Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 10 April 2018 and 17 April 2018

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 10 April 2018 at 5:00 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115). The meeting continued on Tuesday 17 April 2018 at 5:00 PM, same location.

1. **Call to Order**, 5:05 PM
2. **Approval of the 13 March 2018 minutes.** Richard Nunan suggested corrections, which were accepted by unanimous consent.
3. There were no **Announcements and information.**

4. **Reports**
   a. **Speaker of the Faculty Elizabeth Jurisich.** Speaker Jurisich reminded the Senate that the 2018-2019 Faculty Senate meeting dates have been posted, and so far, no conflicts have been reported. Speaker Jurisich reminded everyone of the Celebration of the Faculty on April 24 in the Stern Center Ballroom. Doors open at 3:15 for refreshments. There will be recognition of significant milestones, including faculty governance recognition. The Speaker reminded committee chairs that their end of year reports are due to Megan Gould.

   Speaker Jurisich spoke of the Presidential search timeline, located [http://trustees.cofc.edu/presidential-search/timeline/index.php](http://trustees.cofc.edu/presidential-search/timeline/index.php). She said she expected the earliest the search committee would be presenting a list of choices to the Board of Trustees might be by October. Please contact the Speaker with any questions of concerns, and she will try to answer within the bounds of confidentiality. The Speaker expressed appreciation for those participating in the listening sessions.

   Speaker Jurisich thanked Senators, Committee Chairs and Committee members for their participation in shared governance. She thanked Jannette Finch, Faculty Secretary; Megan Gould, Faculty Secretariat; and George Pothering, Parliamentarian.

   Speaker Jurisich thanked President Glenn McConnell for his service and his heartfelt devotion to the College.

   b. **President Glenn McConnell** delivered prepared remarks, a transcript of which, as delivered, is presented below.

   "Good afternoon.

   Thank you all for having me here for what is my final address to the Faculty Senate as president of the College of Charleston.

   As I stand before you, I think back to July 1, 2014, when I first walked into my office in Randolph Hall. I remember it being a beautiful sunny day and the beginning of a chapter..."
of the College’s history that was full of promise. I felt an incredible honor to lead my alma mater as well as an incredible responsibility to do so with great integrity. I knew there were challenges in front of me. Those challenges would not be easy nor would they be insurmountable as well. For example, just 30 minutes into the job, I had the basketball team crisis. Still, there was hope in the air and a belief that better days were to come.

Nearly four years later, I am quite happy with what we have accomplished together. Through the hard work, talent, and dedication of exceptional coworkers like Provost Brian McGee, our deans, our chairs other academic leaders, staff, and, above all, you, my faculty colleagues, we have accomplished a lot. The Provost is a talented leader who deeply loves this institution, and I am grateful for all his efforts to enhance the academic experience at the College and look out for the students’ best interests. He certainly made my job easier and helped me make the right decisions along the way.

In the early days of my presidency, I stated a commitment to academic freedom, a desire to preserve our excellence in undergraduate teaching, and a need to develop academic programs that align with student demand, meet the needs of our community, and ensure our relevance in the higher education landscape in South Carolina and the Southeast.

Since then, many good things have transpired at our beloved university. Our faculty and students have gained national and international recognition, excelling both inside and outside of the classroom; our university has been ranked on many lists in national and international publications highlighting our academic excellence, student focus and special programming; our student-athletes have competed at the highest levels; and our donors have continued to invest in our bright and boundless future.

Drilling down into the details, without trying to be exhaustive, I will speak briefly about accomplishments that we – faculty and administration – have achieved together.

- Together, we secured millions of dollars in recurring monies from the state for our education and general expense account.

- Together, we completed the most successful comprehensive fundraising campaign in our history, creating more scholarship money for our students.

- Together, we created an endowed distinguished professorship in information management and provided support for other institutional advancement achievements, including corporate partnerships with businesses such as Google and Boeing.

- Together, we developed the College of Charleston’s first terminal degree, the Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing, and new degree programs or concentrations in African American studies; meteorology; community planning, policy, and design; data science and analytics; digital media; theatre studies; sustainable urbanism; public policy; hospitality operations management; and South Carolina’s only undergraduate majors in supply chain management and commercial real estate finance.
• Together, we initiated multiple new undergraduate minors, including Portuguese and Brazilian studies, Southern studies, and information management.

• Together, we achieved approval for new graduate certificates in software engineering and information systems.

• Together, we supported significant growth in undergraduate distance-education offerings in both the regular academic year and the summer sessions, with the majority of summer sessions revenue now coming from online course offerings.

• Together, we approved a new Bachelor of General Studies, what is essentially the first entirely online undergraduate program at the College of Charleston.

• Together, we redeveloped the Master of Education in Languages, with the concentration in English as a Second Language to become the first entirely online graduate program at the College of Charleston.

• Together, we instituted school-based fees in the School of Business and the School of Sciences and Mathematics, a new approach to our long-held financial model.

• Together with Trident Technical College, we initiated a new one-semester residential Charleston Bridge Program, which in its first year supported over 200 undergraduate students who intend to transfer to the College of Charleston, thus making the dream of a College of Charleston education even more possible for qualified South Carolinians.

• Together, we approved a two-plus-two agreement with Trident Technical College for the College of Charleston’s primary degree completion initiative, the Bachelor of Professional Studies.

• Together, we created and will launch this month a new Transfer Center to facilitate convenient student transfer to the College of Charleston.

• Together, we secured our ten-year reaffirmation of SACSCOC accreditation, with no recommendations or focused reports.

• Together, we launched our Quality Enhancement Plan on Sustainability Literacy, which is further distinguishing us as a university in South Carolina and in the country.

• Together, we received $2 million from the state to help us buy from the state the DEW Building on Lockwood Blvd at a low price. This property is now CofC WestEdge and houses the offices of Procurement and the Controller as well as the Joseph P. Riley Jr. Center for Livable Communities. This has opened up more space on our historic campus footprint for students.
• Together, we launched the first Collegiate Recovery Program in the state of South Carolina. Five students in the program will graduate in May.

• Together with our support, the Office of Institutional Diversity launched the Crossing the Cistern program, which is a new one-year scholarship and mentor program for rising sophomores and juniors that awards up to $4,000 and helps at-risk students stay on the path to graduation.

• Together, we witnessed and supported the launch of the Race and Social Justice Initiative, which supports community outreach programs that foster dialogue surrounding social inequities. This is made possible by a Google grant and funding from other community partners.

• And together we witnessed the creation of a new office for veterans and military student support.

It is clear that the work we have done together has strengthened our university, particularly our student-focused approached to education.

Some of these accomplishments were not easy and certainly required a lot of effort and hard work from many of us. The majority of these items required a willing partner in the Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees as well as faith that this was indeed the direction in which the College needed to go. Our successes were not given to us. Our successes had to be created – and we were able to do so because we all rolled up our sleeves and worked together toward common goals.

You – our faculty – should be proud of what we together have accomplished in nearly four years. We are truly in a great position as an institution because of your dedication and commitment to our students and our university. The College’s mission, vision and values are well aligned for continued success.

Over the past four years, we have ensured the College has a bigger voice in the state and grown our presence nationally and internationally – all while retaining our student-focused community and commitment to academic excellence.

Through our shared commitment to our core values, the College of Charleston is – without question – among the best public universities in the state of South Carolina, and, I think we can all agree, in the United States.

As long as we continue to remain true to our mission – to provide students a community in which to engage in original inquiry and creative expression in an atmosphere of intellectual freedom – the sky is the limit for what we can achieve. After all, it’s in this community, that we prepare our students to be responsible, character-driven leaders of our global society and graduate the next lineage of a faithful and caring College of Charleston family.
I am proud of the progress we have made in the face of the challenges laid down before us. I believe that together my colleagues in the administration and I have tried to do our best to support this great institution and to put it on a sustainable financial model.

Thank you for all of your efforts and – when it was necessary – your patience with me. I firmly believe you are the best teacher-scholars in the country. You do a great job with the students, and are dedicated to the students. This is a comment we hear out on the road about what distinguishes this university. It is the relationship of faculty and students that is seen in the teaching model here.

It is because of your efforts – and the efforts of our talented staff – that we produce graduates who are ready for career, ready for advanced and graduate studies, and ready to live the life extraordinary.

I will look back fondly at my time as president of the College of Charleston. Our College is on the verge of a new chapter and its future will yield even greater results.

We are a stronger College of Charleston today than when I arrived over three-and-a-half years ago. We have a remarkable collection of faculty, staff, and senior leadership as well as incredibly bright and talented students.

In addition, we also have a proven and successful fundraising operation. We have set the table for the next president, and I hope you share my enthusiasm for the direction in which we are headed.

Let me close by saying it had been my intention to serve out my last year, and probably could have served until the 2020 events, but I had to change my plans. It was time to slow down.

I thank you all and I wish you the very best. I hope the College of Charleston prospers and grows to greater heights. It is a great institution and all of us who went here feel that it opened doors in our lives and gave us an opportunity to do the very best we could do. It is a great school and a great mission and I'm looking forward to watching students in their moment of triumph at Commencement. I always see that as a highlight of the year.

This will be my last address to you. I will be happy to take any questions. The transition will go very smoothly. Steve Osborne and I have begun familiarizing him with all the things that are pending. I have enjoyed working with the Deans and getting to know everybody. I will be supporting the College in the years to come and it's been a great experience. I have enjoyed working with both Speakers.

With that, thank you, Madam Speaker and members of the Faculty Senate, for your time. I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

Speaker Jurisich again thanked President McConnell and he enjoyed a round of applause.
There were no questions.

c. **Provost Brian McGee** [Appendix A]

Provost McGee gave his personal thanks for President McConnell's four years of service. He said he found him to be a warm, caring, and funny person behind a stern demeanor: a person of the utmost integrity. Although they occasionally disagreed, Provost McGee knew there was a principled reason for it. He said President McConnell put principle first, and integrity was his touchstone. Provost McGee said he has been privileged to work with him.

Provost McGee then turned to his presentation slides and spoke of the image there: the Latin Gate inscribed with 1968, the year it was erected. He said it is a great marker of our heritage as a liberal arts and sciences institution.

The Provost provided this year's numbers for tenure, promotion, and third year review, as well as comparative numbers for 2016-2017. He recognized the many hours of work that is spent on this process, from the roster faculty within academic departments, by Chairs, Deans, and by the different committees on Tenure & Promotion, Post-Tenure Review, and Third Year Review.

Provost McGee said reading the files is inspiring, and he is humbled by the quantity and the quality of the work.

Provost McGee spoke of a topic brought up in the March Senate meeting on classroom scheduling. Course scheduling policies have been in effect since October 2006. The course scheduling policy states that no more than 70% of each department's course offerings can be offered at meeting times beginning at 9:00 AM and ending at 3:00 PM. Both conversation sections and express sections must be held after 3:00 PM. The Provost said the reason for the rules were to create equity for faculty teaching loads, and for students who would need to schedule classes outside the prime time hours of 9:00 to 3:00.

Provost McGee provided a slide containing data on classroom scheduling by School [see Appendix A].

In Fall 2015, the Provost office studied classroom assignments which revealed that the College was due for a classroom allocation study.

The Provost expects to return in Fall 2018 with suggestions for classroom re-allocation.

The Provost suggests discussions will be transparent, with focus on the wisdom of the 70/30 rule.

Provost McGee asked unanimous consent to move the last item of business on the agenda, the Resolution on Degree Recipients ahead in the agenda, in case quorum was lost by the end of the evening. That resolution reads:
Resolved: The Faculty Senate approves the list of May 2018 degree candidates for graduation, as certified by the Office of the Registrar, subject to review and determination by the College of Charleston Board of Trustees.

Unanimous consent was granted and the Resolution on Degree Recipients was passed.

Provost McGee spoke of the work done by the ad hoc Committee on Institutional Identity and Vision. He has read their reports and found significant concerns focused in the areas of compensation, clarity of vision, and distance education.

Provost McGee said he has recently endorsed and directed that the College should join the Universities Studying Slavery, a consortium organized under the leadership of the University of Virginia. http://slavery.virginia.edu/universities-studying-slavery/

He thanked the faculty who have outlined the benefits of being aligned with the consortium.

Provost McGee reminded the Senate of the Celebration of Faculty, April 24 at 4:00 in Stern Center Ballroom. For those colleagues recognized for their teaching accomplishments this semester, he has presented an apple while they teach class.

He congratulated all faculty nominated for awards.

The Provost accepted questions.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the success of the Bridge program.

Provost McGee said that about 140 students out of 200 successfully bridged over to become College of Charleston students.

Gigova asked if those students will continue in Fall 2018, and Provost McGee replied that is not known yet for any student.

Stephen Short, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked for clarification on if distance education courses were considered part of the 70/30 course allocation rule.

Provost McGee said completely online courses are outside of the classroom scheduling rule since they don't require any classroom space.

Christine Finnan, Guest (Teacher Education) asked if both undergraduate and graduate classes were added into the classroom allocation percentages.

Provost McGee said the customary analysis had been to only include Undergraduate, but the most recent numbers include Graduate course sections.

Finnan and McGee suggested that might advantage schools with large graduate sections, but the College still offers many more undergraduate courses than graduate.
Veal listed the members of the Standing Senate Budget Committee and read the charge of the committee from the website.

Membership duties include reviewing College policies relating to long-range financial planning, budget preparation, the allocation of funds within budget categories, and the recommendation of policy changes. Committee members review projected costs of proposals for new College programs, initiatives, and program termination (brought forth by the Provost). The members inform the Senate, before these proposals are put to a vote, of the Committee’s overall evaluation of their potential budgetary impact. Finally, committee members review each annual College budget. The Chair of the Budget Committee, or a designated representative, attends meetings of the Budget Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Veal explained that most of the work completed this year involved the curriculum system Curriculog. The Budget Committee also met with the Deans, the Executive Vice President for Business Affairs, Paul Patrick, and regularly with Provost Brian McGee, who attends Budget Committee meetings.

Recommendations based on the Committee’s work include:

- the Departments originating curriculum proposals need to articulate more clearly and honestly how the addition of a program or courses will affect student enrollment, faculty allocation, and costs.

  Veal explained this will require more questions in Curriculog that are specific to the budgetary process for minors, certificates, majors, and other programs. The Committee would like to work with the Curriculum Committees and those responsible for Curriculog in the development of the budget-related questions.

- the Committee would like to request and review data from the Provost's office on the current economic state of programs, certificates, minors, majors and degrees and compare with the proposals from four to five years earlier.

  Veal gave the explanation that the proposals state how much they plan to spend for key resources, including faculty resources and library resources, and the proposals state how many students they expect to enroll, but data has not been examined. What programs expected compared to what actually happened will help future programs more accurately prepare.

- Deans in invited conversation with the Budget Committee over the past two years were asked questions such as, what have been the biggest challenges in your school due to ongoing budget issues, what are your plans for outreach in news and existing programs and what are any new plans for budget processes and requests do you have for your school?
Handouts completed by the Deans are included in Appendix B. Veal said it was interesting to see how each school was going through the budgetary process.

- examples shown by Veal included the Office of Academic Experience, which receives unfunded mandates from the president, Board of Trustees, and various vice Presidents, but the office awards no certificates and no degrees.

The Budget Committee wants to examine how they can better support this Office.

- other examples given by Veal include Schools that have money for faculty lines, but cannot get them approved through Business Affairs. The process can be slow, not transparent, and Deans and faculty would like to know where the process is being held up.

- the Budget Committee would like to examine The Study Abroad program in hopes of gathering funds that don't transfer in with the credited courses students complete at other affiliate schools.

- another item brought up by the Deans is bottom line budgeting, and if there other ways of looking at it.

- the Budget Committee is interested in the faculty/staff turnover monies that have not been resupplied after current budget cuts.

- the Committee also hopes to examine a process for carryover money or a percentage of that money instead of money swept.

Feedback from Paul Patrick indicates that he is open to working with a representative of the budget committee.

The Board of Trustees Budget workshop in May will include discussion of substantial issues related to the College instead of just reporting out of numbers.

The Budget Committee agrees that the process for budget development should be more transparent, which would be helped by the Speaker or a member of the Budget Committee being present and involved in the discussion, instead of just witnessing the process.
Veal revisited the budget crisis starting in 2015-2016 and encouraged Senators to bring the information to their departments. He said massive budget cuts in 2015-2016 of 1.6 million twice in one year due to low enrollment and fewer out of state students. He said many programs were reduced and many staff and instructor lines were frozen. Financial reports on the budget are available http://budgetingandpayroll.cofc.edu/reports/index.php.

Veal showed the transition from 2015-2016 to the current budget and how it affects other factors than enrollment. Unfunded mandates provide a burden.

He said an increase in tuition is quickly used up by unfunded mandates, strategic action items, and mandatory increases in other monies, like insurance.

Veal said the process for developing a budget is ongoing. The Deans submit a request in April, then the Provost submits the budget to the CFO and the President, then at the budget workshop in May with the Board of Trustees, more discussions take place to finalize a budget by June. Veal wished for more transparency in this process, and said the Budget Committee will strive for that in the next year.

Veal accepted questions.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if the Committee would like more transparency from the Board of Trustees.

Veal affirmed that the Budget Committee would like to be more included in the budgeting process.

e. Ad hoc Committee on Institutional Identity and Vision (Irina Gigova and Jen Wright, Committee members) [Appendix C]

Gigova recapped the purpose of the Committee and explained the three-step process of gathering College Community feedback: designing the survey, holding listening sessions, and releasing a second survey in March with content informed from listening session minutes.

