up our student population.

If there is any doubt in your mind about how the College has responded to change in the past, I invite you to go to our Special Collections in the library and look at some of our old course catalogs. Our curriculum has changed according to demands of the times.

For example, in 1900, amidst some controversy, President Harrison Randolph introduced the Bachelor of Science degree. I don’t think anyone today believes that Randolph’s controversial reform was a mistake.

Like I said earlier, although we have grown bigger and added and subtracted academic programs, we have remained our true self.

We have remained student-focused with small classes, dedicated to enriching the whole mind.

So we have to embrace, as we have done over the decades, the communities we serve. We do not need to fear that innovation may ruin us. It won’t. Rather, it’s going to help preserve what we all have found special about the College.

The best universities in the country are always reinventing themselves – finding a way to change, yet remaining true to themselves, their core mission and their rich traditions.
Like them, we must find the balance of maintaining the best of the past while undertaking new opportunities for the future. And, working together, I know we will. Together in shared governance, let’s make decisions that strengthen the institution and the student experience.

Thank you so much and I’ll be happy to answer any questions.

Applause followed.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), asked the President what role he envisions for the faculty Budget Committee in reviewing all the potential initiatives he outlined and asked, more generally, about the role the faculty will play through its official governing structures.

**President McConnell** replied “a big role.” Most of what he discussed, he said, cannot be done without the faculty’s involvement, citing in particular matters of curriculum and developing new programs and degrees. He said he envisions a “team approach.”

Returning to the “sobering truths” he discussed in his address, the President, reiterated that “we have to make changes” and said that he wanted to clearly and directly lay out our situation. We are not the only school in a bad financial position: he mentioned evidence from a study he had with him at the podium that other universities are about to face stark reality. While at the College “we are not in trouble,” he said, we are “at a crossroads” and we can “tread water” or we can make the College financially strong.

He noted the College’s prior failures to do the latter, giving the examples of Dixie Plantation, for which we never implemented a plan to make it pay for itself, and the North Campus, which is under lease and needs to be financially supporting the College’s core mission but has not yet. He added that he needs the faculty’s help in addressing the latter.

First pausing to address the recent *Post and Courier* piece on the possibility of a football program at the College, to which the he said he should have said to the reporter not just “no,” but “hell no,” the President said that we will not take on additional expenses and that his goal is to “enrich the core mission.” He added that we do not do a good enough job in showing “the great job we do with the human mind,” building students’ capacities for critical and creative thinking.

He said that he expects faculty and faculty committees to be involved in a big way in charting the future course of the College in developing, considering, and approving initiatives, and turning specifically to the School of Professional Studies, listening to the Dean’s appeals for change.

He assured the faculty that he will be pursuing all avenues of financial support in Columbia. Citing the proposed Learning Technology Center, he asserted that we need to build in an endowment so that it can continue to “support and modernize itself.” On the whole, we need to consider how to make things “revenue positive” at the College.

We have to make, he asserted, “course corrections”: not to do so may be an invitation to other universities to come into our market to develop undergraduate programs in the Lowcountry. While we may collaborate with other institutions, we cannot leave the non-traditional student population unserved. Once other institutions come in to
serve that population, they may become cost effective enough to also start cutting into our traditional student market as well.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, following up on Senator Kelly’s question, agreed that the faculty will and should be involved in any upcoming initiatives and program development. But he also asserted that the faculty want to “look hard” at any evidence that programs will generate revenue. Up to 2003, he said, the College seemed to be doing well with respect to non-resident students, a segment of the market that is wealthy and from whom we gain an enhanced reputation.

After that, he noted, we added an MBA program and the BPS degree, which, we were told, would enhance our revenue. Now that our situation is more precarious, we are being told, Krasnoff said, that “we have to double, triple, or quadruple down on that same approach.”

He added that the non-traditional student end of the market is larger but their own ability to pay for school is lower and their reliance on student loans greater. He also noted that there is a concern that many in this market will not even be able to pay back their loans.

There may not, he argued, be revenue that can be shared to help our core mission, even if this is a large market. Faculty buy-in will be contingent on whether or not, in fact, the revenue is there and can be used to enhance the College’s core mission. He closed by saying that the faculty have not been provided evidence of this in the period from about 2003 to the present.

**President McConnell** said that, of course, he cannot speak to what was said in the period prior to his tenure, but that he is providing the best evidence he has of flat-lining enrollments in the non-resident segment and how those enrollments are not likely to get any better. Additionally, he said that the presence of for-profit educational outfits tapping the non-traditional market suggests that the revenue is there. He added that statistics, studies, and experts all indicate that there is a market there. The President referenced a study he had with him at the podium that speaks to “choosing where to compete” and suggests “low-income high-ability, English language learners, community college transfers, adult degree completers, and professional masters” degree seekers. He added that he and the administration have also looked at studies of the “curves universities are on,” what other schools are doing.

He also observed that big universities, whom he said he would not name, directly compete with the College for non-resident students by drastically cutting tuition with abatements. Some of these schools are based on a model of constant growth.

Returning to the issue of the non-traditional population, the President said that people with jobs who are trying to complete degrees are “not without funds.” They have money, may be eligible for grants, and are entitled to a college education. The School of Professional Studies will give such students access to a degree.

He suggested that these degrees could be creatively “fire-walled” from the degrees offered at the downtown campus, such as by making these degrees only available from the University of Charleston, South Carolina at the College of Charleston, instead of the College of Charleston, making sure they aren’t BA, BS, or Artium Baccalaureatus degrees. If there is a concern about branding, such things can be done, the President said, inviting faculty to look at what has been done in the same vein at the University of Virginia and other schools.

**Irina Gigova**, Department of History, asked if there has been any discussion of lowering out-of-state tuition in order to make us more attractive.
President McConnell responded that the administration is looking at this very thing but reiterated that a large rival institution is "slashing" non-resident tuition via abatements, and this makes competing difficult.

Gigova assented to the President’s characterization of the competition but added that our attractiveness also derives from our location, which may even be a more enticing selling point with a reduction in non-resident tuition.

Gigova also asked, in relation to the non-traditional student population the President spoke of pursuing, if these students would go into the Bachelor of Professional Studies program or if they might also go into expansions of existing BA and BS programs offered on new campuses.

President McConnell said that many of these students will be attracted to the BPS in order to complete their degrees. Others may want a BS or BA from the College, and we may be able, the President said, to offer some courses at night for students who meet admission standards and also might be able to offer courses in a hybrid format to help meet such a need. He expressed hope that faculty will discuss these possibilities since offering such programs could help create a positive cash flow.

Daniel Greenberg, Department of Psychology, asked how potential areas of expansion that the President listed—Computer Science, Accounting, Education, Psychology—were identified as such, generally, but also with specific reference to Psychology, and what kind of expansion the President envisions.

President McConnell, first noting that, as a rule, he prefers to leave academic matters to academics, said that the Charleston Chamber of Commerce in their studies identified Computer Science, Supply Chain, and Information Management as areas for potential expansion and this is still under study and the subject of conversation. The other areas, he said, he “was given by staff” and he added them to the report. He said that decisions on any program expansion will be made, in part, on demand and supply. Another factor to consider in this area is potential collaborations with other institutions.

There were no further questions.

The President thanked the Senate, and invited faculty to contact him, anonymously or over signature, with any ideas that they may have.

Applause followed.

B. Interim Provost McGee (Powerpoint Slides)

The Interim Provost said that there is much good news to celebrate at the beginning of the academic year and began his report with three varying examples.

Last year marked the third year in a row of substantial growth in funded research ($9.8 million at a highly competitive time for research dollars, particularly federal research monies). He called this a tribute to the faculty’s excellence and hard work.

This past summer saw the delivery of 94 sections of courses through distance education, and these accounted for 21% of the summer offerings and had higher enrollments than face-to-face course sections. Face-to-face classes, he said, will always been a central part of the College’s undergraduate and graduate programs, but recent experience in distance education suggests that we can “with quality and integrity … expand opportunities for our students,” another tribute to the faculty and a marked contrast to 2007, when the Senate entertained a motion to ban distance education at the College.
We also, he noted, have an increasingly diverse student body, up from 13.3% of degree-seeking undergraduates in minority categories in 2010-11 to 18.1% in 2015-16. This is evidence that we are making real progress toward becoming a more inclusive campus.

**Budget and Academic Vision,**

The Interim Provost provided data on the decline in the non-resident student population since 2012, broken down into regular, provisional, and transfer populations (see slide 2, “Non-Resident Undergraduate Summary”) and added additional evidence to the President’s analysis of the causes for the decline.

Note: in slide 2, “NR” denotes “non-resident.”

The Interim Provost pointed out that despite efforts to improve how we recruit and to increase scholarship offers and vary them to make them more attractive to these students, non-resident new, regular freshman enrollment since 2012 has gone from 973 down to 906 this year.