Wright gave an explanation of some of the data gathered. All data is provided in Appendix C. Wright pointed out areas faculty and staff strongly agreed on and strongly disagreed on.

Wright mentioned consensus on creating a healthy environment included the need for more direct communication, more transparency, more autonomy in making decisions regarding institutional matters, and more collaborative culture. Other desired improvements are more opportunities to engage outside of our divisions, more common space for interaction, and more involvement for both staff and faculty.

Disagreements were in the areas of shared governance, and if Yammer has improved our ability to communicate.
For improved morale, considerations of salary and benefits was high, job status, our voice in decision-making, and good relationships among employees.

Email is still where we get most of our information.

Answers to questions addressing what kind of programs we should be offering and what kinds of students we should be targeting were not surprising

Most survey respondents think we are the right size.

Many respondents indicated strengths as experiential learning, and the teacher-scholar model.

Wright said plans for 2018-2019 include conducting a deeper analysis of the data to expand on campus dialogues, examining differences in faculty and staff, and younger and older faculty, and conversations about our identify and visions for the future.

There were no questions.

5. Old Business
   a. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
      (Richard Nunan, Chair)
      Motions 1, 2, 3 were approved by Faculty Senate at the March 13 2018 Faculty Senate meeting. Motion 4 was discussed. Cover Memo for the seven motion proposals [Appendix D]
         i. Motion 4: By-Laws Article V, Section 3
         ii. Motion 5: Language clarification \textit{(Motions 4, 5 are included in By-Laws Committee proposed modifications to FAM Hearing language-[Appendix D]}
         iii. Motion 6: Modify FAM language, PTR Post Tenure Review revisions from PTR-[Appendix D]
         iv. Motion 7: New FAM language, PTR_PTR Superior Rating standard language-Appendix D

The discussion on Motion 4 begun in the March 13 Faculty Senate meeting continued. There was an amendment on the floor to delete the second occurrence of the word "randomly."

Speaker Jurisich asked if there was further discussion of randomly.

The proposed amendment to change randomly was withdrawn.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) presented an amendment to limit the Hearing Committee to two panels, which would alternate in hearing cases as they come up in the year.

The text of that proposed amendment is below.
Amendment 04/10 from Senator Tom Kunkle (seconded and approved by the Senate)

(Blue strike-throughs and Green text are proposed amendments to Motion 4 from the By-Laws committee.)

12. Faculty Hearing Committee

a. Composition: Twelve (Eleven) tenured faculty members, at least six (four) of whom shall hold the rank of Professor. Each September the committee Chair will divide the Hearing Committee pool into two panels of six members each, including at least three at the rank of professor, with one of those three designated as a panel alternate. Panels are to be constructed with an eye to broad disciplinary distribution, and submitted by the Chair to the Committee as a whole for majority approval. Each panel will determine its own chair at that time. If a case emerges over the course of the academic year, one of the panels will be assigned randomly to that first case, and the remaining panel to any second case. Any additional cases will be heard by new the panels in alternating fashion, randomly constituted out of the committee pool, minus any members obliged to recuse themselves for conflicts of interest. The position of panel alternate will rotate among the three professors on each panel. In the event of conflicts of interest emerging in the first two panels as initially constituted, members will be swapped as needed, by the Committee Chair, subject to majority approval by the Committee as a whole. Five members will be randomly among those with no conflict of interest, including two members with the rank of Professor. In the event of a second hearing in a given academic year a second committee of five will be constituted. Members of the first committee may elect to not be considered for service in the second Hearing. Each iteration of a group to Hear a case will consist of five members, two of whom must have the rank of Professor. Two years of service is encouraged.

2nd Kunkle Amendment to Motion 4

Each Hearing Committee member will normally serve two three consecutive academic years.

Speaker Jurisich asked for further discussion of the amendment to motion 4.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said that there was no need for rotating alternates to the panels. Caveny-Noecker said there are twelve people constituting two panels of six, and one of three panel members who are professors will be considered an alternate, in case any panel member must recuse themselves.

Caveny-Noecker and Nunan discussed the need for a second alternate in more than one case.
Kunkle clarified that the alternate would attend all the hearings but would not attend deliberation.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) supported having a different alternate for extra cases.

**Speaker Jurisich** called for the vote in favor of the Kunkle amendment. The amendment passed.

Discussion on Motion 4 concerning the structure of the Hearing Committee continued.

Nunan reminded the Faculty Senate that the change if passed would require a change to the By-Laws that would have to be approved by all faculty.

Nunan pointed out other discussion items, such as the proposal from the ad hoc committee on Hearings to extend service to three year periods. Language referring to one-year periods of service would have to be altered to reflect the three year suggestion.

Tom Kunkle suggested an amendment changing three consecutive years of service on the Hearing Committee to two years.

There was no discussion. Speaker Jurisich called for a vote on the proposed amendment. There was unanimous positive vote for the amendment.

Nunan explained the next item for discussion was how many days were awarded to all parties.

There was no more discussion.

Speaker Jurisich asked for a vote on Motion 4, which addressed the structure of the hearing committee and the number of faculty on the hearing committee.

Motion 4 passed.

Motions 3 and 4 will require full faculty vote. The link to those motions is: http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2017-2018/apr-2018/By-Laws_Motions_3and4_for_Faculty_Vote.pdf

Nunan introduced Motion 5, and spoke of the sections that regarded Hearing Committee procedures, which do not require full faculty vote.

The first part, as explained by Nunan, involve the rights of faculty and adjuncts to grieve the circumstances of their grievance.

Nunan said that AAUP guidelines and specific laws dictate that if CofC wishes to terminate someone in the first two years, they should receive an explanation of why.

Nunan said termination reasons that violate academic freedom or are discriminatory, or if there are procedural violations are all problems.
Nunan said that suggested language changes provide Junior faculty, instructors, and adjunct faculty with the right to challenge their termination, if they disagree with the stated reasons for dismissal.

**Mark Del Mastro, Senator** (Hispanic Studies) asked about "inadequate consideration" and asked if this was defined anywhere.

Nunan said that failure to go through proper procedures to terminate someone is the likely interpretation. He said the By-Laws Committee left the language in the motion because it appears elsewhere.

**Provost McGee** said it involves whether or not the terms of the contract are being honored appropriately. He said the process of examining legal terms in the language of By-Laws and the FAM might encourage a separate legal review.

Speaker Jurisich asked for discussion on the first part of Motion 5.

Provost McGee said that some parts of the Faculty Administration Manual were drafted as early as 1982-1985, before Senior Instructor and Instructor ranks were created and added to the FAM.

McGee urged Senators to employ caution in adding to the work burdens of Chairs.

Nunan explained the next part of Motion 5, which involved how many working days were allowed for the grievance process. The By-Laws committee wished to afford the grievant time for due process, instead of adhering to a time frame that emphasizes efficiency for the institution. The Committee wants to maintain 20-day windows of working business days instead of the 15 days suggested by the ad hoc committee on Hearings.

**Irina Gigova, Senator** (at-large, HSS) asked about the approximately 93 days allowed for preparation for the Hearing process and suggested the costs increase for the grievant. She asked about extending the process versus shortening the process.

Nunan responded with different Hearing Committee scenarios and examples.

Gigova asked why the President had eleven working days rather than ten to respond and pointed out that in one place, the President has ten days, in another, it is listed as two weeks.

Nunan suggested that By-Laws will change two weeks to a specific number of days when possible, in order to be more precise, and will strive for consistency.

Provost McGee said because of timing in the spring semester, everyone involved wants that process to conclude in a timely manner and everyone wants more time for the grievant to prepare, and whatever timeframe is decided will be imperfect.

Gigova made a motion to change references to eleven working days or two weeks to ten working days. That motion was seconded.
Gigova Amendment to Motion 5 (p. 125 of current FAM)

13. President’s Decision

The President shall make a final determination within two weeks, eleven ten working days after she/he receives recommendations from all of the following: the department evaluation panel, the appropriate Dean, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Provost.

There was no further discussion about timing.

The next section of Motion 5 under discussion involved the authority of the Hearing Committee to make decisions about conflicts of interest.

The Speaker asked for discussion.

There was none.

The next section of Motion 5 involved small modifications of language that dealt with the alternate on the Hearing Committee.

There was no discussion.

Speaker Jurisich called for a vote on Motion 5. Motion 5 passed.

Motion 6 was introduced.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker explained when the streamlined post-tenure review was put into place, and the differences in satisfactory and superior reviews for Chairs.

Mark Del Mastro, Senator (Hispanic Studies) noted a natural conflict when the Chair of a department come up for superior rating, and is reviewed by a panel of colleagues, who the Chair is responsible for evaluating. Del Mastro asked if there had been discussion about that dynamic. Del Mastro found it problematic to put colleagues in that situation.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker said the same thing happens when a department chair comes up for promotion to professor. She said she sees this as a natural by-product of faculty self-governance and peer evaluation. She said there are alternatives, such as having a panel for the School. That would remove the autonomy of voice within that Chair's department.

There was no further discussion of the motion. The Speaker called for the vote. Motion 6 passed.

Motion 7 was introduced.

Nunan said the motion involved language on how to apply standards for post-tenure review that is more flexible.
There was no discussion.

Speaker Jurisich called for the vote. Motion 7 passed.

*A motion was heard and seconded to continue the April 10, 2018 faculty Senate meeting on the next meeting date of April 17, 2018. That motion passed.*

*The April 10 meeting concluded at 7:30 PM.*

*The continuation of April 10 meeting was called to order on April 17, 2018 at 5:05PM.*

**6. New Business**

a. **Committee on Nominations and Elections** (Tom Kunkle, Chair)
   i. Election of 2018-2019 Senate Committees

   The slates for committees were accepted as shown on the projector with no additional nominations. The vote was unanimous accepting the 2018-2019 Senate Committees

   ii. Call for nominations, Committee on Nominations and Elections

There were no additional nominations.

Speaker Jurisich closed the nominations for Committee on Nominations and Elections. Election for this committee will take place by electronic ballot in MyCharleston.

b. **Committee on General Education** (Lisa Covert, Chair)
   i. For approval for the Gen Ed Social Sciences requirement:

   - ANTH 203 (pdf)
   - HONS 169 (pdf)

   **Richard Nunan, Senator** (at-large, HSS) asked if these courses existed yet.

   **Christine Finnan, Guest** replied in her role as Anthropology professor that ANTH 203 had existed as a Special Topics courses, but it had not yet been approved by the Senate.

   Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) suggested approving the courses for inclusion in General Education, contingent upon Faculty Senate approval later in the meeting.

   ii. For approval for the Gen Ed Humanities requirement:

   - RELS 103 (pdf)
   - RELS 223 (pdf)
All curriculum proposals were passed.

c. Committee on Graduate Education (Christine Finnan, Chair)
   i. Communications program change Communications program change (pdf)

   Deactivate course COMM 500 Introduction to Graduate Studies in Communication, (pdf)

   COMM 502 Qualitative Research Methods, (pdf)

   COMM 681 Classical Rhetorical Theory, (pdf)

   COMM 682 Modern and Contemporary Rhetorical Theory(pdf)

   Course change COMM 501 Research Methods in Communication (pdf)

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the master’s program mode of delivery as completely online.

Amanda Ruth-McSwain, Guest (Director of Communication Graduate Studies) said that her department had been working on the program revision for three years, and had robust conversation within the department about what the online mode of delivery meant for the degree and the degree experience. In researching aspirational peers and other departments of Communication, most programs offer online degrees in order to reach the professional audience that is the primary student target as professed by the mission of the College of Charleston Communication graduate program. Ruth-McSwain said the current curriculum, expectations, and student learning outcomes will be maintained, just the mode of delivery is changing.

Nunan asked what other programs are offering this type of model.

Ruth-McSwain said Purdue, Northwestern, University of Florida, quite a few R1 institutions, Georgia, Central Florida, and several others. She said College of Charleston would be one of the first to offer the masters online in the state of South Carolina, which they hope will be an advantage.

Iana Anguelova, Senator (at-large, SSM) said she thought Communication is uniquely suited for an online degree.

Ruth-McSwain agreed that best practices in digital communication is part of what they teach.
Christine Finnan, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, said the Committee was impressed with the rigor that stays within the courses and program.

The Speaker called for a vote. All Communication curriculum passed.

ii. Early Childhood program change Early Childhood program change (pdf)

Christine Finnan mentioned an error in the agenda. EDEE 542 was incorrectly listed in cross-listed courses, and it should be within new courses.

Speaker Jurisich said the listing is correct within Curriculog.

- Early Childhood new courses
  EDEE 542: Early Childhood Mathematics Content & Instruction, (pdf)
  TEDU 535. Creating Welcoming Learning Environments for Students and Families, (pdf)
  TEDU 537. Teaching Early Childhood & Elementary Social Studies & Science (pdf)
  iii. Early Childhood electives Early Childhood electives (pdf)
  iv. Early Childhood renumbering and cross-listing
  EDEE 520: Methods and Materials in Early Childhood Education. Field Ex. 2, (pdf)
  EDEE 529: Advanced Instructional Strategies for Emergent Literacies PK-3, (pdf)
  EDEE 538: Advanced Teaching Writing, Design Children's Literature..., (pdf)
  EDEE 588: Advanced C, I & Literacies Assess. PK-3(pdf)
  v. Elementary renumbering and cross-listing
  EDEE 503: Creativity and the Fine Arts... (pdf)
  EDEE 507: Creating Effective Learning Communities (pdf)
  EDEE 509: Teaching Diverse Learners (pdf)
EDEE 525: Advanced Foundations of Language and Literacies Development, (pdf)

EDEE 535: Theories and Strategies for Developing Literacies, (pdf)

EDEE 545: Advanced Teaching Writing..., (pdf)

EDEE 568 Science for the Elementary School Teacher, (pdf)

EDEE 590: Field Experience: C&I (2-6), (pdf)


vi. Elementary program change Elementary program change (pdf)

vii. Elementary electives Elementary electives (pdf)

All Education courses were approved.

viii. English program change English program change(pdf)

ix. Historic Preservation new course and course change

HSPV 840 Digital Tools for Historic Preservation, (pdf)

HSPV 893 Independent Study in Historic Preservation (pdf)

x. Middle Grades Education electives Middle Grades Education electives (pdf)

xi. Public Administration course number changes PUBA 511. Urban Policy, (pdf)

PUBA 513. Planning Law, (pdf)

PUBA 516. Local and Regional Economic Development, (pdf)

PUBA 517. Urban Transportation, (pdf)

PUBA 520. Local Government Politics and Administration, (pdf)

PUBA 522. Intergovernmental Relations, (pdf)

PUBA 530. Natural Resources Law and Policy, (pdf)

PUBA 531. Administrative Law, (pdf)

PUBA 534. Environmental Law and Regulatory Policy, (pdf)

PUBA 535. Land Use Law, (pdf)

PUBA 537. Wetlands Policy, (pdf)

PUBA 540. Leadership and Decision Making, (pdf)

PUBA 550. Essential Elements of Nonprofit Administration, (pdf)

PUBA 551. Research & Management in Environmental Orgs., (pdf)

PUBA 554. Human Resource Management for Non-Profit Orgs., (pdf)

PUBA 555. Nonprofit Capacity Building, (pdf)

PUBA 556. Fundraising & Marketing for Nonprofits, (pdf)

PUBA 557. Managing Public/Private Partnerships, (pdf)

PUBA 560. Contemporary Perspectives on Arts Management, (pdf)

PUBA 561. Advanced Arts Management, (pdf)


PUBA 563. Arts and Technology, (pdf)

PUBA 564. Arts Education(pdf)

x. Special Education renumbering and cross-listing

EDFS 501: Introduction to Exceptional Children and Youth, (pdf)
EDFS 505: Field I: Assessing & Instructing Students with Disabilities, (pdf)

EDFS 510: Characteristics of Individuals with Mental Disabilities, (pdf)

EDFS 512: Educational Procedures for Individuals with Emotional Disabilities, (pdf)

EDFS 513: Field II: Assessment & Instruction of Students with Disabilities, (pdf)

EDFS 520: Characteristics of Students with Learning Disabilities, (pdf)

EDFS 522. Educational Procedures for Individuals with Mental Disabilities, (pdf)

EDFS 525. Literacy Development & Intervention for Students with Disabilities, (pdf)

EDFS 528. Educational Procedures for Students with Learning Disabilities, (pdf)

EDFS 530. Characteristics of Individuals with Emotional Disabilities, (pdf)

EDFS 537. Educational Assessment of Students with Disabilities, (pdf)

EDFS 550. Classroom and Behavior Management(pdf)

x. Special Education electives Special Education electives (pdf)

**Speaker Jurisich** asked for a vote on curriculum items as a block, unless there was objection. There was no objection. All Graduate Education curriculum items were passed. All Graduate Curriculum items passed.

d. **Curriculum Committee** (Chad Galuska and Gayle Goudy, Co-Chairs)

i. Anthropology: Create a new HONS course (HONS 169: Language and Culture) (pdf) and add it to the ANTH B.S. degree requirements (ANTH-BS) as an alternative to ANTH 205. (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

iii. Computer Science:

- Prerequisite changes to CITA 280, 395, and 495. (pdf) (pdf)
- Create a new concentration (Computing in the Arts, Game Development and Interaction, B.A.). (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

iv. English:

- Create a new course (ENGL 498: Eportfolio Workshop). (pdf)
- Create a new minor in Writing, Rhetoric, and Publication (ENGL-WRIT). (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

v. Honors: Complete restructuring of the HONS Program. (pdf)

An overview of the Honors proposal was provided by Trisha Folds-Bennett, Dean of the Honors College and projected during the Senate meeting. It is included in Appendix E below.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked if there would be opportunities for team taught courses in the proposed curriculum.

Trisha Folds-Bennett, Guest (Dean of Honors College) said the Honors program would continue to support those courses.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) thanked Dean Folds-Bennett for providing the overview [seen in Appendix E], as it explained the program changes more clearly than the pdf provided in the agenda. Krasnoff said Philosophy supports the proposal, as courses must contain the central question of foundational texts or sources. Krasnoff suggested moving two courses, HONS 169 and HONS 180, from the Exploring Complexity and Diversity section to the Foundations of Knowledge and Methods of Inquiry section.

An amendment to move the courses suggested was proposed and seconded.
Mark Del Mastro, Senator (Hispanic Studies) asked if the Dean of Honors agreed with the proposal.

Dean Folds-Bennett said it made sense at this time to include the courses in the Foundations section even though that may change over time.

Iana Anguelova, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked how could Business Ethics be considered part of Foundations of Knowledge and Methods of Inquiry?

Larry Krasnoff said thinking about ethics in business is foundational.

Anguelova said it is true there is no discipline for business statistics, but there is a discipline for statistics, and a method of inquiry that is associated with statistical methods of inquiry.

Julia Eichelberger, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the interdisciplinary nature of the courses in the Complexity and Diversity section and asked why HONS 180 needed to be removed from the Complexity and Diversity section.

Krasnoff said HONS 180 was not interdisciplinary enough to remain on the Complexity and Diversity section.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) added that HONS 180 along with Business Law had traditionally been used for students who are on an Honors Business track.

Folds-Bennett said that had been the case in the past.

Wesley Burnett, Guest (School of Business) said they now advise more on a case-by-case basis.

Nunan spoke of linked courses that are sequences for students and said the list of courses serves as a useful advisory tool.

Folds-Bennett said they wished to offer students as much flexibility as possible.

The motion to move HONS 169 and HONS 180 to the Foundations section was approved.

Speaker Jurisich asked for other discussion points on the Honors proposal.

Richard Nunan asked for clarification on the senior seminar and asked if there would be any students to take the course.

Folds-Bennett said this is not a required category, and they will be working on developing more one and two credit courses for the category.

The Honors Curriculum changes passed.

vi. International Studies:
• Create a new special topics course (INTL 291: Special Topics in International Studies) (pdf) and add it to the INTL-BA major. (pdf)

• Add numerous courses to the INST-Minor. (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

vii. Linguistics: Add four existing courses (EDEE 325, TEDU 325, SPAN 449, SPAN 450) to the options within the interdisciplinary LING-Minor. (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

viii. Mathematics:

• Terminate the BA-MATH (pdf)

• Terminate two concentrations: Applied Mathematics Track (BS-MATH-MAPP) (pdf) and Pure Mathematics Track (BS-MATH-MPUR). (pdf)

• Add a new concentration within the BS degree: Mathematics Track (BS-MATH-MATT). (pdf)

• Modify two concentrations within the BS degree: Statistics Track (BS-MATH-STAT) (pdf) and Teacher Education Track (BS-MATH-EDMT). (pdf)

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked about the uses of the word track and concentration and if they are two different things?

Mary Bergstrom, Guest (Registrar) said that concentration, cognate, and track describe 18 hours or more. For the Registrar, the terms fall into the same bucket.

Bob Mignone, Guest (Chair, Mathematics) said he considered track and concentration as the same.

Provost McGee said the terms mean different things on other campuses and use of the terms has consequences for regulators, including CHE and SACSCOC. In the future, Provost McGee supports the Senate examining the definition and use of the terms.
Iana Anguelova, Senator (at-large, SSM) pointed out examples where the terms concentration and track are used interchangeably.

Math Curriculum proposals passed.

ix. Neuroscience: A number of changes are being proposed to the Neuroscience Minor, including changes to make prerequisites more explicit, changes to electives, and the addition of more options for students to complete the research requirements (NSCI-Minor). (pdf)

Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS) expressed concerns about "double-counting" and about the size of the minor at 30-36 credit hours. She said in terms of size and structure, neuroscience resembled an interdisciplinary major more than a minor.

Jeff Triblehorn, Guest (Director, Neuroscience minor) said that additional classes are not being added to the minor. The number looks large, because the pre-requisites are listed in order to make it more explicit. The number of credits is not actually increased, but remain the same, or are actually decreasing. The revisions in the minor make it easier for students in a number of ways: the research options now include a bachelors essay option for those student not able to research in a lab; some courses count towards GenEd requirements; more courses count towards GenEd, from disciplines outside of Biology or Psychology. Triblehorn explained that a rule prohibiting double-counting more than one course for the major or for the neuroscience minor. They have removed the double-counting restrictions to allow students to double-count additional classes. Triblehorn described the research component, as students are introduced to conducting hands-on research, asking experimental questions, writing scientifically, giving presentations, designing experiments, all giving students some exposure to neuroscience research.

Larry Krasnoff asked how many neuroscience minors have there been and how many of those are Biology or Psychology majors?

Triblehorn replied between 50 and 70 and about evenly split between Biology and Psychology.

Richard Nunan spoke in favor of the more flexible minor, but spoke of the larger issue threatening liberal arts education.

Provost McGee said the catalog does not reflect recent definitions of what constitutes majors or minors and encouraged the Senate in the next academic year to examine the definitions, with the help of the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid.

Beatriz Maldonado Bird, Senator (at-large, LCWA) asked how many total classes do the students take that are affected by the double-counting rule?

Triblehorn said Psychology, 3, and Biology, 5. He said that input from many departments and faculty supported eliminating the double-counting role.

There was discussion of numbers of classes and double-counting.
Irina Gigova asked if there was discussion about reducing the minor.

Trblehorn said no, everyone is happy with the minor and with the success of students completing the minor.

**Tom Kunkle, Senator** (at-large, SSM) pointed out that the neuroscience minors used as an example by Gigova did not list the pre-requisites, so the comparison is not accurate. Kunkle spoke in favor of the minor, and did not think large science majors and minors are sucking the life out of liberal arts and sciences.

Changes to the Neuroscience minor passed.

x. Professional Studies: Revise the core of the major (**PRST program change**). (pdf)

- Most existing core courses will be deactivated (PRST 220, 300, 301, 303, 400). (pdf) (pdf) (pdf) (pdf) (pdf)
- New courses are being created to take their place:
  - **PRST 310: Leading Oneself and Others in the 21st Century** (pdf)
  - **PRST 311: Critical Thinking, Use of Research and Decision Making in the 21st Century** (pdf)
  - **PRST 312: Creativity and Innovation in the 21st Century** (pdf)
  - **PRST 313: Global Society in the 21st Century** (pdf)
  - **PRST 314: Ethics, Social Responsibility and Sustainability in the 21st Century** (pdf)
  - **PRST 315: 21st Century Life and Work Skills** (pdf)
  - **PRST 410: BPS Capstone** (pdf)

Susan Kattwinkel, Senator (Theatre) asked when the program was first offered?

**Godfrey Gibbison, Guest** (Dean, School of Professional Studies) said the program was designed in 2011-2012, and the first class was offered in Fall 2013, so the program is approaching the fifth year.
Larry Krasnoff asked for an example comparing an old course with a revised course.

Gibbison used the example of Global Issues in the 21st century. The original course was conceived of how countries relate to each other, but there was not much about how the global economy functions. Student are now expected to understand that the fundamental economic arrangement of the 21st century is globalization, and that capital, goods and services, move globally, and students are part of the global system.

Much of their lives are driven by forces that are not local, even though their understanding is primarily local. Gibbison said students are expected to shift their thinking to understand the global dynamics.

Krasnoff pointed out that the different emphasis in curriculum also allows for interdisciplinary interpretation, opening up teaching duties across departments.

Gibbison agreed that was a consideration.

The Professional Studies revisions passed.

xi. Psychology: Create two new courses and add them as electives to the B.S., B.A., and minor.

- **PSYC 312: Adverse Child Experiences** (pdf)
- **PSYC 435: Advanced Topics in Positive Psychology** (pdf)
- **BS-PSYC, BA-PSYC, PSYC-Minor** (pdf) (pdf) (pdf)

xii. Religious Studies:

Create three new courses:

- **RELS 103: Death and the Afterlife** (pdf)
- **RELS 247: The Daoist Tradition** (pdf)
- **RELS 253: Religions of Charleston** (pdf)
- Add these new courses and RELS 223 (Religions of the Ancient Near East) to the **RELS-Minor** (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

xiii. Southern Studies: Add ARTH 396 as an elective in the **SOST-Minor** and provide flexibility to allow the program to use exemption management to include other kinds of electives (FYSE, independent study, tutorials) on a case-by-case basis. (pdf)
Curriculum approved with no discussion.

xiv. Studio Art: Create a new course (ARTS 318: Themes and Practice) (pdf) and add it to the major requirements (BA-ARTS). (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

xv. Supply Chain and Information Management: Create a new course (INFM 340: Innovation Technology). (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

xvi. Teacher Education:

- Renumber the following EDFS courses to facilitate cross-listing with graduate courses: EDFS 401 (pdf) (from 345), 410 (pdf) (from 353), 420 (pdf) (from 352), 430 (pdf) (from 351), 450 (pdf) (from 330).

- Cross-list with graduate courses, but not renumber, the following courses: 412 (pdf), 413 (pdf), 422 (pdf), 425 (pdf), 437 (pdf)

Curriculum approved with no discussion.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

Provost McGee said the work involved in curricular matters is significant and he appreciates all who work on curriculum matters, the various committees, Academic Affairs, the Registrar's office, and the work is at the very core of what we do as faculty. Provost McGee reminded faculty to make use of the Barnes and Noble campus bookstore, who we have a contract to work with. Proceeds from that campus bookstore feed back into student scholarships. If anyone has concerns about Barnes and Noble, please bring them to the Provost's attention, but please don't push students away from working with the bookstore.

Godfrey Gibbison urged faculty to take time to examine the rapid changes occurring in higher education. He suggested putting together a task force in the next academic year to examine how higher education is changing in the United States and to examine how the College of Charleston could respond to those changes. He said there are probably procedures in place left over “from when mules took messages to Columbia.” When the new president is hired, we can suggest proposals based on research into the changing nature of the higher education landscape.

8. Adjournment, 6:20 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Jannette Finch
Faculty Secretary
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Faculty Senate
Provost’s Report
Major Topics
April 10, 2018

- Latin Gate
- Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review
- Classroom Scheduling
- Resolution on Degree Recipients
- Comments on Today’s Senate Agenda
Provost’s Report

Faculty Senate
April 10, 2018
# Tenure, Promotion, Third-Year Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th></th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Successful cases</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Successful cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure or promotion to Librarian III</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Professor or Librarian IV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Instructor promotion or renewal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-Year Review</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Tenure Review (superior cases only)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (including third-year and superior post-tenure review cases)</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classroom Scheduling

- Scheduled for April and May Discussion in Academic Council
- Current Course Scheduling Policy, Effective Oct. 2006:

**Course Scheduling Policies**
- No more than 70% of each department’s course offerings can be offered at meeting times beginning between 9:00am and 3:00pm.
- Departments must adhere to Approved Meeting Pattern Times.
- All Conversation Sections must be offered outside of prime-time meeting times (either before 9:00am or after 3:00pm).
- All Express sections must begin after 3:00pm.
Classroom Scheduling

- For Fall 2018, LCWA, SB, EHHP, SSM below 72% “Prime Time” Utilization
- For Fall 2018, HSS and SOTA above 72%
- Over 380 Sections Required Classroom Scheduling Assistance for Fall 2018
- Equity Issues for Faculty and Students
- Nov. 2015 Classroom Assignment Study Suggested Need for First Classroom Reallocation Since 2005
- Discussion of 70/30 Rule Will Include Classroom Reallocation
Resolution on Degree Recipients

Resolved: The Faculty Senate approves the list of May 2018 degree candidates for graduation, as certified by the Office of the Registrar, subject to review and determination by the College of Charleston Board of Trustees.
Comments

- Institutional Identity and Vision
  - Compensation
  - Clarity of Vision
  - Distance Education

- Universities Studying Slavery

- Celebration of Faculty, April 24 at 4:00 p.m., Stern Center Ballroom
Senate Budget Committee Report
Members

- William Veal, Chair
- Irina Gigova
- Todd McNemey
- Scott Harris
- Julia Eichelberger
- Pam Riggs-Gelasco
- Jeff Yost
What is our Charge?

- To review College policies relating to long-range financial planning, budget preparation and the allocation of funds within budget categories, and to recommend policy changes. To review in particular the projected costs of proposals for new College programs and initiatives, and to inform the Senate, before these proposals are put to a vote, of the Committee’s evaluation of their potential budgetary impact…To review each annual College budget…
What have we done this year?

- Curriculog
- Met with Deans
- Met with Executive Vice President for Business Affairs, Paul Patrick,
- Met regularly with Provost, Brian McGee
Recommendations

- **Curriculog** - The Departments of origin and the Curriculum Committee need to articulate more clearly and honestly how the addition of a program or courses will impact student enrollment, faculty allocation, and costs.

- **Future Budget Committees** - Request and review data from Provost’s office about the current economical state of new programs, certificates, minors, majors, and degrees. Compare these to the proposals from 4-5 years earlier.
Deans’ Presentations

- Evolved from an open Budget Discussion to a presentation
- We need to keep these going
- Handouts are attached to committee minutes
- Positive participation
Results of Discussions with Deans

- Office of Academic Experience - This entity receives unfunded mandates from the President, Board of Trustees, and various Vice Presidents.

- Various Schools have money for lines but cannot get them approved through the Business Affairs office.

- Study Abroad using affiliated programs is "leaving money on the table" and must be collected.

- Why do we use Bottom Line Budgeting?

- Faculty/Staff turnover is in need of a resupply.

- Can we establish a method for carrying over money not spent each year, or at least a percentage?
Meeting with Paul Patrick

- Open to having faculty representative in the budget development process.
- Budget workshop should include a discussion about re-evaluating priorities.
- The process for budget development should be more transparent.
- He supports flexibility with Ledger 3 “carry-forward”
How did the Budget “crisis” begin?

2015-16 Budget/fiscal Year

- Massive cuts due to low enrollment and fewer out of state students
  - $1.05 mil in the Fall 2015
  - $0.632 mil in the Spring 2016

- Many programs were reduced
- Staff and instructor lines were frozen.

- [http://budgetingandpayroll.cofc.edu/reports/index.php](http://budgetingandpayroll.cofc.edu/reports/index.php)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016-2017 ($ millions)</th>
<th>2017-18 ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB and SSM Fees</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition (3.5% &amp; 2.75%, 2.08%)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandated New Spending</strong></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25% pay increase</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Dental Ins.</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflationary</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Action Items</strong></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Cuts</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional Budget Cuts</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process is Ongoing

- Deans’ requests to Provost in April
- Provost submits budget to CFO and President
- Budget Workshop with BoT in May
- Discussions that may lead to changes in budget
- BoT meets to vote in June
Mission Statement: The Office for the Academic Experience provides students with educationally purposeful opportunities that lead to deep learning, integrated social and intellectual development, and engagement with local and global communities.

Goals: 1) To promote student engagement in transformative learning experiences both in and out of the classroom. 2) To assure student success by challenging all students to overcome obstacles in order to do their best work.

AEX Departments and Staffing (8 departments; 59 staff; 400+ student employees)

Academic Experience (Lynne Ford, AVP; 1 FT program coordinator)
  Convocation
  The College Reads!
  Founding Documents Requirement
  General Education Curriculum and Assessment (Faculty Coordinator, Gia Quesada)

Academic Advising and Planning Center (Karen Hauschild, Director; 12 FT Advisors, 1 FTT, 2 PTT)

Center for Academic Performance and Persistence (Michelle Futrell, Director; 2 FT Staff; 1 PTT)
  Provisional Students, IMPACT Scholars (Celia Dennison, Director; 2 FTT vacant)

Center for Excellence in Peer Education (Page Keller, Director; Jennifer Bradley, Asst. Director)

Center for Student Learning (Lindy Colman, Director; 5 FT Staff, 4 Lab Directors)

First Year Experience (Sarah Owens, Director; Liza Wood, Asst. Director)

New Student Programs (Mindy Miley, Asst. VP for First Year and Bridge Student Services)
  Orientation (Stephanie Auwaerter, Director; 1 FT Staff)
  Charleston Bridge (Mindy Miley, Director)
  First Year International and Experiential Programs (Director, Bruce Fleming)
    iCharleston (3 FTT Site Directors for London, Kelowna, Dublin)
    HSS Scholars

REACH (Edie Cusack, Director; 4 FT Staff, 2 FTT Staff, 1 FTT Admin)

Veteran & Military Student Services (Jessica McMahan, Director—FTT)

Annually AEX employs over 400 students as peer educators providing students with training, supervision and professional development, and financial support.