We also saw substantial decreases in the same period in the numbers of new provisional first year non-resident students and non-resident transfers.

Overall, our non-resident student numbers have gone down from 4,121 in 2012 to 3,752 in 2015. While some refinement of the numbers might happen if we account for re-admits and other details, the trend and magnitude of the change is obvious and, with non-resident students paying two and a half times the tuition of resident students, the financial implications are obvious.

The causes for these declines are many and complex, the Interim Provost said, as the President indicated in his report. Added to the President’s observations on competition from other institutions in-state and out, he noted that we are pitted against organizations that aggressively pursue enrollment growth, have increasingly innovative approaches, and when they have deeper pockets, add that to the mix as well. In addition, stagnation in middle-class income has parents particularly sensitive to higher education costs.

We continue, nonetheless, to recruit non-residents and are working on ways of best doing that—here the Interim Provost singled out the efforts of Jimmy Foster, Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid. We are also looking into recruiting from new non-resident groups, he said, notably international students, keeping in mind at the same time that such students may also need special student services to ensure their success.

Given our financial situation on the revenue side, the Interim Provost said that we will be looking at cost-saving reductions that will be necessary, at least in the short term. Principles that Academic Affairs will adopt for any cuts that are required, he said, include

1. working to preserve our ability to maintain and improve faculty salaries so that they remain competitive for recruitment and retention

2. understanding that operating budgets (which have already been cut over the years without full replenishment) cannot be a source of further cuts, which means that

3. we will have to, therefore, look at faculty and staff positions, permanent and temporary (the largest cost item in institutions of higher education), and

4. there will be shared governance in this process, involving the Faculty Budget Committee, Academic Planning Committee, and other faculty committees.
There will be a thoughtful, multiyear approach to budget reduction, he emphasized, and we will not make ill-advised cuts that undermine our ability to meet our institutional goals.

On the revenue side, the strategy will include recruiting students in our current prospective student populations, seeking new opportunities with graduate students and non-traditional undergraduate students, and concluding the comprehensive fundraising efforts, which are also contributing to our bottom line.

Returning to non-traditional students, since there was a question for the President about them with respect to degrees, BA, BS, and BPS, the Interim Provost said that the answers have yet to emerge through a process that will engage faculty for their expertise in curriculum and audience. He said it is well to keep in mind that only 29% of the students in American higher education—undergraduate and graduate—fall into the 18-21 year old range of traditional undergraduate students. Thus, 71% do not fit into the typical mold of the College of Charleston undergraduate: there are plenty of other students, he said, that we might serve as a public institution.

“In short,” he asserted, “it isn’t enough for the College to have a viable enrollment strategy and a prudent budgetary strategy. We need those strategies, but they are not enough. Most fundamentally, we need a coherent and compelling vision for ourselves as a public university in the quality sector; we need a vision that allows us to thrive financially and intellectually, not merely survive. And I believe that our vision is going to require that we succeed in offering educational excellence to more than one type of student, as President McConnell so amply summarized.”

Accreditation

The Interim Provost noted the necessity of successful accreditation—“or else we’re out of business”—and said that the upcoming SACSCOC reaffirmation effort will require the efforts of all, not just administrators writing reports. He offered some specifics that can help in the process:

- all faculty by May 15, 2016, should have at least a year’s prior complete data entered into the Faculty Activity System. It is essential to do this.

- faculty involved in assessment should “close the loop” by making changes to course design and delivery based on what assessments reveal. Evidence of closing the loop should be provided for accreditation purposes, but also for the simple fact that it is “our professional responsibility as faculty.”

- department and program heads should be systematically documenting adjunct evaluation to meet SACSCOC standards for evaluation of all faculty (over a third of our instruction is offered by our adjunct faculty colleagues). A shift, the Interim Provost noted, from less formal, largely verbal processes of adjunct faculty evaluation to formal, written documentation of the same may amount to a culture change in some departments, but he hopes that guidance from Academic Affairs will help.

Additionally, the Interim Provost asked for the faculty’s patience while many policies in the works are being developed: a course numbering policy to represent the progressive sophistication of courses from the 100-level through graduate courses; policy to clarify the meaning of “academic program,” “department,” “center,” “institute,” and so on; a scheme for undergraduate program review analogous to the graduate program review scheme (he noted that CHE used to do this work but stopped over ten years ago).

Faculty committees, he added, can expect frequent and repeated consultation as these policies develop.
Faculty/Administration Manual and Catalog Changes Last Year

The Interim Provost noted that there is some repetition in his comments here in the upcoming report from the Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual.