- Peer educator roles include Summer Orientation interns, FYE Peer Facilitators and Team Leaders, Honors BGS Peer Facilitators, iCharleston Peer Mentors, Peer Academic Coaches (PACS), EDLS Peer Leaders, CSL lab consultants and tutors, Supplemental Instructors and SI leaders, REACH tutors, REACH fitness mentors, REACH social mentors, and REACH job (internship) coaches. In 2017-18, we added Peer Advisors in AAPC.
- Serving as a Peer Educator is a high impact learning practice. National research confirms the efficacy of being mentored to retention, academic performance, graduation and career success.
- The Peer Educator pay scale ranges from $8.50 (first-time summer orientation interns) to $11.00 (SI Leaders).
New Program Areas

- Charleston Bridge (fall only, 200 students, residential, collaboration with TTC)
- HSS Scholars—high achieving FY students, fall on-campus, spring @ Franklin University Lugano
- Transfer Resource Center—a collaboration between AEX and Registrar to create a one-stop for transfer students.
- Expansion of Gallup Strengths programming—all FY students in 2017-18 completed assessment—academic success habits, choice of major, campus engagement, career planning.
- Expansion of online tutoring support in CSL.
- Expansion of advising through Peer Advisors, Quick-Question Drop-in, and Mobile advising.

Unrestored Budget Cuts

2015-16 Recurring Budget Cut: $ 53,000 ($28K FYE, $25K AEX) Resulted in loss of FYE faculty professional development, loss of funds for FYE activities outside of class with students, loss of AEX staff and student employee professional development and conference travel. Eliminated ability to fund new program ideas.

Continuing Budget Challenges:

- Addition of academic support programs without funding or a plan for recurring funding (e.g. provisional/Impact/Top Ten Percent, Veteran & Military Student Services, Charleston Bridge).

- Increased demand on existing and new support programs as student profile changes without corresponding increase to budgets or in new staff positions.

- Low staff salaries and few opportunities for advancement means high turnover in critical student support roles (e.g. academic advising). Several critical staff remain temporary employees, including the Director of VMSS.

- Loss of FYE funds and fewer regular faculty (lost lines, replacement with adjuncts) threatens the quality of this academic program. FYE is a degree requirement for all incoming students with less than one year of college. FYE also provides significant faculty development opportunities not available otherwise.

- Significant budget losses in 2015-16 reduced professional development opportunities for faculty, staff, and students. No funds to support student conference participation. No other sources of institutional staff professional development fund (eliminated by president’s office).

FY 18 Progress: Last year, converted 5 temporary employees to permanent staff (CEPE, FYE, Impact, 2 in REACH). New space in the basement of Lightsey to promote collaboration and coherence in student experience, the addition of commuter student lockers and study spaces, and new collaborative study spaces in the basement and second floor lobbies.

FY 19 Budget Requests: Restore lost AEX and FYE operating funds; provide and fund line for VMSS Director ($37,050 + fringe) and provide recurring operating budget for VMSS ($4,000); provide recurring funding for Provisional/Impact program ($140,000); provide recurring funding for Charleston Bridge ($50,000). Provide funds to address low staff salaries and salary compression.
The School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs
Finance Committee Report

Mission Statement: The School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs prepares students to become discerning, knowledgeable, and engaged citizens in an ever changing, interconnected global world.

Vision Statement: Through rigorous language education, a broad range of interdisciplinary programs, and numerous study abroad and co-curricular activities, students develop high level language competency, cultural intelligence, and in-depth appreciation of the global issues that confront humankind in the 21st century. The School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs, therefore, is the place within the College of Charleston where disciplines merge, the realities of the world are confronted, and where knowledgeable, engaged citizens of that world come of age.

Direction: Our core purpose is teaching global fluency: high linguistic competency; cultural intelligence; world-engagement. Working in partnership with all of the schools of the College, we maintain a curriculum that prepares students to engage with and comprehend diverse cultures. In keeping with our understanding of the traditions of liberal arts education at the College of Charleston, we expect our majors:

• To achieve language proficiency sufficient to communicate effectively with native speakers or to read and understand texts in an ancient language
• To acquire an understanding of cultures that is multi-disciplinary and diachronic
• To comprehend the interconnected socio-economic, political and cultural dimensions of global transformation

Composition: LCWA houses 118 faculty: 66 full-time roster and 52 part-time adjunct. Total student enrollments over the past five academic years have been relatively stable with slight growth (2012F: 6,546; 2013F: 6,867; 2014F: 6,463; 2015F: 6,361; 2016F: 6,742). This is compared to national averages that report decreases of up to 20%. Over the past five years LCWA has produced the highest amount of minors of all the Schools.

International Programming: The Institute of International Education ranked the College of Charleston third among US master’s level institutions for students participating in study abroad, and participation of LCWA faculty and students in study-abroad, for periods up to a year, and international internships continues to grow.

Initiatives:

• Career/Business Expos: LCWA departments and programs are working together with regional international businesses to provide recruitment opportunities for our students. On February 8th, the German program, together with the German America Chamber of Commerce of the Southeastern US, the School of Business, and the Career Center, hosted the second annual CofC German-American Business Summit. Nearly 200 students and over 100 community members attended the job fair, keynotes, and panel discussion on workforce needs. The event was followed by a reception hosted by main sponsor Mercedes-Benz Vans.

• On-line Programming: on-line summer courses are available in cultural literacy and intermediate languages and these are being expanded into Fall/Spring options. M.Ed. in Language/ESOL emphasis is scheduled to go to a fully on-line mode of delivery starting this fall.
- **International Scholars**: Under the general direction of LCWA and the Honors College, the International Scholars program combines honors study with the B.A. in International Studies, Hispanic Studies, or Jewish Studies with a second major in selected areas. The program customizes the Honors College experience, emphasizing language study, mentored relationships, and study abroad. International Scholars develop a curricular program and an undergraduate research agenda that reflects an understanding of global issues and international perspectives.

- **Community Outreach**: LCWA is infusing throughout the School curricular-enrichment programming in cooperation with community partners, for example: The World Affairs Colloquium Series; The World Affairs Signatures Series; The Center for Southern Jewish History; The Program in Carolina Lowcountry and Atlantic World.

- **Global Fluency Exchange**: GFE will be the center-point for international experiential learning required to fulfill the College’s and LCWA’s mission by connecting our students with opportunities to involve themselves in thinking about and working on real-world challenges both within our community and abroad. The GFE would also house such programs as a (1) Global Fluency Training Center, which would connect the College with the business community at large, as well as (2) “Globally Speaking” classes. These specially designated courses would feature on-line collaboration between students and students abroad, and other international experiential learning. (3) A Fellows and Student Ambassadors Program would provide a coordinated collaboration between faculty, students, and international business partners.

**Budget Implications:**

- Given the above growth patterns, especially in regards to internationalism, years of flat-budgets have caused critical challenges in basic resources.

  We are dependent on adjuncts, who in areas such as Classics, Chinese, Arabic, Russian, and Japanese cannot be found locally. These most often require national if not international searches, and therefore the baseline adjunct salaries are not competitive enough to recruit qualified instructors. We find ourselves struggling to finance plus-up salaries and handle immigration status for temporary appointments.

  For this coming year, due to budget constraints, retirements and resignations of roster-faculty were filled with VAPs. This coming year we will need to convert those to permanent positions. Often such roser-hires now require research and development stipends and increased moving allotments. To remain competitive keeps pushing the limits on the already strained operating budget.

  Funding for support systems, such as basic marketing, coordination of study abroad and internships, and operating budgets are not adequate for current needs. For example, International Studies with over 200 majors and six full-time faculty operate on an operating budget of $13,500. Such shortages place further demands on the operating budget of the School.

  In short, increases to operating budget are not a virtue but rather a necessity.

- **Development**: Since the one constant about State funding is that it is insufficient and will remain predictably so, if the College and LCWA are going to fulfill their mission, then we must cultivate external and independent financial sources for our programming. The LCWA development plan, titled “Go Global” targets raising funds for international programming and is strategically tied to the School’s mission and in the coming year will be diffused throughout its units.
Dean’s Presentation to the Budget Committee of the Faculty Senate
March 27, 2018

What have been and are the biggest challenges in your school due to ongoing budget issues?
- Salary compression
- Reliance upon temporary staff and adjunct faculty
- Research budgets are constrained due to previous years’ budget reductions
- Delayed renovation of the Albert Simons Center for the Arts
- Delayed renovation of the Calhoun Annex
- Need for design studios and computer lab for Historic Preservation and Community Planning
- Securing adequate shop and storage space away from campus
- Inadequate operating budget for the Arts Management Program (300 + majors)
- Need for long-term, on-campus housing for artists/scholars-in-residence

What are your plans for outreach with any new and existing programs?
- Music summer camp
- Graduate Certificate in Arts Management
- Program to facilitate graduates’ transition to the workplace

What are any new plans for the budget process and requests do you have for your school this year?
- Full-time staff to replace temporary staff
  - Arts Management
  - Projects Assistant
- New line to support Director of Media Relations/Box Office Manager
MEMORANDUM

To: Senate Budget Committee

From: Michael Auerbach, Dean, SSM

Re: 2018-2019 Budget Issues

Date: 26 March 2018

Impact of Prior Budget Cuts: The biggest impact of previous budget cuts has been the inability to fill all open faculty lines. Even if all current faculty searches are successful, we will enter next year with seven open positions: three in math, two in physics & astronomy, one in biology, and one in chemistry. The other significant impact came from the reduction of operating funds ($76,309), which has reduced our ability to fund faculty travel to professional meetings, instructional supplies, and student assistants. The implementation of a school fee in AY2017-18, greatly expanded our ability to support undergraduate research and the SCAMP program.

Proposed New Programs: Two new graduate programs are making their way through the curriculum approval process. A new M.S. in Data Science and Analytics will be reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs of the CHE this week. A proposed Ph.D. in Mathematics with Computation will soon begin curriculum approval. The major new expense in both of these proposed programs is for assistantships. A requested special appropriation request to support the M.S. in Data Science and Analytics was not successful this year. SSM is currently discussing support from private sector companies for both proposed new programs.

Outreach: SSM conducts informal science and outreach events that impact thousands of local school children each year. Some are facility based (e.g., Natural History Museum), some are written into the broader impacts sections of grants, and many others, including the Lowcountry Science Fair, various STEM festivals, and STEM day with the Lady Cougars, are organized through the Lowcountry Hall of Science & Math. While several of these events are supported by extramural grants, the vast majority rely on faculty and staff volunteering their time and effort. SSM also contributes to several of the larger STEM events.
**Process for Budget Development:** The SSM dean solicits budget needs and special requests from departmental chairs. The dean then prioritizes these requests, while adding in school-wide needs and initiatives. Dean and chairs then discuss the emerging priorities before they are requested by memo from the provost. A committee comprised of the Dean, Associate Dean, and six undergraduates (one from each of the SSM departments) oversees the allocation of funds derived from the school fee.

**New Budget Requests:** SSM’s greatest need is to restore funding for faculty lines and operating expenses lost to prior cuts. SSM also needs matching funding to construct a new building at Ft Johnson.
Findings of the Ad Hoc Committee on Institutional Identity and Vision (4/20/2018)

Purpose and Mission:
The Faculty Senate formed this ad hoc committee to solicit input from the College community about the identity and vision for the College. The reported findings will inform future Faculty Senate deliberations and be shared with the college community, Board of Trustees, and Presidential Search Committee.

Survey Process:
The process began with an initial online survey that received responses from 440 individuals, who were asked to respond to six main issues presented by the committee. In addition to the six main questions the Committee identified, 198 respondents brought up several additional questions that became the main themes for the six discussion sessions held between January 31st through February 14th.

The questions of the second online survey reflect themes reported from participants of the six discussion sessions and its purpose was to understand how the larger community of College employees felt about these emergent themes. This second online survey was open from March 9th through March 28th. This latest online survey collected 606 responses from 43 administrators, 192 tenured faculty, 62 tenure-track faculty, 15 instructors, 4 visiting instructors, 44 adjuncts, 11 full-time permanent staff, 13 full-time temporary staff, 5 part-time permanent staff, 9 part-time temporary staff, and 18 other employees of College of Charleston. More than half of the respondents (56%) reported they have been at the College for 10-years or less, while 27% reported 10-20 years of service, and 18% reported more than 20 years of service. The survey questions consisted of strongly agree – strongly disagree scale (1-7) statements, multiple choice selections, and one open text response question.

Findings
Our findings are presented in the following documents:
a) Tables of multiple choice responses in three different forms - all respondents, by faculty vs staff, by years of service 1-10 vs more than 10. Tables are formatted for Power Point display.
b) Written summary of notable differences in multiple-choice responses between faculty vs staff, by years of service 1-10 vs more than 10.
c) Executive summary of free-text comments grouped by general topic with number of respondents who addressed each topic.

Supplemental Data
d) All text comments separated by general topic. We used Excel to split long responses into single line (or sentences by punctuation), then grouped them by general topic (26-pages). This intermediate step was done to make it easier for us to group comments by general topic given that many comments were lengthy and touched upon multiple different topics.
e) Raw open text comments (212 respondents, about 26 pages to print).
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SUMMARY OF SURVEY COMMENTS (Grouped alphabetically by general topic)

These statements represent a paraphrased executive summary of the open-text responses. These statements are not intended as recommendations of the committee. This summary attempts to convey broadly expressed sentiments as well as constructive or insightful comments that may have been stated by only one respondent. They represent the diversity of opinions voiced without giving any indication of their frequencies. The number in parentheses following each topic heading indicates the number of comments on that topic entered by distinct individual survey completions. Verbatim duplicate comments were counted as coming from one individual survey completion.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS (1)
- CofC has done a great job at maintaining standards.

ADJUNCTS (See also PAY) (2)
- There are concerns about overreliance on adjunct faculty.

ADMINISTRATION (See also EVALUATION OF SUPERVISORS) (28)
- Concern expressed regarding faculty evaluation of administration (Deans and above) being ignored
- Goals are not effectively filtering down from the administration to the departments and faculty; overall poor communication between administrators and faculty
- Improvements in transparency (regarding hiring, budgets, decisions) should be made
- Administrators need to improve the incorporation of faculty feedback on strategic issues, including budgeting.
- Administrative bloat has led to the misallocation of resources from faculty/students to the administration
- Local authority needs to be restored.
- Perceived need for new leadership on all levels

ADMISSION STANDARDS (See also STUDENT QUALITY) (3)
- Admission standards must be maintained and improved
- Teaching standards may be indirectly and negatively affected by weaker admission standards
- Lower admission standards may lead to poor performances from underprepared students

ALUMNI (1)
- Alumni development should begin when students enroll and be fostered throughout their time here.

ASSESSMENT (1)
- A lack of appreciation of the value of the current (top down) assessment process by faculty.
- The administration does not incorporate faculty input throughout the assessment process.
- The assessment process would benefit from more autonomy and resources in the development of learning goals.

BUREAUCRACY (7)
- Ineffective, bloated, arcane bureaucracy lead to inordinate amount of time required to process curricular changes, grant proposals, hiring approvals...
- Too much faculty time and resources are expended on bureaucratic matters
- Efforts should be made to streamline processes.

CITY (See also ENVIRONMENTAL, IDENTTIY, CIVIC ENGAGEMENT) (4)
- The College should leverage Charleston’s historical, environmental, commercial (e.g. port), cultural attributes (not simply its beaches) to attract students, employers, etc.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT (2)
- There are opportunities for the College in the heart of the city to become more engaged in the community.
- Students’ academic experiences should incorporate civic engagement.
CLASS SIZE (4)
- Larger class enrollment, particularly for lower-division courses, is concerning.
- It is disingenuous for the College to advertise small class sizes when that does not accurately reflect reality.

COLLABORATION (5)
- More cross-campus collaboration could foster a better sense of campus community.
- It appears the campus operates in “silos” with limited collaborations across divisions/units of the College.
- Better collaboration between the administration, faculty and students may assist the College in moving towards common, strategic goals and serving students better.

COMMUNICATION (21)
- Existing communication systems (i.e., Yammer) do not facilitate communication among the College’s constituents.
- The use of traditional faculty list serves would improve the faculty’s ability to communicate with the administration.
- Better communications channels should be established between the campus community and the Board of Trustees.
- Some feel that they are unaware of what’s taking place throughout the campus community.
- Transparency could be improved with more effective means of communication.

COMMUTING (See also TRAFFIC) (1)
- The College should make efforts to accommodate students who commute to the downtown campus.

COST OF LIVING (1)
- The regional cost of living is placing strains on faculty, staff and students.

CULTURE (3)
- The College’s organizational structure should support a sense of common campus culture.
- Changes in the campus culture should occur at all levels of the College with all involved.

DEGREE PROGRAMS (See also GRADUATE PROGRAMS) (5)
- Some constituents feel that a greater variety of professional degree programs will help the College compete for high-quality students, and regional employment demands.
- Others worry about the cost (and uncertain gain) of professional and Ph.D. degrees.

DIVERSITY (11)
- More effort needs to be made to expand campus racial diversity
- The College suffers from the perception that it caters to white, wealthy students.
- The diversity of the greater Charleston community could be incorporated into the College’s community through local outreach programs.
- Diversity should be a core value of the College and both admissions and scholarship criteria should be adjusted to assist students of underprivileged backgrounds.

EMPLOYEE CONDUCT (6)
- Employees should be held accountable for unethical behavior.
- Administrators should treat subordinates respectfully.

EMPLOYEE RETENTION (2)
- The College should invest in its employees with the goal of retaining quality staff and faculty.
ENVIRONMENTAL (See IDENTITY) (3)
- The unique regional geography provides the College with the opportunity to develop sustainability initiatives that address environmental issues facing our society.

EVALUATION OF SUPERVISORS (See also ADMINISTRATION) (1)
- Staff and faculty of all ranks should be able to provide upward evaluations of their supervisors.

EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING (1)
- Student development could be enhanced by a wider variety of experiential learning programs.

FACULTY ACHIEVEMENT (3)
- Faculty achievements and contributions should be more widely publicized across the campus community.
- Incentives and rewards for faculty achievements should be provided by the administration.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT (1)
- A faculty development center could be used to centralize an array of programs and workshops designed to support faculty regarding innovative teaching techniques, research, assessments, etc.

FACULTY EVALUATION (5)
- Accountability should be more uniformly applied to all types of faculty, including adjuncts.
- Teaching should receive greater weight in the tenure and promotion decision, as it is widely perceived that research is now the driving factor.
- Tenured faculty that perform minimal research should teach additional courses.

FACULTY EXPECTATIONS (5)
- The criteria for tenure and promotion should be more clearly delineated in the FAM.
- There appears to be a significant variation in tenure and promotion requirements across schools and departments.
- Faculty expectations should take into consideration relative strengths of the faculty member (i.e., teaching vs. research).
- Tenure and promotion criteria should be realistic for an institution with high teaching expectations and taking into consideration practices elsewhere (e.g. recognizing first books that come out of dissertations).

FACULTY HIRES (1)
- Insufficient support from the state of South Carolina has led to an overreliance in non-tenure track faculty.

FINANCES (4)
- The state of South Carolina’s economic success seems at odds with the financial struggles consistently faced by the College.
- The greater campus community should receive more training regarding budgeting and financing.
- Administrators should be more accountable for unfavorable budget variances.

GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (2)
- General education requirements could be streamlined (and/or reduced) while maintaining our commitment to liberal arts education.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS (5)
- There are concerns the creation of additional graduate programs without adequate funding may damage faculty cohesion and retention and hurt the traditionally strong focus on undergraduate high-quality education.
- Until the institution has adequate financial resource to sustain strong graduate programs, the focus should be on undergraduate programs.
IDENTITY (33)
- There is strong support for maintaining the College’s liberal arts and science tradition, with the primary focus being on undergraduate teaching.
- There are concerns about the lack of uniformity in the College’s identity across various schools and departments.
- Our identity should more directly reflect a clear commitment to our mission (teaching vs. research).
- The lack of clear identity is reflected in lackluster student involvement and commitment to the institution.
- Some voices for the College changing in order to meet the demands of the marketplace that prioritizes career-oriented majors or specialized majors that prepare students for graduate school.
- Rather than aspiring to be like an entire institution, we should look for exemplary programs/experiences drawn from multiple institutions.
- Identity should incorporate applying liberal arts & sciences skills to solve problems of environmental and socio-economic sustainability situated in our unique location where there are issues of sea level rise, gentrification/affordability, and racism.

INNOVATION (3)
- The College’s traditional culture of innovation has faded and we need to recommit ourselves to aspiring to constantly improve.
- Focus on cheap and efficient delivery of education or on preserving traditions should not replace desire for innovation.

LEADERSHIP (10)
- There are concerns about the quality of the current campus leadership, from the deans to the upper-level administration.
- Deans need to be held to higher performance standards.
- Professional academicians should play a more prominent role in campus leadership.
- Leadership should create a collaborative working space.

LOCAL BUSINESSES (5)
- The liberal arts curriculum and skills should be a foundation upon which to create programs that address the demands of the local business community.
- Expansion of local business and industry provides opportunity for internships and engagement.

MARKETING (9)
- There are areas for improvement regarding the effectiveness of our marketing efforts.
- Many of the events and programs that occur at the College are not well publicized and, therefore, underutilized.
- The College could do a better job promoting the merits of obtaining a liberal arts education.
- Some feel that the College provides misleading information about class sizes and should be more transparent with its messaging to potential students and parents.

MISSION (4)
- The College’s mission should focus on academic excellence rather than a customer satisfaction, business model approach.

MORALE (21)
- Faculty and staff express low morale due to feeling underappreciated and underutilized by an administration that forces strategic decisions onto the campus community without considering the opinion of constituents.

NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS (4)
- More efforts are needed to attract and accommodate nontraditional students.
ONLINE EDUCATION (3)
- There is some support for expanding online course offerings, particularly to appeal to non-traditional and working students.
- Some favor face-to-face interaction over online learning.

PARTNERSHIPS (1)
- The College could improve its relationships with local institutions with the goal of improving our financial situation and to expand our program offerings.

PAY (25)
- There are concerns about the inequities in pay levels across departments and schools.
- There is dissatisfaction about salary compression for associate and full professors.
- Inadequate pay is a major contributor to faculty/staff turnover and low employee morale.
- The College’s pay scale is not comparable to similar institutions and inadequate for the region’s rapidly increasing cost of living.
- The discrepancy between administrator and faculty wages is unjustifiable.
- Pay-for-performance models should be considered for teaching and service activities.
- Without any financial rewards many years in a row, it is difficult to do more for the institution.
- There are concerns of pay inequality for women.
- Adjunct/staff wages are unacceptably low. Retaining quality faculty and staff is becoming more difficult without increase in wages.

PRESIDENT (20)
- The next president should not be a political appointee but a product of a transparent search process.
- The president should have an academic background and experience, the ability to articulate a vision, maintain high moral character and effectively communicate with the campus and community constituents.
- Faculty and staff input should be considered throughout the presidential search process.
- Some feel that an external hire would be preferable.
- All else equal, diverse candidates should be given special consideration during the search process; a woman or an African American president could help overcome the College’s historic reputation of elitism and discrimination.

RECRUITMENT OF STUDENTS (1)
- There should be efforts to improve the recruitment of local high school students and overcome perceptions that the College does not seek local students.
- Investment in campus facilities and athletic programs may lead to more interest in the College.

REPUTATION OF THE COLLEGE (1)
- Many local students do not regard the College as prestigious and do not apply.

RESOURCES (7)
- Resources to support faculty research, teaching and service are perceived to be inadequate.
- Resources are not fairly allocated to various campus constituents.
- Many of the physical structures and the infrastructure on campus are in need of maintenance and repair; older buildings need to be more wheelchair accessible.
- More resources should be made available to support incoming students.
- More fundraising efforts should be adopted to support faculty and students.
- There is a perception that scarce institutional resources are diverted to individuals with peripheral or former affiliations with the College.
SATELLITE CAMPUSES (2)
- There is little support for the North Campus.

SIZE OF THE COLLEGE (4)
- If shrinking enrollment continues, a reduction in faculty size through attrition should be considered.
- Excellence, not size, should be the institutional goal.
- The College currently appears to be at a comfortable size.
- The College should try to grow and acquire more space in downtown Charleston.

STAFF RESPECT AND VOICE (7)
- There is a strong sentiment that staff members have no way to express their opinion, voice their concerns and interact with others outside their office.
- The Staff Advisory Committee has not been effective in instituting change and incorporating staff in the overall decision-making. The opinions and feedback provided by staff go largely ignored by their superiors, faculty and administrators.
- The process under which staff are evaluated and promoted should be reconsidered in order to encourage upward mobility.
- Internal applicants should get stronger consideration than external candidates.

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT / EXPERIENCE (5)
- There is a perception that students are not very engaged in the campus community and that many programs are underutilized by students.
- We should encourage more student activism, particularly as it relates to the community.
- Out-of-state students should receive in-state tuition rates for COFC study abroad programs.
- The institution needs to take care better of its current students.
- Initiatives should be designed to build well-rounded education rather than vocational-based programs.
- The liberal arts model needs to be malleable as the demands of the job market evolve.

STUDENT QUALITY (See also ADMISSION STANDARDS) (9)
- The variation in the quality of the students creates challenges for professors who would prefer not to water-down course material to accommodate poorly prepared students.
- There are perceived challenges between maintaining high academic standards and maintaining high retention rates.
- The customer-service model encourages a weakening of academic standards.
- There is the perception that the quality of students has declined in recent years.
- Maintaining high quality students is key to the long-term future of the institution.
- We need to maintain high educational standards, but assist better students who struggle

STUDENT RETENTION (1)
- Retention rates are an ongoing concern for the College.
- The College should provide more support services for students who are at risk of leaving the College.

SURVEY (11)
- Some respondent felt that some of the survey questions were loaded or linked issues that should have been separated.
- While many respondents felt the survey expressed their main concerns and were grateful for the opportunity, others would have liked to see questions related to work loads, diversity and concerns of adjuncts.

TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES (1)
- The institution needs to deal with the problem of having long-time employees under “temporary” designation.
TRAFFIC (1)
• The College can do more to positively impact traffic issues in Charleston (offer telecommuting for employees under clear guidelines; alter the timing of course offerings to spread out traffic and ease demands on parking)

TRAINING (1)
• There is room for improvement for new employee orientation programs as well as ongoing administrator training.

TUITION (3)
• There are concerns that the current tuition-driven budget model is harming the institution in terms of recruitment and deficits.
• Education at the College should be more affordable

UNDERGRADUATE EXPERIENCE (10)
• Parents and students like and appreciate the individualized, committed education the institution offers
• There are students who want to be challenged and are eager to take advantage of the opportunities we offer
• The focus on high-quality undergraduate training is a selling point that distinguishes the institution from others.

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH (3)
• The personal attention given to students by faculty during collaborative research projects is a selling point for the College among both students/parents and faculty.

VISION (3)
• Inadequate leadership has hampered the College’s ability to fulfill its vision as an elite liberal arts institution.
• The College should follow-through on recommendations from past strategic studies such as those on climate, diversity, and accessibility.

WORKLOAD (7)
• There is the general feeling that the responsibilities of faculty and staff are always increasing while compensation remains inadequately stable; respondents complained about declining quality of life and inadequate work-life balance.
• The lack of raises for consecutive years has harmed morale.
• There is excessive bureaucracy that contributes to low morale.
• Demands for participation in service activities seems excessive and reduces the time available to invest in teaching and research.
• Course releases and sabbaticals should be more widely available for faculty who wish to develop new courses and programs or simply focus on their research.
FACULTY & STAFF COMPARISON

Who are we?

Faculty more strongly supported the aim to be a liberal arts college; a selective, preeminent national university (example, William and Mary). Both were above the neutral midpoint.

Staff more strongly supported the aim to be a comprehensive university (example, George Mason). Both were above the neutral midpoint.

Faculty more strongly disagreed with the aim to be a research university (example, USC). Both were below the neutral midpoint.

How Do We Do What We Do Well?

Faculty more strongly supported the following statements (both were above the neutral midpoint):

- CofC could attract stronger students than it currently does if only we changed our marketing and admissions strategies.
- Marketing of the College should emphasize that in today's rapidly changing work environment, a traditional liberal arts education is more important and valuable than ever.
- The college should increase the proportion of out-of-state and international students as a way of addressing ongoing financial constraints.
- Expectations of faculty and staff involvement in new program development should be accompanied by ongoing and incremental support (resources) from the administration.
- The T&P evaluation should be supportive of faculty engagement with students and the larger community outside of the classroom.

Staff more strongly supported the following statements (both were above the neutral midpoint):

- The college should focus on improving student retention and expanding community college transfers as a way of stabilizing or expanding annual tuition revenue.
- Staff and faculty should be more involved in identifying opportunities for operational cost savings.
- The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment.

Staff supported (above midline), while faculty did not support (below midline), the following statements:

- To survive financially, CofC faculty and staff will need to embrace the customer service model.
- We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CofC who will not be on the main campus.
- In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.
- The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.
- We need to support better our academically weaker students and alter current teaching approaches to service them effectively.
How Do We Create a Healthy Campus Climate?

Staff more strongly supported the following statements (both were above the neutral midpoint):

- The institution needs a more collaborative culture between faculty and staff and among units.
- Certain campus committees (e.g. Welfare, Academic Standards, Budget) should include both faculty and staff as voting members.
- The college needs a general Faculty and Staff Council.

Faculty more strongly disagreed with the following statements (both were below the neutral midpoint):

- Yammer has improved our ability to communicate effectively and efficiently.
- The administration's plans and decision are effectively explained and communicated.
- The current structure of shared governance is effective in giving faculty voice and influence on the institutional development.

Staff more strongly disagreed with the following statements (both were below the neutral midpoint):

- Strategic plans are a waste of time and energy that do not help the institution.
- The structures of shared governance should be restricted to roster faculty.

Faculty supported (above midline), while staff did not support (below midline), the following statements:

- I don’t seek more communal engagement as my voice does not matter.

Faculty were more supportive of:
- Undergraduate programs
- Masters programs
- Ph.D. programs

Staff were more supportive of:
- Certificate programs
- Vocational training
- Online programs
EARLIER (less than 10 years) & LATER (10+ years) EMPLOYEES

Earlier employees supported (above midline), while later employees did not support (below midline), the following statements:

- CoFC should aim to be a comprehensive university (example, George Mason).
- We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CoFC who will not be on the main campus.
- The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.

Later employees supported (above midline), while earlier employees did not support (below midline), the following statements:

- I understand the work and responsibilities of other departments and offices.

Later employees more strongly disagreed with the following statements (both were below the neutral midpoint):

- CoFC has a well-defined identity that is clearly, and consistently communicated to all employees, students, prospective students, etc.
- CoFC should aim to be a research university (example, USC).
- In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.
- Yammer has improved our ability to communicate effectively and efficiently.
- The administration's plans and decision are effectively explained and communicated.
- The current structure of shared governance is effective in giving faculty voice and influence on the institutional development.

Earlier employees more strongly disagreed with the following statements (both were below the neutral midpoint):

- Strategic plans are a waste of time and energy that do not help the institution.
- The structures of shared governance should be restricted to roster faculty.

Earlier employees more strongly supported the following statements (both were above the neutral midpoint):

- The college should focus on improving student retention and expanding community college transfers as a way of stabilizing or expanding annual tuition revenue.
- The college should explore ways to subsidize students' cost of living to make it more financially feasible for students relocating to Charleston for their studies.
- It is acceptable to have different categories of faculty (e.g. teachers, researchers, teacher-scholars) with diverging Tenure and Promotion expectations.
- Certain campus committees (e.g. Welfare, Academic Standards, Budget) should include both faculty and staff as voting members.
- The college needs a general Faculty and Staff Council.
- The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment.
Later employees more strongly supported the following statements (both were above the neutral midpoint):

- Morale is low among your colleagues (in your school/division).

Earlier employees were more likely to say we should aspire to:

- Researcher
- Facilitator of connections with area businesses
- Facilitator of civic engagement

Later employees were more likely to say we should aspire to:

- Teacher
- Teacher-Scholar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who are We?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CofC should aim to be a selective, preeminent national university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(example, William and Mary).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CofC should aim to be a comprehensive university (example, George Mason).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CofC should aim to be a liberal arts college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CofC should aim to be a research university (example, USC).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>5.63</th>
<th>4.04</th>
<th>5.88</th>
<th>3.06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree        7 = Strongly Agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoF&amp;C could attract stronger students than it currently does if only we changed our marketing and admissions strategies.</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing of the College should emphasize that in today’s rapidly changing work environment, a traditional liberal arts education is more important and valuable than ever.</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To survive financially, CoF&amp;C faculty and staff will need to embrace the customer service model.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CoF&amp;C who will not be on the main campus.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should increase the proportion of out-of-state and international students as a way of addressing ongoing financial constraints.</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should focus on improving student retention and expanding community college transfers as a way of stabilizing or expanding annual tuition revenue.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and faculty should be more involved in identifying opportunities for operational cost savings.</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of faculty and staff involvement in new program development should be accompanied by ongoing and incremental support (resources) from the administration.</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree    7 = Strongly Agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>T&amp;P Evaluation</th>
<th>Teaching Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The T&amp;P evaluation should be supportive of faculty engagement with students and the larger community outside of the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to support better our academically weaker students and alter current teaching approaches to service them effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree  
7 = Strongly Agree
How do we create a healthy climate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do We Create a Healthy Climate?</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution needs a more collaborative culture between faculty and staff and among units.</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't seek more communal engagement as my voice does not matter.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yammer has improved our ability to communicate effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administration’s plans and decision are effectively explained and communicated.</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plans are a waste of time and energy that do not help the institution.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current structure of shared governance is effective in giving faculty voice and influence on the institutional development.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The structures of shared governance should be restricted to roster faculty.</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain campus committees (e.g., Welfare, Academic Standards, Budget) should include both faculty and staff as voting members.</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college needs a general Faculty and Staff Council.</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = most important factor
7 = least important factor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Should we have multiple campus sites with distinct identities?</th>
<th>How important is clarity of institutional purpose for morale?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td>39% YES</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td>56% YES</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = most important factor
7 = least important factor
Where do I get most of my information about campus events, initiatives, and plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department Chair</th>
<th>Newsletter</th>
<th>SenateComm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yammer</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most frequent source: 1.0; Least frequent source: 7.0
What should we provide?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What should we provide?</th>
<th>Certificate programs</th>
<th>Vocational training</th>
<th>Online programs</th>
<th>Undergraduate programs</th>
<th>Masters programs</th>
<th>Ph.D. programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who should we serve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who should we serve?</th>
<th>transfer students (from tech colleges)</th>
<th>transfer students (from other 4-year colleges)</th>
<th>traditional undergraduates</th>
<th>working professionals</th>
<th>active-duty military</th>
<th>graduate students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What should we aspire to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Teacher-scholar</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Facilitator of connections with area businesses</th>
<th>Facilitator of civic engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# First Choice Selling Point for Marketing the College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st choice for our selling point as a college</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>public liberal arts and sciences institution in the state of SC</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty interactions with individual students (research, mentoring, smaller classes)</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal arts skills - critical thinking, teamwork, writing - equip students to better apply modern technologies in current and future careers</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential campus in the historic and architecturally beautiful city</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies technology and teaching innovations to create exciting in-class experience</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential learning (internships with companies/non-profits, civic engagement)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business / entrepreneurship</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston location (architecture, gardens, weather)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size of the College – small classes + opportunity for specialized research</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Who are We?</td>
<td>7 = Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 yrs</td>
<td>CofC has a well-defined identity that is clearly, and consistently communicated to all employees, students, prospective students, etc.</td>
<td>CofC should aim to be a comprehensive university (example, George Mason).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>CofC should aim to be a research university (example, USC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do We Do What We Do Well?</td>
<td>1-10 yrs</td>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CofC who will not be on the main campus.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should focus on improving student retention and expanding community college transfers as a way of stabilizing or expanding annual tuition revenue.</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should explore ways to subsidize students’ cost of living to make it more financially feasible for students relocating to Charleston for their studies.</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment.</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is acceptable to have different categories of faculty (e.g. teachers, researchers, teacher-scholars) with diverging Tenure and Promotion expectations.</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree    7 = Strongly Agree
How do we create a healthy climate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do We Create a Healthy Climate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morale is low among your colleagues (in your school/division)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-10 yrs</th>
<th>10 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = most important factor
7 = least important factor
How do We Create a Healthy Climate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>JobCert</th>
<th>GoodRel</th>
<th>Yammer</th>
<th>SenateComm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 yrs</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = most important factor
7 = least important factor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Certificate programs</th>
<th>Vocational training</th>
<th>Online programs</th>
<th>Undergraduate programs</th>
<th>Masters programs</th>
<th>Ph.D. programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 yrs</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## What should we aspire to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>&gt;10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-scholar</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator of connections with area businesses</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator of civic engagement</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WHO ARE WE?
What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations of faculty and staff involvement in new program development should be accompanied by ongoing and incremental support (resources) from the administration.</th>
<th>Marketing of the College should emphasize that in today's rapidly changing work environment, a traditional liberal arts education is more important and valuable than ever.</th>
<th>The T&amp;P evaluation should be supportive of faculty engagement with students and the larger community outside of the classroom.</th>
<th>Our competitive integrity lies in maintaining individualized support for students.</th>
<th>Staff and faculty should be more involved in identifying opportunities for operational cost savings.</th>
<th>The college should focus on developing a 'culture' attractive to students rather than perfecting recruitment strategies.</th>
<th>The college should focus on improving student retention and expanding community college transfers as a way of stabilizing or expanding annual tuition revenue.</th>
<th>The college should increase the proportion of out-of-state and international students as a way of addressing ongoing financial constraints.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOW DO WE DO WHAT WE DO WELL?
What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>6.2</th>
<th>5.8</th>
<th>5.7</th>
<th>5.7</th>
<th>5.4</th>
<th>5.4</th>
<th>5.2</th>
<th>5.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is acceptable to have different categories of faculty (e.g. teachers, researchers, teacher-scholars) with diverging Tenure and Promotion expectations.