A title of “University Professor” has been added to the F/AM that, as funding permits, gives the College a means of recognizing accomplishments of some of our best faculty.

A graduate faculty definition was added to the F/AM to clarify for ourselves and outside audiences what attainments we expect of graduate faculty.

In addition, he discussed the College’s compliance with state law requiring the teaching of founding documents of the United States. He noted that changes have been made to the undergraduate catalog for compliance. Citing a public email exchange between Professor Robert Dillon and himself last spring and noting that there may be questions remaining about the College’s means of discharging the legal requirement, he invited further discussion and questions in Q&A.

He also singled out for discussion the proposed creation of adjunct faculty titles. While the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual vetted the language (see PDF), it did not get discussion in the Senate’s final meeting last year. The Interim Provost provided hard copies of the proposed language.

Adjunct faculty at the College, he observed, do not have titles, except in cases in which a Dean names adjunct faculty something like “Adjunct Assistant Professor,” “Adjunct Associate Professor,” or “Adjunct Professor.” A title for adjunct faculty, such as is in place at many other institutions, “signal[s] the dignity and importance” of their work at the College. Multiple committees last year vetted the proposed language. Adjunct faculty would have the title of “Adjunct Lecturer,” and after a long term of service including 30 or more course sections, eight separate semesters (including summer terms), and at least 500 student enrollments would be eligible for the title of “Adjunct Senior Lecturer.”

In April, Rick Heldrich, Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, circulated the notice of intent to change the F/AM to add the titles (PDF) via email and asked if there were any concerns. Two Senators, the Interim Provost said, did express concern and a desire to talk about the proposed language in the Senate in the coming fall. The Interim Provost invited such discussion in the Q&A.

Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review

The Interim Provost shared a slide (#3) that he also shared last April listing numbers of cases for review, tenure, and promotion last year and the outcomes of those cases.

He reported that at the beginning of the year last year and also in the spring he had discussions with the Deans related to review, tenure, and promotion processes. They identified topics for further discussion this year with the Deans, the Faculty Welfare Committee, and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

- adding clarity to the selection process for external reviewers
- streamlining cases where there is no controversy at the school level
- reviewing the continued use of Associate Professors in the process of promoting colleagues to full professor
whether or not to review the 30-year old process for faculty grievances. The Interim Provost said that it is his intent to initiate a review, starting with these topics and with these parties, which would not effect this year’s cases but could have implication for future reviews.

**Senate Agenda**

Colonial Academic Alliance - The Interim Provost congratulated Faculty Athletics Representative Vince Benigni for his enormous work to create academic opportunities for student athletes and other students, such as Honors College students, for undergraduate research and in bringing a guest faculty member from another CAA school for a talk and to meet with students (see Benigni’s report below).

New Business - The Interim Provost noted that an active tenure and promotion grievance at the College may impinge on the discussion of a motion in new business relating to administrators’ roles in tenure and promotion (see below). He stipulated the he is bound by the F/AM’s code of professional conduct to be circumspect with regard to speaking to open grievances. Thus, he said, he will listen to the discussion and answer any direct questions he can without speaking to the active grievance.

He thanked all who are involved in the critical and sometimes onerous process of evaluating colleagues for tenure and promotion.

The Interim Provost closed his report by saying “the opportunity for this year is to address questions of fundamental importance to our future identity, as challenged by the President, and emerge with a clearer picture of how we will balance tradition with change, the past with the future. The College, as I have known it,” he said, “is in many respects a conservative organization, and its faculty have been protective of the many strengths of this institution. Indeed, I would agree that there is much here that must be conserved, and faculty will rightly be thorough in consideration of new initiatives. However, as the President has noted, the College has embraced new opportunities repeatedly over the past century, and I am confident we will do so again. So, let’s carefully consider the President’s call to build a new financial model, with new locations, new programs, and new students, and a university as deeply committed to its public mission as to its wonderful liberal arts and sciences heritage.”

He thanked the faculty for all they do for our students and for the institution. Applause followed.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Daniel Greenberg**, Department of Psychology, inquired to what extent the Interim Provost will involve junior faculty in the discussions about tenure and promotion. Their insight derived from how they see and experience the process could be very helpful, he said.