The college should explore ways to subsidize students’ cost of living to make it more financially feasible for students relocating to Charleston for their studies.

Staff and faculty should be provided incentives for participating in fund-raising efforts.

CoC could attract stronger students than it currently does if only we changed our marketing and admissions strategies.

The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment.

We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CoC who will not be on the main campus.

The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.

The college should consider shrinking in size (including cutting programs, consolidating offices and reducing employees) in response to budgetary pressures.

In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.

To survive financially, CoC faculty and staff will need to embrace the customer service model.

The college should adjust to the fact that our student body will be weaker in terms of study skills, motivation and academic ability for the foreseeable future.

The College must admit students of lower academic quality than our standards would normally allow to survive this financially difficult period, but only temporarily.

**HOW DO WE DO WHAT WE DO WELL?** What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is acceptable to have different categories of faculty (e.g. teachers, researchers, teacher-scholars) with diverging Tenure and Promotion expectations.</th>
<th>The college should explore ways to subsidize students’ cost of living to make it more financially feasible for students relocating to Charleston for their studies.</th>
<th>Staff and faculty should be provided incentives for participating in fund-raising efforts.</th>
<th>CoC could attract stronger students than it currently does if only we changed our marketing and admissions strategies.</th>
<th>The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment.</th>
<th>We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CoC who will not be on the main campus.</th>
<th>We need to support better our academically weaker students and alter current teaching approaches to service them effectively.</th>
<th>The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase enrollment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.**

**To survive financially, CoC faculty and staff will need to embrace the customer service model.**

**The college should adjust to the fact that our student body will be weaker in terms of study skills, motivation and academic ability for the foreseeable future.**

**The College must admit students of lower academic quality than our standards would normally allow to survive this financially difficult period, but only temporarily.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>3.8</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>2.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We need better leadership from our executive team to improve campus culture and morale. There should be more direct communication between faculty and staff regarding institutional matters (admissions, retention, academic standards, etc.) The administration should allow employees more autonomy in decision-making or involve staff and faculty in its decision-making. The institution needs a more collaborative culture between faculty and staff and among units. I would like to see more informal opportunities to get to know faculty and staff outside my division. We need common spaces (e.g. dining halls, clubs, informal drop-ins, sports teams, book clubs) to promote better communication between employees. Certain campus committees (e.g. Welfare, Academic Standards, Budget) should include both faculty and staff as voting members. Morale is low among your colleagues (in your school/division).

Collaboration is difficult because departments and programs are pitted against each other for resources and limited funding. The college needs a general Faculty and Staff Council. I have ideas about improving the college but have no way to communicate those to others. For an institution of this size, complexity and diversity, it is fine to target different audiences with different messages. I don’t seek more communal engagement as my voice does not matter. I understand the work and responsibilities of other departments and offices. Strategic plans are a waste of time and energy that do not help the institution. The current structure of shared governance is effective in giving faculty voice and influence on the institutional development.
The structures of shared governance should be restricted to roster faculty.
I feel well informed about initiatives on campus outside my division.
The administration’s plans and decision are effectively explained and communicated.
Yammer has improved our ability to communicate effectively and efficiently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I get the most information about events, initiatives and plans on campus from (rank order: 1 - most frequently to 7 - least frequently). You can click and drag to</th>
<th>Salary and benefits</th>
<th>Certainty of job status</th>
<th>Voice in decision-making</th>
<th>Good relations with other employees</th>
<th>Clarity of institutional purpose</th>
<th>Institutional organization and collaboration</th>
<th>Institutional financial health/outlook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW DO WE CREATE A HEALTHY CAMPUS CLIMATE? What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

Rank the following as factors for your good morale (1- most important to 7- least important). You can click and drag to change the ordering:
### Which of the following (select one or more) should the College emphasize as its most compelling selling points?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selling Points</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>faculty interactions with individual students (research, mentoring, smaller classes)</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberal arts skills - critical thinking, teamwork, writing - equip students to better apply modern technologies in</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size of the College – small classes + opportunity for specialized research</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential learning (internships with companies/non-profits, civic engagement)</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston location (architecture, gardens, weather)</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public liberal arts and sciences institution in the state of SC</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential campus in the historic and architecturally beautiful city</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies technology and teaching innovations to create exciting in-class experience</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business / entrepreneurship</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I think the College of Charleston should offer (select one or more):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate programs</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters programs</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online programs</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate programs</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. programs</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Which populations of students should the College of Charleston serve (select one or more)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Populations</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>traditional undergraduates</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer students (from other 4-year colleges)</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer students (from tech colleges)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate students</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working professionals</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active-duty military</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How would you describe the size of the College of Charleston?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>too small</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just right</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too big</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Which of the following should faculty aspire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-scholar</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator of civic engage</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator of connections</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### To succeed, the College of Charleston should adopt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential (i.e. applied) learning</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance education</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student portfolios</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flipped classrooms</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current position at college - Selected Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTPerm</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTTemp</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTPerm</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTTerm</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Years of Employment at the College of Charleston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5yrs</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20yrs</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30yrs</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty Types

- Faculty: 69%
- Staff: 31%

**Total Participants:** 620
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current position at college - Selected Choice</th>
<th>Years of Employment at the College of Charleston:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1-5yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>10-20yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>20-30yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>over 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTTPerm</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTTemp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTPerm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTTPerm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PARTICIPANTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHO ARE WE? What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CofC should have a well-defined identity and mission that is consistently communicated to all faculty, staff, students, prospective students, alumni, and local community.</th>
<th>CofC should focus on quality undergraduate experience.</th>
<th>CofC should aim to be a liberal arts college.</th>
<th>CofC should aim to be a selective, prominent national university (example, William and Mary).</th>
<th>CofC should aim to be a comprehensive university (example, George Mason).</th>
<th>CofC's marketing efforts effectively communicate our identity to the outside world.</th>
<th>CofC should aim to be a research university (example, USC).</th>
<th>CofC has a well-defined identity that is clearly, and consistently communicated to all employees, students, prospective students, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**How Do We Do What We Do Well?** What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<p>| Sentiment | Expectations of faculty and staff involvement in new program development should be accompanied by ongoing and incremental support (resources) from the administration. | Marketing of the College should emphasize that in today's rapidly changing work environment, a traditional liberal arts education is more important and valuable than ever. | The T&amp;P evaluation should be supportive of faculty engagement with students and the larger community outside of the classroom. | Our competitive integrity lies in maintaining individualized support for students. | Staff and faculty should be more involved in identifying opportunities for operational cost savings. | The college should focus on developing a 'culture' attractive to students rather than perfecting recruitment strategies. | The college should focus on improving student retention and expanding community college transfers as a way of stabilizing or expanding annual tuition revenue. | The college should increase the proportion of out-of-state and international students as a way of addressing ongoing financial constraints. |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <strong>Average</strong> | 6.2 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 5.2 |
| <strong>Strongly Disagree</strong> | 0% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 1% | 3% | 2% |
| <strong>2</strong> | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 3% | 4% | 4% |
| <strong>3</strong> | 0% | 5% | 2% | 2% | 3% | 4% | 5% | 8% |
| <strong>4</strong> | 6% | 7% | 16% | 13% | 12% | 20% | 13% | 14% |
| <strong>5</strong> | 11% | 13% | 15% | 22% | 25% | 19% | 26% | 23% |
| <strong>6</strong> | 38% | 30% | 32% | 35% | 29% | 30% | 33% | 29% |
| <strong>Strongly Agree</strong> | 43% | 42% | 33% | 26% | 25% | 24% | 17% | 21% |
| <strong>Total</strong> | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stated Sentiments</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is acceptable to have different categories of faculty (e.g., teachers,</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>researchers, teacher-scholars) with diverging Tenure and Promotion expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should explore ways to subsidize students' cost of living to make</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it more financially feasible for students relocating to Charleston for their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and faculty should be provided incentives for participating in fund-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raising efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CofC could attract stronger students than it currently does if only we changed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our marketing and admissions strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should expand and diversify its professional programs in order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adapt to regional growth and increase enrollment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more satellite programs (like the BPS) and increased distance education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offerings to increase the number of students paying tuition to CofC who will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not be on the main campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to support better our academically weaker students and alter current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching approaches to service them effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should invest more in student amenities on campus to increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrollment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Levels</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to serve a broader range of student interests, we should have different sets of general education requirements for different programs.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To survive financially, CofC faculty and staff will need to embrace the customer service model.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college should consider shrinking in size (including cutting programs, consolidating offices and reducing employees) in response to budgetary pressures.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College must adjust to the fact that our student body will be weaker in terms of study skills, motivation and academic ability for the foreseeable future.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College must admit students of lower academic quality than our standards would normally allow to survive this financially difficult period, but only temporarily.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>3.8</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>2.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HOW DO WE CREATE A HEALTHY CAMPUS CLIMATE?
What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>5.9</th>
<th>5.9</th>
<th>5.9</th>
<th>5.8</th>
<th>5.4</th>
<th>5.2</th>
<th>5.2</th>
<th>5.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We need better leadership from our executive team to improve campus culture and morale.</td>
<td>[5.9]</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be more direct communication between faculty and staff regarding institutional matters (admissions, retention, academic standards, etc.)</td>
<td>[5.9]</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administration should allow employees more autonomy in decision-making or involve staff and faculty in its decision-making.</td>
<td>[5.9]</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution needs a more collaborative culture between faculty and staff and among units.</td>
<td>[5.8]</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see more informal opportunities to get to know faculty and staff outside my division.</td>
<td>[5.4]</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need common spaces (e.g. dining halls, clubs, informal drop-ins, sports teams, book clubs) to promote better communication between employees.</td>
<td>[5.2]</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain campus committees (e.g. Welfare, Academic Standards, Budget) should include both faculty and staff as voting members.</td>
<td>[5.2]</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale is low among your colleagues (in your school/division).</td>
<td>[5.2]</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Strongly Disagree**: 0%
- **Disagree**: 2%
- **Neutral**: 12%
- **Agree**: 25%
- **Strongly Agree**: 45%

**Total**: 100%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration is difficult because departments and programs are pitted against each other for resources and limited funding.</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college needs a general Faculty and Staff Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have ideas about improving the college but have no way to communicate those to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For an institution of this size, complexity and diversity, it is fine to target different audiences with different messages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't seek more communal engagement as my voice does not matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the work and responsibilities of other departments and offices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plans are a waste of time and energy that do not help the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current structure of shared governance is effective in giving faculty voice and influence on the institutional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How Do We Create a Healthy Campus Climate?

What follows are some of the sentiments we heard expressed during our campus-wide faculty and staff gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The structures of shared governance should be restricted to roster faculty.</th>
<th>I feel well informed about initiatives on campus outside my division.</th>
<th>The administration's plans and decision are effectively explained and communicated.</th>
<th>Yammer has improved our ability to communicate effectively and efficiently.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank the following as factors for your good morale (1- most important to 7- least important). You can click and drag to change the ordering:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary and benefits</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty of job status</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice in decision-making</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good relations with other employees</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of institutional purpose</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional organization and</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional financial health/outlook</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I get the most information about events, initiatives and plans on campus from (rank order: 1 - most frequently to 7 - least frequently). You can click and drag to re-order items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E-mails</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
<th>My dept chair/supervisor</th>
<th>Campus newsletters</th>
<th>Local press</th>
<th>Yammer</th>
<th>Senate/committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most</strong></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty interactions with individual students (research, mentoring, smaller classes)</td>
<td>Undergraduate programs</td>
<td>I think the College of Charleston should offer (select one or more):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>traditional undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts skills - critical thinking, teamwork, writing - equip students to better apply modern technologies in</td>
<td>Masters programs</td>
<td>transfer students (from other 4-year colleges)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the College - small classes + opportunity for specialized research</td>
<td>Online programs</td>
<td>transfer students (from tech colleges)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning (internships with companies/non-profits, civic engagement)</td>
<td>Certificate programs</td>
<td>graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston location (architecture, gardens, weather)</td>
<td>Ph.D. programs</td>
<td>working professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public liberal arts and sciences institution in the state of SC</td>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>active-duty military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential campus in the historic and architecturally beautiful city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies technology and teaching innovations to create exciting in-class experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business / entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If some combinations of the above degree programs or student populations do not make sense for one campus, then we should have multiple campuses with distinct identities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you describe the size of the College of Charleston?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>too small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following should faculty aspire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator of civic engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator of connections with area businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum
From: Richard Nunan, Chair
on behalf of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
(George Pothering, Mike Lee, Liz Jurisich, Jannette Finch, Deanna Caveny-Noecker)
To: Faculty Senate
Re: Committee motions concerning Faculty Hearing Committee structure & procedures

The Faculty By-Laws Committee has seven motions to put before the Senate for the March Senate meeting. The first two are simple language modification motions carried over from last year, and are set forth in this cover memo. A third, also included in this cover memo, is simple in concept, but somewhat detailed in execution.

The fourth & fifth motions, concerning the structure and procedures of the Faculty Hearing Committee and the conduct of hearings, are quite complex, running to 23 pages of text (attached). Summarizing the content of that document is the main task of this cover memo.

The sixth motion, a follow-up to some of Dr. Chris Fragile’s recommendations on behalf of the 2016-17 Post-Tenure Review Committee, and to some additional related recommendations from Provost McGee, plus one minor innovation proposed by us, the 2017-18 By-Laws Committee, isn’t too complicated, but a bit detailed, and also attached separately.

Some uncontroversial elements of the 2016-17 recommendations from last year’s ad hoc Committee on Hearings, and from last year’s PTR Committee, have already been incorporated in the Faculty-Administration Manual (FAM hereafter), while Motions 4, 5, & 6 concern the potentially more controversial recommendations of those two Committees.

Finally, Motion 7 is yet another (more substantive) innovation concerning PTR evaluation standards language, proposed by the 2017-18 By-Laws Committee. Because this motion functions quite independently of the other PTR recommendations, we offer it as a separate motion.

Motion 1
FAM 162 VIII.A.9 Class Attendance: Instructors ascertain whether both excused and unexcused absences count in determining the basis for a grade of “WA,” which stands for “withdrawn failure due to excessive absences” and is equivalent to a failing grade.

Request by Mary Bergstrom on behalf of the Office of the Registrar, in order to more accurately reflect what a ‘WA’ grade means, which is an ‘F’, not a ‘W’, with respect to GPA. While the By-Laws Committee recognizes that this modification is unlikely to eliminate all confusion that results from conflating ‘W’ grades (which are not ‘F’ s) and ‘WA’ grades (which are), it is a step in the right direction. Changing the grade labels involves complications which fall well outside the Committee’s authority.
Motion 2  
FAM 164  VIII.A.11 Final Examinations and Final Course Grades: At the request of the student, a faculty member should make available information and/or an evaluation of the student’s progress prior to the drop date withdrawal deadline. Request by Lynn Cherry, to comply with current institutional language.

Note that the language in brown is not part of the proposed language for these motions. It is simply explanatory gloss for the Senate’s information. Language in blue is new language proposed (or endorsed) by the 2017-18 By-Laws Committee, in these particular cases to replace strike-through language. That color-coding will apply throughout these motions.

Motion 3  
Replace binary-gendered pronouns with gender-neutral substitutes throughout the FAM.

The practical significance of this motion is illustrated throughout the long attached motion on matters governing faculty hearings. Traditional English usage practices are profoundly sexist, a practice which academic institutions have been combatting for some time now. But traditional usage is also profoundly binary with respect to third person gender references such as he/she or her/him. Not everyone subscribes to this dual-valued allocation of genders, and we believe the College should be more inclusive in its official documents. Doing this does sometimes necessitate resorting to plural pronouns in contexts where singular forms would be more traditional. But the practice is becoming more commonplace, and thus our language is arguably evolving, in terms of what is now regarded as grammatically correct.

Although the effects of this motion are already integrated into the attached proposal on hearings, the intent of the motion is much broader, eventually encompassing the entire FAM. Conversely, Motions 4 & 5 below, concerning substantive changes in matters relating to faculty hearings, can be approved with or without passage of Motion 3. The pronoun modification language in the body of the attached document can be reversed again, if needed.

The next two motions are really an integrated unit, but they have been separated out because they involve distinct ratification processes. Motion 4 concerns the By-Laws section of the FAM. As an alteration in the Faculty By-Laws, in addition to securing Senate endorsement, it must be approved also by the Faculty as whole. Motion 5 concerns hearing-related issues which fall outside the By-Laws section of the FAM. Those recommendations, if approved by the Senate, have to then be acceptable also to the Administration.

Motion 4  
Modify By-Laws Article V, Section 3 (Standing College Committees), Subsection B.12 (Faculty Hearing Committee), pp. 26 and 27 of current FAM, so as to restructure committee membership as explained in attached detailed motions on hearings (pp. 2-4 of 1st attachment).
This proposal is a variation, with some new innovations, on a recommendation conveyed by the ad hoc Committee on Hearings to the Faculty Senate at the April 2017 meeting. As the ad hoc Committee originally suggested, we have proposed eliminating the distinction between regular and alternate committee members in favor of a committee of the whole. But we have also proposed augmented its size by one member, increased the number of full professors by two, and proposed a different method for selecting individual hearing panels. Our reasoning for these measures is included in the attachment. Red ink indicates language retained (or deleted) from the ad hoc Committee’s original proposal concerning Hearing Committee structure last year. (See page 1 of first attachment for a detailed summary of the color-coding.)

The remaining 19 pp. of the first attachment constitute Motion 5. But for the sake of organizational clarity, the motion is subdivided by its distinctive parts below.

Motion 5

A. Clarification of FAM language governing the rights of probationary faculty and adjuncts to grieve certain kinds of allegations about the circumstances of their termination or non-renewal before a faculty hearing panel. (FAM pp. 72 and 78-80, plus enumeration modifications on 89-91; attachment pp. 5-11)

This is entirely a By-Laws Committee innovation, motivated by concerns about the lack of clarity in FAM language governing the grievance rights of Instructor-rank faculty, and adjunct faculty. It’s unrelated to the ad hoc Committee’s recommendations, but nonetheless also relevant to the larger hearing process reform initiative in which the ad hoc Committee and By-Laws Committee have both been engaged.

B. Timing sequence issues with regard to hearing procedures. (FAM 125, 126, 149, 181; attachment pp. 12-16) These actually come up throughout the attachment (see summary on p.1)

The By-Laws Committee has made some necessary modifications of timing issues in some locations, but in general, the By-Laws Committee parts company with the ad hoc Committee on the question of shortening timing intervals. The By-Laws Committee’s reasoning for its reversal on this question is laid out in detail on attachment p. 14

C. Conflict of interest findings by faculty hearing panel. (FAM p. 182; attachment pp. 17-18)

The proposal offered by the ad hoc Committee concerning conflicts of interest has been both augmented and modified significantly. It has also been moved from the location originally proposed by the ad hoc Committee. Note also the distinction between the hearing panel and the Hearing Committee (the ‘committee of the whole’). That was intentional.

D. (Mostly) minor repairs of language governing hearing and post-hearing procedures. (FAM 183, 186-188, legendary missing last page of FAM; attachment pp. 19-23).

Some of these modifications were devised by the ad hoc Committee last year, others by the By-Laws Committee this year. Note (potentially) limited role of the alternate panel member, whose existence in this proposal is another By-Laws Committee innovation. The last page, discovered in a secret Pentagon storage room near the Ark of the Covenant, was unavailable to the ad hoc Committee last year.
Motion 6
Modify FAM language governing Post-Tenure Review Procedures to clarify timing issues about when a faculty member can come up for a Superior Rating. (Second attachment)

This motion reflects the more substantive elements of the set of recommendations submitted to the Senate by Chris Fragile on behalf of the 2016-17 Post Tenure Review Committee during the April 2017 Senate meeting. The more straightforward details, like the more straightforward details in the ad hoc Committee on Hearings recommendations, were incorporated in the draft 2017-18 FAM over the 2017 summer, and approved then by the 2016-17 and the 2017/18 By-Laws Committees, after which they were ratified by the Senate at the September 2017 Senate meeting. The chief difference between the 2016-17 PTR Committee recommendations and Motion 6 involves a softening of the PTR Committee recommendations concerning deferments.

Motion 7
Insert new FAM language governing Post-Tenure Review standards of evaluation for a Superior Rating. (Third attachment)

This motion is largely self-explanatory. It is offered in the hope of securing both more flexible and more consistent application of the PTR standards for a superior rating.

The By-Laws Committee thanks Senate members in advance for taking the time to read through and deliberate carefully about these detailed and rather complex motions.
By-Laws Committee Partial Affirmation, Proposed Modifications, & Additions to 2017-18 Ad Hoc Committee on Hearings Recommendations (1 Mar 2018)

Color coding:

Black: Language as currently appears in 2017-18 FAM (includes 09/17 changes ratified by Senate)

Red: Language modifications proposed by ad hoc Committee on Hearings in March 2017

Green strike-through: Old language to be stricken on advice of ad-hoc Committee

Blue: New (or restored) language recommended by the By-Laws Committee

Brown: Explanatory rationales from By-Laws Committee (Ad hoc Committee rationales are available in last year’s Senate archives. By-Laws Committee has not repeated them here.)

In general, strike-through means language proposed to be stricken; thus, red strike-through refers to language proposed by ad hoc Committee, not yet added to FAM, but proposed for replacement by more recent By-Laws Committee language. Black strike-through is By-Laws Committee action applied to existing FAM language.

Pagination & §#s based on current FAM (different from ad hoc Committee FAM pages & §#)

Pages with procedural timing issues (& resolution of a timing conflict):

27 By-Laws V.3.B.12.c (Hearing Committee meeting within 15 vs. 20 days—eliminated)

125 T&P Procedures (President’s decision within eleven working days instead of 2 weeks)

126 Hearing Procedures (Notice of grievance to be filed w/in 15 vs. 20 working days; President’s decision within 10 working days of receipt of Hearing)

149 Termination Hearing (Notice of grievance to be filed w/in 15 vs. 20 working days)

181 Hearing Procedure (Notice of grievance to be filed w/in 15 vs. 20 working days);

182 Hearing Committee 5 vs. 10 days for jurisdiction decision (By-Laws recommends 7) No more than 15 vs. 20 working days after that meeting to schedule Hearing

187 Resolution of timing conflict between notification by grievant about problems in Hearing and decision by President.

In general, the By-Laws Committee recommends against the ad hoc Committee’s proposed reduction of the 20-day windows for the tasks of notifying the Hearing Committee of a grievance and then for scheduling a hearing, out of concern for adequate time for grievant to prepare a case. (See detailed comments at bottom of FAM p. 126 below.)
c. Grievance Procedure:

(1) Any faculty member with a grievance should first report it to her or his Department Chair.

(2) If a faculty member is not satisfied with the settlement provided by the or Department Chair, or if the or chair is directly related to the grievance, the faculty member should request in a letter to the Chair of the Grievance Committee a hearing before the Grievance Committee. The letter should state the nature of the grievance.

(3) On receipt of such a written request, the committee Chair will convene the committee to hear the complaint within ten days (normally excluding Christmas, other state holidays, Spring holidays, and from the day after spring Commencement through August 15).

(4) If in the judgment of the committee a grievance is determined to exist, the committee shall attempt to resolve the matter through mediation or other appropriate action.

(5) Grievances unresolved by the Grievance Committee will be referred by the committee Chair to the appropriate authority.

(6) The committee shall supply a faculty member who has brought a grievance before the committee with a written statement of the committee decision in the case.

12. Faculty Hearing Committee

a. Composition: Twelve Eleven (11) tenured faculty members, at least six four of whom shall hold the rank of Professor. Each September the committee Chair will divide the Hearing Committee pool into two panels of six members each, including at least three at the rank of professor, with one of those three designated as a panel alternate. Panels are to be constructed with an eye to broad disciplinary distribution, and submitted by the Chair to the Committee as a whole for majority approval. Each panel will determine its own chair at that time. If a case emerges over the course of the academic year, one of the panels will be assigned randomly to that first case, and the remaining panel to any second case. Any additional cases will be heard by new panels, randomly constituted out of the committee pool, minus any members obliged to recuse themselves for conflicts of interest. In the event of conflicts of interest emerging in the first two panels as initially constituted, members will be swapped as needed, by the Committee Chair, subject to majority approval by the Committee as a whole. Five members will be randomly among those with no conflict of interest, including two members with the rank of Professor. In the event of a second hearing in a given academic year a second committee of five will be constituted. Members of the first committee may elect to not be considered for service in the second Hearing. Each iteration of a group to hear a case will consist of five members, two of whom must have the rank of Professor. Two years of service is encouraged.
Each Hearing Committee member will normally serve three consecutive academic years. Committee assignments shall be staggered as determined by the Committee on Nominations and Elections. Early each Fall term, committee members will undergo training sessions relevant to Hearing Committee responsibilities, conducted by past committee members or others with relevant expertise. It will be the committee Chair’s responsibility to organize the training sessions.

Composition: Five tenured faculty members, at least two of whom shall hold the rank of Professor, and six tenured alternates, at least two of whom shall have the rank of Professor, who shall be available in case of a conflict of interest involving a member of the committee. In the event of the disqualification of a committee member because of a conflict of interest, a replacement of comparable rank shall be chosen from among the alternates, if possible.

The recommendation to assign the committee Chair the novel task of selecting panel members early in the year is a By-Laws Committee attempt to apply AAUP best practices advice to the task of designating hearing panel membership, by doing it prior to the emergence of any particular grievant, so as to minimize the possibility of conflict of interest issues that might otherwise arise in panel selection. The additional suggestion about swapping out panel members is an acknowledgment of the possibility that conflicts of interest could arise nonetheless, depending on the identity of a particular grievant and the constitution of a particular panel. The panel member swapping policy is the By-Laws Committee’s proposed solution to that contingency.

The innovation of adding an alternate to each panel is a By-Laws Committee addition to the ad hoc Committee’s novel recommendation to reconstitute the previous mix of regular and alternate Hearing Committee members as a collective panel pool. This additional new element was devised to render it less likely that a panel’s full complement of members might be disrupted if a panel member is unpredictably unable to complete panel duties. If such a contingency appears unlikely at the close of a hearing, the alternate could then be excused from participation in post-hearing deliberations, and merely be “on call” for participation if a regular panel member abruptly becomes unable to participate at some later point in the panel’s post-hearing deliberations. This proposal does necessitate adding a twelfth member to the Hearing Committee, one at the rank of Professor. The total number of members at the rank of Professor would increase from four to six, compared to the existing policy, and from five to six, compared to the ad hoc Committee’s recommendations. This undeniably poses a new challenge for the Nominations Committee.

Concerning proposed addition in blue at top of this page (bottom of what is now FAM page 26), advising training sessions for Hearing Committee members, the ad hoc Committee did not address the issue in their proposal to the Senate, although they did discuss the topic. This language serves to put both the Faculty and the Administration on notice that training sessions should be conducted, while leaving open the details by precisely whom, or on what topics training sessions would be conducted, prior to the emergence of specific cases. The general idea is to try to insure, in part, that Hearing Committee members are reasonably conversant with hearing process regulations in FAM, but also that they are familiar with the specific nature of the substantive rights possessed by grievants, and with the nature of committee members’ quasi-judicial responsibilities, and authority, within hearings. Case studies would be an appropriate vehicle to use in training sessions.
b. Duties:

(1) To hear the cases of tenured faculty members against whom the College has made formal, written allegations of a nature that, if substantiated, could lead to their dismissal for cause.
(2) To hear cases of non-tenured faculty members against whom the College has made formal, written allegations of a nature that, if substantiated, could lead to their dismissal during the course of a contract year.
(3) To hear cases involving alleged discrimination in denial of tenure, dismissal at the end of the contract term, promotion, compensation, or work assignment.
(4) To hear cases involving alleged violation of academic freedom.
(5) To hear cases involving alleged violation of due process.
(6) To hear election appeals.
(7) To hear other matters referred by the President to the Committee where a due process hearing is necessary.

c. Grievance Procedure:

On receipt of a written request, the committee Chair will normally convene the Committee within thirty days (normally to exclude all College holidays and from the day after spring commencement through August 15) fifteen working days in accordance with procedures for the committee outlined in the Faculty Hearing Committee Faculty/Administration Manual, Appendix E, Article X, Section I, the section laying out the procedures governing “Grievances Before the Faculty Hearing Committee.” In addition to the procedures set forth in X.I, the Committee will also follow pertinent policies located in Articles IV Conduct of Faculty and Administrators, V Terms and Records of Faculty and Unclassified Administrators, VI Evaluation of Faculty, and VII Faculty Discipline, Misconduct, and Termination, which details the Hearing Committee’s procedure.

13. Faculty Research and Development Committee

1. Composition: Nine faculty members. The Provost, or a representative selected by the Provost, shall serve as ex-officio member without a vote.
2. Duties:

(1) To support and encourage faculty research, professional advancement, and development at the College.
b. All members of the faculty, whether tenured or not, are entitled to protection against illegal or unconstitutional discrimination by the institution, or discrimination on a basis not demonstrably related to the faculty member’s professional performance, including but not limited to gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, race, color, religion, national origin, veterans’ status, genetic information, or disability, as proscribed by law and described in the College’s policy *Prohibition of Discrimination and Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment and Abuse.*

4. Complaints of Violation of Academic Freedom or of Discrimination in Non-reappointment

If a faculty member on probationary or other non-tenured appointment *(including adjuncts)* alleges that a decision against reappointment was based significantly on considerations violative of academic freedom or governing policies concerning illegal or institutional discrimination by the institution *based on, but not limited to* gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, race, color, religion, national origin, veterans’ status, genetic information, or disability, *he or she* may file a grievance with the Faculty Hearing Committee. *(See Art. X.I. for procedures.)*

5. Academic Freedom for Administrative Personnel Holding Faculty Status

The foregoing regulations apply to administrative personnel who hold faculty status and rank, but only in their capacity as faculty members. All other unclassified academic administrators who allege that a violation of academic freedom or improper discrimination contributed to a decision to terminate their appointment to an administrative post, or not to reappoint them, are entitled to the procedures set forth in Section IV.A.

6. Political Activities of Faculty Members

As responsible and interested citizens in their community, faculty, staff and unclassified administrators of the College should fulfill their civic responsibilities and are free to engage in political activities.

The College policy related to such matters is that the holding of county, municipal and other local offices is generally permitted. However, the holding of such an office must not conflict with the performance of the faculty member’s assigned College duties. If, at any time, it appears that there is a conflict or substantial interference with assigned duties, the College has the right to claim a conflict of interest or substantial interference and request that the faculty member either resign the political post or take leave without pay from the College. Further, this also applies if any of the political duties give the officeholder an exercise of control.
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over the College or any of its activities through financial support, direction of academic research, extension functions or employment of personnel.

Where a faculty or staff member seeks county, state or federal government political office, he or she must discuss said candidacy with the Provost before becoming a candidate. The purpose of this discussion is to try to determine, in advance, whether a conflict of interest or substantial interference with assigned duties would result. If it is determined it would, the Provost will recommend to the President that the candidate be granted leave without pay for the duration of an election campaign and/or term of office before the date of officially taking office. The terms of such leave of absence will be set forth in writing and the leave will not affect unfavorably the tenure status of a faculty member, except that time spent on such leave will not count as probationary service unless otherwise agreed to. (See “Statement on Professors and Political Activity,” AAUP Bulletin 55 [Autumn 1969]: pp. 388-89.) The President has the sole discretion to accept or reject the request for a leave of absence.

7. Academic Freedom for Graduate Students

In no case will a graduate or teaching assistant be dismissed without having been provided with a statement of reasons and an opportunity to be heard before a duly constituted committee. (A dismissal is a termination before the end of the period of appointment.) A graduate or teaching assistant who establishes a prima facie case to the satisfaction of a duly constituted committee that a decision against reappointment was based significantly on considerations violative of academic freedom, or of governing policies against improper discrimination as stated in Section IV.A (above), will be given a statement of reasons by those responsible for the non-reappointment and an opportunity to be heard by the Faculty Grievance Committee.