**The Interim Provost** observed that junior faculty are among the members of the Faculty Welfare Committee, which is one reason for the customary involvement of that committee in such discussions. He added that if and when it becomes apparent that there has been insufficient input from junior faculty in the discussion, it would be wise to seek additional counsel from them.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator - Mathematics, asked for more specificity on the issue of potential cuts in faculty and staff positions.
The Interim Provost replied that if curtailing operating budgets cannot be a source of making up the roughly $1.5 million deficit and there is not enrollment reserve money to cover it, there is only one remaining place to go: staffing. The College has up until fairly recently grown in faculty and staff, with periodic contractions due to the economy but not due to budget shortfalls. This is new territory for many of us. We may need, he said, to freeze positions for a time or even eliminate them at the academic department/program level. He said he cannot say what positions and how many will be under consideration, but he added that the work of identifying positions will be done in consultation with the faculty Budget Committee, the Academic Planning Committee, and the Council of Deans, among others.

Senator Anguelova asked a second question about what can be done to address transportation needs as we consider adding other campuses. She gave the example of insufficient transportation to and from the North Campus.

The Interim Provost noted that there is a longstanding “chicken and egg problem” regarding transportation to and from the North Campus. We need a sufficient number of students and courses to make transportation cost effective, but without transportation already in place, building that kind of enrollment is difficult. We recognize the problem and are working on it, he said.

Morgan Koerner, Department of German and Russian Studies, asked the Interim Provost to break down the diversity figures he gave at the beginning of his report into subgroups. He expressed particular interest in our number of African American students.

The Interim Provost noted that we have had a “moderate rise” in African American students, a rise in students self identifying as two or more races, and we have had “very substantial growth” in Spanish-speaking students. He offered to break down things further for Koerner over email.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, in regard to the expansion of courses, asked if there has been any work toward streamlining the process for vetting new courses.

The Interim Provost deferred to Daniel Greenberg, a former Chair of the Curriculum Committee, who said that new software will streamline the process and help move us from a paper-based process to an electronic one. He added that the current committee has streamlining on their agenda.

Bonnie Springer, last year’s Chair of the Curriculum Committee and representing the committee at this meeting, noted that the committee is investigating processes for different categories of change, such that relatively small coursev changes might not have to go through an intensive review. Other institutions’ examples have been helpful in this regard. The committee is also looking carefully at the current forms and toward the goal of developing an electronic workflow system.

There were no further questions.

Applause followed.

At this point, the Interim Provost noted that, among with many other guests, one member of the Board of Trustees was present in the audience: Randy Lowell.

C. The Speaker of the Faculty

Speaker McNerney said that, in order to keep his report short, many of the items he might have touched on he has included in his recent Speaker’s newsletter and
he strongly urged those who have not read the newsletter, which he sent out via email on 8 September, to read it.

Especially given the amount of work ahead of us, the Speaker, on behalf of both the Nominations and Elections Committee and himself, shared his deep appreciation for colleagues who have volunteered to fill committee vacancies.

The Speaker then addressed a failure last year to ratify a change to the F/AM regarding how meeting agendas are distributed, which struck the implied requirement that these be printed. This change will be up for ratification this year; but in the meantime the Speaker asked for and received unanimous consent to continue the practice of distributing agendas and materials electronically.

The Speaker also announced that we have hired a new Faculty Secretariat, after having done without one for most of the summer and the beginning weeks of the fall semester. She will start working shortly.

A good part of the summer, the Speaker also reported, he spent reorganizing the directories and files of the Senate website to make the site more coherent and sensible as an archive. As a result, he said, inadvertently, some hyperlinks to other pages and files have been severed. The Speaker said he appreciates being informed about these, plans to address them, and invited further reports of broken links as they become apparent.

He also explained that the Senate has not been reapportioned since it was reduced in size a few years back. Reapportionment will need to occur this year and a policy to guide future reapportionments will need to added to the F/AM.

Finally, the Speaker clarified that an $800 one-time bonus, legislatively-mandated but not state-funded, to occur in November for employees making less than $100,000, is only for full-time employees. Our part-time, temporary, and presumably, he added, adjunct colleagues will not see the bonus. Since the bonus is one-time, it will not affect salaries, and, he hastened to add, since it is not a state-funded initiative but a mandate, nonetheless, it has to be paid from the College’s limited funds.

D. Faculty Athletics Representative

Vince Benigni

Colonial Academic Alliance

Benigni reported that recent discussions he has had with the President and others have revealed concerns about a lack of faculty engagement in some major and smaller events on campus. Thus, he has shifted his report to the Senate from the customary subject of student athletics to faculty engagement opportunities available through the Colonial Academic Alliance.

The College will be the inaugural scholar exchange host of Northeastern University Presidential scholar William Mayer, who will deliver a keynote address on Donald Trump as Presidential candidate and, in addition, talk with classes. If the event goes well, Benigni said, we hope CofC scholars will have the opportunity to go to Colonial Alliance schools on the program.

Benigni also discussed the Alliance’s undergraduate research conference, to which Dean of the Honors College Trisha Folds-Bennett has taken over 20 students with funding from the Office of Academic Affairs, which, Benigni said, he hopes can continue this year. The Alliance also runs an annual faculty pedagogy summit to which our faculty are invited, the most recent of which was held at Drexel University and focused on technology in teaching.
Andrea DeMaria and Jeri Cabot, Benigni said, have launched a federal bystander intervention program that has taken a leadership role in the Alliance, which is producing PSAs and enabling scholarly work on bystander intervention.

He noted that information about other opportunities to get engaged with the Alliance is forthcoming.

He closed by emphasizing the importance of faculty engagement. He reported he has been meeting over the last few months with such people as Mark Berry, Paul Patrick, Jimmy Foster, Todd McNerney, Jerry Hale, and Mark Halberg to think of ways to increase faculty engagement “but pulling some of the layers back so we have more time to watch theater shows and to go to athletic games and to go to faculty and sabbatical presentations,” etc. Yet we have 12-14 hour days, he said, that mitigate against such engagement. He issued a challenge of sorts to everyone, the Interim Provost, and the President: how do we change so that we can bring back faculty engagement? He asked for faculty to send ideas to him about how we might increase faculty engagement in CoFC activities and events and develop more camaraderie and a better esprit de corps.

E. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual
Jason Vance, Chair

Update on Changes to Faculty/Administration Manual, 2014 –15
(Presentation Slides - PDF | F/AM Change Log - PDF)

Vance reported on changes made to the F/AM last year, which are listed in the presentation slide PDF file. He asked the Senators to call their constituents’ attention to these changes and encourage them to consult the change log.

Vance also listed items on the committee’s agenda this year and that are carryovers from last year (see Presentation Slides PDF, p.11): reapportionment of the senate, the status and procedures of the Faculty Hearing and Grievance committees, separating of process/procedure and policy in the F/AM, addressing concerns raised over titles for adjuncts, and clarifying language on committees (such as charges, purview). He also noted that Academic Affairs and Legal Affairs will be reviewing institutional policy for consensual relationships.

Applause followed.

There were no questions.

5. Old Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee
Bonnie Springer, Chair

Department of Health and Human Performance
Course and Program Change Proposals (PDF)

Speaker McNerney prefaced this set of motions by the faculty curriculum committee by saying that the items for consideration by the Senate were “sort of approved, but not exactly” last year. There was a header in the agenda that addressed these changes; however, the corresponding files were not posted with the agenda and, consequently, Senators did not have access to the details. Nonetheless, the Senate approved the items listed. This was discovered in the summer, the Speaker said, at which time it was decided that the appropriate path to take was to bring the proposals back to Senate for any deliberation the Senate wished to have.
Springer explained the motion is to approve the changes listed in the files: delete the Health minor and to deactivate HEAL 495 as a capstone course in the Public Health major (with a teach-out plan for students who still need it).

There was no discussion.

The motion was approved on voice vote.

6. New Business

A. Election of Speaker Pro Tempore

Speaker McNerney explained the function of the Speaker Pro Tempore, who will take on the Speaker’s duties should the Speaker be unable to perform them. Also, in a case in which the Speaker wishes to participate in discussion, the Speaker Pro Tempore will preside over the debate.

The Speaker called for nominations from the floor:

Tom Kunkle, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM) nominated Julia Eichelberger, Senator - SHSS.

There were no further nominations. Eichelberger was elected Speaker Pro Tempore on a unanimous voice vote.

B. Motion on Administrators’ Roles in Faculty Evaluation

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy

Speaker McNerney explained how Senator Krasnoff’s motion is being handled with respect to Senate by-laws and procedures. In the case of a motion for a by-laws change brought to the Senate, the Senate would have an opportunity to discuss it, but it would be remanded without a vote to the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual for further study and possibly work before being brought back to the Senate. Senator Krasnoff’s motion, however, seeks a change to the administrative portion of the F/AM and not the portion of the F/AM over which the Senate has control. Ordinarily changes to this section of the F/AM begin with language being brought to the committee first before it comes to the Senate for debate and advice to the Office of Academic Affairs in the form of a notice of intent to change the administrative section, but such a notice is not subject to approval by the Senate. Senator Krasnoff’s motion, the Speaker said, is, in some respects, the reverse of that process: a motion from a faculty member to change part of the F/AM over which we do not have control. The Speaker described three possible actions on the motion:

1. approve the motion by a vote
2. disapprove of the motion by vote
3. remand the motion to the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual for further conversation before it comes back to the Senate

The Speaker then turned the floor over to Senator Krasnoff.