8. Other Academic Staff

1. In no case will a member of the academic staff who is not otherwise protected by the preceding regulations which relate to dismissal proceedings be dismissed without having been provided with a statement of reasons and an opportunity to be heard before a duly constituted committee. (A dismissal is a termination before the end of the period of appointment.)

2. When a member of the academic staff feels that his/her non-reappointment is the result of a violation of academic freedom or discrimination (see Sections IV.A and IV. C), the individual may bring the matter before the Faculty Hearing Committee. If the committee finds that the facts, as preliminarily stated in the

No changes are proposed for p. 73. It’s included here (along with p. 72) for reference, to aid understanding of subsequent modifications on FAM pp. 78, 79, & 80 (immediately below).
2. Evidence of accuracy of the curriculum vitae (academic credentials validated by appropriate documentation);
3. Contract and/or letter of initial employment;
4. Job description for unclassified administrators;
5. Letter authorizing sabbaticals or other leaves of absence;
6. Copies of recommendations and action on tenure, promotion, and third-year evaluation;
7. Copies of annual salary letters;

The appropriate Academic Dean or Dean of Libraries will maintain copies of annual and third-year evaluations and correspondence relating to professional development, honors and College employment.

D. Probationary Appointments for Tenure-track Faculty and Instructors

Any appointment of a faculty member to a tenure-track position, or at the Instructor rank, is considered probationary since the individual has not yet fulfilled the required conditions to be considered by his or her peers and the administration for continuous appointment; i.e., for tenure or promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor.

1. Crediting of Prior Experience Toward Fulfillment of Probationary Period

At the College of Charleston probationary appointments are for one year, subject to renewal. Unless stated otherwise in the initial contractual letter of appointment to any rank sent to an instructional faculty member or librarian, the probationary period before the individual is considered for tenure is six years. Credit may be granted for a faculty member’s full-time service at other institutions of higher learning. The number of years of credit for prior service normally will not exceed two years even though the faculty member’s total probationary period in the academic profession is thereby extended beyond the normal maximum of six years. The initial letter of appointment will state the years of prior service that will be counted toward fulfillment of the probationary period and the year in which he/she will be considered for tenure.

(Rev. April 2007)

Librarians appointed to the College Library with three or more years of service in other libraries but who do not yet evidence appropriate records of activity in professional growth and development and/or institutional or

23 This section is based directly upon and quotes extensively from the 1982 RIR, 2. Probationary Appointments, p.22

Modification of the section heading and insertion of the ‘Instructor’ rank in the opening paragraph in section D are designed to insure that faculty at Instructor rank are covered by the same protections as probationary T-T faculty. The Committee surmises that the reference to ‘Instructors’ in subsection 3 (next page) may have been intended to expand this coverage accordingly.
community service will be given less than maximum credit in order to have more time to prepare for tenure review.

A period of scholarly leave of absence up to one year may count as part of the probationary period as if it were prior service at another institution. The faculty member, the Department Chair, the Dean, the Provost and the President will agree in writing to this provision at the time the leave is granted.

2. Information Relating to Standards and Procedures of Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

The instructional faculty member or librarian will be advised at the time of the initial appointment to review the sections of this Faculty/Administration Manual describing the substantive institutional standards and procedures generally employed in decisions affecting renewal and the granting of tenure and to discuss these with the Department Chair (or Dean of Libraries). Any special standards adopted by the faculty member’s department will be transmitted by the Department Chair (or Dean of Libraries) at the time of appointment and be reviewed, together with the institutional standards, during the annual evaluation of the member by the Chair. The faculty member will be advised of the time when decisions affecting renewal or tenure are ordinarily made, and will be expected to submit material that he or she believes will be informative.

3. Procedure for Considering Non-Renewal of a Faculty Member (Including Instructors) in First or Second Year of Probationary Appointment

From time to time it is important to the welfare of students or faculty in a department for a faculty member to be terminated at the end of a first-year or second-year appointment. Since state legislation (South Carolina Code of Laws, Section 8-17-380) provides that non-renewal of a one-year contract at the end of the contract period is not grievable, such terminations are not in violation of the terms of employment. Nonetheless, since terminations based on discriminatory intent, violations of academic freedom, or inadequate consideration are all grievable under other provisions of the South Carolina Code, federal law, and/or this Manual, all decisions to terminate probationary appointments at the end of the first or second year must be accompanied by written notification of cause. Such notification is necessary to establish that the grounds for termination are indeed not grievable.

If the Chair or any other tenured member believes that non-renewal is appropriate, the Chair should convene the tenured faculty for a discussion of the chair’s proposed action, and seek to reach group agreement. If a consensus cannot be reached, the Chair will present in writing to the Dean

Subsection 3 heading has been modified by the insertion of parentheses around the expression ‘Including Instructors’ for purposes of clarification of intent of subsection. By-Laws Committee assumes this language was added shortly after Instructor and Senior Instructor ranks were created. Deleted last line of Subsection 3’s first ¶ is replaced by a new line at end of section (next page).
the various positions represented by the group within the department as well as his her their position. The decision on whether to terminate or continue will rest with the Chair unless the Dean has serious reservations. In such a situation, the Provost will review all of the pertinent information and, after discussing the case with the Chair and the Dean, will rule on which action is to be taken.

In the case of individuals in their first (second) year of probationary appointment, individuals must be notified by March 15 (December 15) if their contract will not be renewed at the end of the contract year. Except under exceptional circumstances, a new faculty member credited with two years or more probationary time should be given at least one year’s notice in the event his or her their contract is to be terminated.

After a decision has been reached, the Chair should notify the Provost at least two weeks before the dates specified in the Faculty/Administration Manual so that the Provost can inform a first or second year faculty member that he she they will not be given a contract for the following year.

The College is under no obligation to reappoint any untenured faculty member at the expiration of the contract year. But termination decisions for probationary faculty must be accompanied by written notification of the reasons for termination. If the probationary faculty member finds that explanation unpersuasive with respect to grievable allegations (see first paragraph of subsection), they may file a grievance with the Faculty Hearing Committee. (See Article X.I for procedures.)

4. Employment of Faculty Who are Not United States Citizens

All faculty members who are not United States citizens must hold a valid visa or permanent alien registration card at all times while employed by the College of Charleston. This is a condition of employment and faculty members who do not comply with this condition are subject to termination.

E. Adjunct Faculty Appointments

Adjunct faculty and adjunct library faculty appointments are typically for a single semester, and never for longer than a year’s duration, although they may be renewed at the discretion of the relevant administrative authority. Since adjunct faculty are temporary appointments, no obligation exists on the part of the College to evaluate such a special appointee with a view to continued employment past the end of the fixed term, nor to give any notice in respect of such an intention.

In no case will an adjunct faculty member be dismissed without having been provided with a statement of reasons and an opportunity to be heard before a duly constituted committee. (A dismissal is a termination before the end of the period of appointment.)

Last sentence in Subsection 3 is intended to clarify the purpose of the written notice of cause.
Since state legislation (South Carolina Code of Laws, Section 8-17-380) provides that non-renewal of a temporary adjunct contract at the end of the contract period is not grievable, such terminations are not in violation of the terms of employment, and therefore require no written justification. Nonetheless, non-renewals based on discriminatory intent, violations of academic freedom, or inadequate consideration are all grievable, even for adjunct faculty, under other provisions of the South Carolina Code, federal law, and/or this Manual. Therefore, when an adjunct faculty member alleges a violation in their non-reappointment on any of these three grounds, they may request written notification of cause. If the adjunct faculty member finds that explanation unpersuasive with respect to grievable allegations (as listed above), they may file a grievance with the Faculty Hearing Committee. (See Article X.I for procedures.)

F. Unclassified Administrators

1. Annual Evaluation of Administrators: The evaluation of College of Charleston unclassified administrators takes place annually. Evaluation processes vary depending on the nature and conditions of the administrative appointment. The President is evaluated by the Board of Trustees.

2. Dismissal for Cause: Dismissal of an administrator prior to the end of an employment contract term shall be only for adequate reason (cause) and may be grieved using the procedure in Section 3 which follows below. The following adequate reasons for termination of a contract before the end of a contract term are the same as those described for faculty in Art. VII.C.

Modify Sections V.F (p. 89), V.G (p. 89), V.H & V.I (p. 90), V.J (p. 91) to V.G through V.K.

Rationale for proposed insertions governing adjunct faculty rights:

At present, there are express protections of the sort inserted here for dismissals or non-reappointments of tenure-track faculty in their first or second year of appointment, and (the By-Laws Committee assumes), similar protections for faculty occupying probationary Instructor lines.

Similarly, in IV.C.5 “Academic Freedom for Administrative Personnel Holding Faculty Status” (p. 72 of the current FAM), IV.C.7 “Academic Freedom for Graduate Students” and IV.C.8 “Other Academic Staff” (p. 73 of current FAM), such protections are provided for administrators acting in faculty capacity, for graduate students, and for non-faculty academic staff, possibly with some pedagogical duties. (The nature of the classification is somewhat unclear.) There is also more general protection of “all members of the faculty, whether tenured or not,” against discrimination and violation of academic freedom, in IV.C.3.a (p. 71), IV.C.3.b, and IV.C.4 (p. 72). But adjunct faculty are nowhere explicitly included in comparable language.

More specifically, while the first two groups, probationary tenure track faculty and probationary instructors, can be terminated without cause under SC law, cause must nonetheless be provided in order to vindicate those faculty members’ rights against terminations that were discriminatory or violations of academic freedom. (See V.D.3 on p. 79 above.) In the case of faculty occupying Instructor lines, the By-Laws Committees changes recommended on pp. 78 & 79 are designed to
make it explicit that Instructor lines are included under that form of protection. But the same is not expressly true for adjunct faculty terminated either through dismissal or through non-renewal.

The absence of the proposed insertions is seriously problematic with respect to adjunct faculty rights with regard to academic freedom and non-discrimination. If an adjunct faculty member at risk of termination never has to be given any reasons for the termination, how can that individual pursue an action through the Hearing Committee in an effective way? At present, it appears that administrators acting in faculty roles, graduate students, non-faculty academic staff, probationary faculty in tenure-track and Instructor lines, all have that opportunity. (Tenured faculty and Senior Instructors can only be fired for cause—the latter during their contracted employment period.) Adjunct faculty, regardless of number of years appointment, are not expressly covered. Yet adjunct faculty, too, are entitled to non-discriminatory treatment & protection of academic freedom.

Note that the language governing non-renewals of adjuncts does not require universal notifications of reasons for non-renewals, but it does enable protesting adjuncts to compel such explanations.
12. Provost’s Recommendation for Tenure and Promotion Candidates

After the Advisory Committee has made its written recommendation to the President, the Provost may interview the candidate as part of his/her their independent evaluation of the candidate. The Provost’s recommendation shall be submitted in writing to the President by the announced deadlines. In all cases in which the Provost’s recommendation is negative or reverses an earlier decision, the Provost will provide a copy of his/her their recommendation to the candidate, chair, Dean, and chair of the Advisory Committee simultaneously with notice to the candidate of the President’s decision. (Rev. Apr. 2009; Rev. Apr. 2012)

13. President’s Decision

The President shall make a final determination within 2 weeks eleven working days after she/he receives recommendations from all of the following: the department evaluation panel, the appropriate Dean, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Provost. All such recommendations shall be submitted to the President no later than March 1 of each year. In addition to these recommendations, the President shall also have access to, and may consider, other materials used by any or all of the foregoing during the course of their respective evaluations. Once a final decision is made by the President, and within the 2 weeks after the last recommendation is received by her/him, the President shall inform the candidate, the Provost, the Dean, and the evaluation panel chair in writing, of her/his decision. (Rev. Apr. 2009)

13. Appeal to the Faculty Hearing Committee

a. A denial may only be appealed to the Faculty Hearing Committee when the faculty member alleges that the denial was based upon any of the following three grounds:

i. Discrimination, defined as differential treatment based upon gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, age, race, color, religion, national origin, veterans’ status, genetic information, or disability; or,

ii. Violation of academic freedom, as it relates to freedom of expression; or,

36 Deadlines for earlier stages of the review process are prior to March 1 and are announced by Academic Affairs each year.
37 This list was revised in August 2017 to reflect the College’s policy Prohibition of Discrimination and Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment and Abuse.
iii. Violation of due process, as provided in the College’s published rules, regulations, policies and procedures.

b. The appeal shall be heard as a grievance before the Faculty Hearing Committee, and the faculty member should follow the procedures of that committee in requesting a hearing. The notice requesting a hearing before that committee must be filed within twenty fifteen working days of receipt of the President’s written decision.

c. The President’s decision will be made within ten working days after he/she reviews receipt of the recommendation of the Faculty Hearing Committee, and receipt of any objections about the conduct of the hearing or correction of errors of fact from the grievant, or notice of waiver of that right by the grievant.

14. Discretionary Appeal to College of Charleston Board of Trustees

a. The President’s decision in cases heard by the Faculty Hearing Committee may be appealed to the College of Charleston Board of Trustees. The decision as to whether or not to accept the appeal is within the sole discretion of the Board.

b. When an appeal to the College of Charleston Board of Trustees is sought, the faculty member must file a Notice of Appeal within 10 working days of receipt of the President’s decision. This Notice must be in writing and sent to the Chair of the Board, with a copy to the President. The Notice of Appeal must identify the issues to be raised in the appeal and the grounds for the appeal.

c. If the Board decides to hear the appeal, the Chair of the Board will establish a reasonable timetable for disposition of the appeal, which will be communicated to all parties.

d. At the Chair’s discretion, appeals will be heard by the entire Board or by a committee of not less than three Board members appointed by the Chair for that purpose.

e. Appeals will be heard on the record established in the Faculty Hearing Committee. The Board shall have available for its review all tape recordings, statements, documents and evidence accumulated during the appeal process. Briefs and oral arguments will be permitted but are not required. Oral arguments may be made by the parties or by their attorneys.

f. The Board shall submit its decision in writing to the President and the faculty member. The decision of the Board is final.

The College of Charleston Board of Trustees passed this policy concerning appeals by faculty members in January 1985. This list was revised in August 2017 to reflect the College’s policy Prohibition of Discrimination and Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment and Abuse.

IV.D.13.b includes first of several ad hoc Comm. recommendations to shorten Hearing deadlines.
This series of proposals revolved around the idea that, by reducing the statute of limitations in which to file a complaint, and the interval from filing to a scheduled hearing, from 20 working days to 15, the ad hoc Committee on Hearings hoped to increase the likelihood that the work of a hearing panel in a tenure or promotion denial case, or denial of a superior PTR rating case, might stand a reasonable chance of completion prior to the May 15th end-of-contracted annual ‘regular duties’ of faculty.

In the view of the By-Laws Committee, this move toward contraction of the time frames fails to take account of the hardships already experienced by grievants faced with the prospect of composing a case in a very short time period, largely on their own, without any prior experience in such a project, and often when they are immersed in routine pedagogical duties which already consume a lot of their time on a daily basis. Making that interval even briefer for the convenience of faculty serving on a Hearing Committee panel just does not seem a compelling justification for eroding the due process rights of grievants.

Part of the thinking of the ad hoc Committee appears to have been that prospective grievants are, or should be, already aware of the likelihood, or at least risk, of a negative outcome in their tenure, promotion, or PTR evaluation, and should be undertaking preliminary preparations well before the President’s final decision is issued. This may be true in many cases of these types, although perhaps not all, but this argument loses sight of the fact that prospective grievants may emerge from other administrative processes which take them much more by surprise. Not all grievances are about tenure decisions.

The emendation suggested in blue in 13.c is newly proposed to conform with the (already existing) requirements of the Post-Hearing language in the last two pages of the FAM (included below). Time has to be allowed for the grievant to file notice with the President about any procedural concerns about the manner in which the Hearing was conducted, or about any alleged errors of fact upon which the hearing panel, or the President, may otherwise be relying in coming to their respective judgments in the case.
C. Termination of Tenured Faculty Members “For Cause” and Termination Procedure

1. Conditions Under Which A Tenured Faculty Member’s Contract Can Be Terminated

Until the retirement of the faculty member and subject to the procedure stated hereinafter, an appointment with tenure may be terminated by the College only for adequate cause. The following will be considered adequate cause for the termination of tenure:

   a. Demonstrably bona fide institutional contingencies such as curtailment or discontinuance of programs or departments;
   b. Financial exigencies that are demonstrably bona fide but only after giving the faculty member 12 months’ notice;
   c. Physical or mental inab
   d. Incompetence, neglect of duty, immorality, dishonesty, including but not limited to plagiarism, falsification of academic credentials or vitae, conduct unbecoming a faculty member, conviction of violating the criminal laws of any state or the United States, willful and repeated violations of College rules, regulations or policies. (Faculty Responsibilities to Students, Code of Professional Conduct, Faculty/Administration Manual Art. VIII.A, and Statement of Professional Ethics, Faculty/Administration Manual Art. IV.B.)

Termination Procedure

   a. Termination for cause of a tenure appointment shall be preceded by a written notice of proposed dismissal which states the reasons for the proposed dismissal and gives the faculty member an opportunity to be heard by the Faculty Hearing Committee. Formal written notice may be preceded by discussions between the faculty member and appropriate administrative officers looking toward a mutual settlement.

   b. If the faculty member elects to have a hearing before the Committee, they must file a Notice of Grievance with the Chair of the Committee, with a copy to the President, within twenty fifteen working days