Senator Krasnoff observed that the motion deals with potential conflicts of interest in faculty evaluation. Two principles are in play:

1. There are several levels of evaluation in the T&P process and at each level evaluators are supposed to apply the same criteria for tenure and promotion. Even if they disagree about how to apply the criteria,
the criteria are the same at all levels from department, to school, to Provost.

2. Decisions at each level, as well, have to be arrived at independently. While evaluators must understand what happened at prior levels, they still need to arrive at independent decisions. We have to be convinced, Krasnoff asserted, that the evaluation at each level derives from judging the case on its merits, independently, and based on the same criteria.

Sometimes, however, he said, it is not easy to ensure such a process and, for those occasions, conflict of interest provisions come into play, such as the recusal of a member of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review when a member of her home department comes up for review at the Advisory Committee level. The idea, he said, is that one cannot serve at two levels. But it is also important to note that such recusals could happen not just in the way it ordinarily happens, as above, but also could take the form of recusal of an Advisory Committee member at the home department level, which would then allow the member to review the case at the college-wide, Advisory Committee level. But we don’t do it that way, Krasnoff argued, because the fact of that individual’s “existing web of relationship” with the department may interfere with the independence of judgement at the college-wide decision level.

The case of administrators in respect to this issue is complicated. Most administrators have a home department, but how strong their web of relationship is with that department may vary. One can see, Krasnoff added, for instance, how a new member of the college in an administrative position might have fewer ties and relationships to her faculty home department and might, thus, have less potential for conflict of interest.

Administrators from the same department as T & P candidate will also, he added, be applying criteria from the discipline, which means that the review at the administrative level is not the same as it would be were it conducted by an administrator from a different home department.

While Deans and administrators may be perfectly capable of differentiating between different roles, which Krasnoff stipulated, the real question is if we can know that such differentiation is taking place. Krasnoff argued that we can only feel confident in such cases if the appearance of conflict of interest is removed.

Conflict of interest protections are not, he said, in place to prevent people from doing bad things, but rather, to prevent the appearance of people doing bad things, preventing people from coming to incorrect interpretations about how an outcome was arrived at. As such, conflict of interest protections do not punish administrators, but protect them and ensure that administrators’ decisions can be seen as independent.

Krasnoff here posed a hypothetical T & P situation that might lead to the appearance of a conflict of interest, hastening to add that he speaks only in the hypothetical and not of the case involved in the active grievance to which the Interim Provost referred in his remarks on the Senate’s agenda. Suppose, Senator Krasnoff said, that a department found against a candidate and subsequently so did the Dean and the Provost, who are both members of the same department, yet the college-wide Advisory committee came to the opposite decision. Additionally, in the hypothetical, the faculty grievance
committee upheld a claim that at the departmental level of review there were violations of due process. “Can we be sure,” Krasnoff asked, that in the hypothetical case, “the administrators’ judgment was entirely independent, that they were making decisions, as it were, about the merits of the case and not, in some sense, driven by their relationships with the particular department?” “I don’t know,” he replied.

Such a situation points out the need, Krasnoff argued, for a system that eliminates the appearance of a conflict of interest and thus protects the independence of the administrator’s judgment. That is the point of the motion, he said.

Questions/Discussion

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked why the motion excludes the Dean of the Libraries.

Senator Krasnoff replied that in that school there is no comparable department structure. The motion assumes that there are multiple departments in the schools to which the motion would apply. He did note, however, that the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance poses potential challenges for the motion since it only has two departments.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics said that she would oppose the motion. It is part of the description of the job of Dean, she argued, to abstract themselves from networks of relationships and to render independent, professional judgment. If we don’t trust their professionalism in rendering T & P decisions, why would we trust them, she asked, in other areas that require their professional, independent judgement.

Krasnoff replied that it is easier to render such judgment in cases where there is no question of a conflict of interest. He reiterated that he is not arguing that it is impossible for Deans to abstract themselves from their departmental relationships. But if there’s any question, in this most important decision of T & P, administrators should recuse themselves.

Anguelova said she would agree that T & P decisions are among the most important decisions a Dean makes, but if her own Dean had to recuse himself from T & P cases from his home department of Biology, he would have to recuse himself from half the T & P cases in his school.

Tim Johnson, Chair - Department of Classics, said he finds the motion problematic, especially in the case where a Dean’s home department is an especially large one. Were he coming up for review from such a department and the Dean had to recuse herself and an Associate Dean or another person from outside step in, that could result in someone with less expertise reading the review packet. A more important question to ask, Johnson said is, since conflict of interest can occur in so many different forms at all levels, if there are sufficient checks and balances in the system at each level of review from the department up. We want the best readers at every level of review and the motion, he argued, might actually undermine that.

Idee Winfield, Senator - SHSS, spoke in favor of the motion. She suggested that the motion offers a similar check and balance as we have at the departmental level, where we have an outside committee member join in the process not for their expertise in the field but to ensure that correct procedures are followed. The college-wide committee has that check in the form of recusal of committee members from the same department, but at the
Dean's and Provost's level, no such checks exist. She asserted that these decisions are critical since they involve lives, and we really need to have a system that we have confidence in and confers legitimacy to decisions about who stays at the College and who goes.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, speaking as someone with many years of administrative experience, having served as Chair of Mathematics for ten years before joining Academic Affairs, she said, argued that we have a “pretty consistent process,” due in part to the fact that at the higher levels of review a single person makes most of the recommendations. Handing off some of the decisions to others, as specified in the motion, risks fracturing the consistency gained by the year after year of experience of an administrator serving in that role.

Jason Coy, Department of History, noted that he understands the need for consistency, but we do not worry about consistency when alternates serve in the stead of those who have to recuse themselves on the college-wide committee. He added that he has a problem with the idea that faculty cannot be trusted to be objective on the college-wide T & P committee and must, per the F/AM, recuse themselves, but once they are promoted to administrative posts, in contrast, they can be trusted to be objective. This is “not in the spirit of shared governance: you either assume that everyone can be objective or have checks that protect against” conflict of interest,” he said.

Caveny-Noecker, offered a clarification to differentiate the current process of faculty recusal from cases in the Advisory Committee from the recusal of Deans and the Provost asked for in Senator Krasnoff’s motion. The former is a policy in place to prevent the “double jeopardy” of having a single person act twice as an evaluator of a candidate in a single year, first at the departmental level and then again at the college-wide level. The case that Senator Krasnoff’s motion addresses is different, since Deans and the Provost do not participate in departmental evaluation panels but only in their administrative roles.

Coy offered point of clarification as well, observing that faculty, according to the F/AM are not allowed to choose which process, departmental or college-wide, that they are allowed to act in: they are specifically recused from the college-wide process.

Iana Anguelova, replying to Coy, said that faculty are specifically recused from college-wide T & P processes because they will only be in the committee for a short while. It is also better, she asserted, to have them involved in their departmental processes.

Kelly Shaver asked Krasnoff, hypothetically, what would happen in a school in which the (only) Associate Dean and the Dean are from the same department?

Krasnoff replied that the motion would provide an incentive not to do that and added that it is probably a bad idea to have a Dean and an Associate Dean from the same discipline.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, noting that the Senate will not be able to give the motion its full due at the meeting, given the hour, moved that the Senate send the motion to the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, who are already involved in several discussions around T & P processes. The motion was seconded.
Senator Krasnoff asked for a clarification as to the charge to the committees. Kelly replied that he would ask them to come back with a report to the Senate.

Discussion/Question

Jason Vance, Senator - SSM, asked if these committee reviews will include looking into historical data as to how many times, given the motion’s definition of such, potential conflict of interest existed in T & P decisions.

Speaker McNerney replied that, once remanded to committee, the committees can seek whatever information they require (such as that mentioned by Vance, information from other institutions, and the like) to produce their reports for the Senate.

There was no further discussion of Senator Kelly’s motion from the floor.

The motion was approved on a unanimous voice vote.

7. Constituents’ Concerns

Speaker McNerney noted that the by-laws specify that 15 minutes be set aside for constituent concerns at the end of the Faculty Senate’s regular meetings.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, raised a longstanding concern of hers that the effort required to earn a superior rating in post-tenure review at the Professor rank is same as that needed to earn promotion to Professor, yet the raise is not equivalent. She announced that she will be bringing this concern to the Faculty Compensation Committee, the Faculty Welfare Committee, the Budget Committee, and the President’s Advisory Committee

8. Adjournment: 7:21 PM

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary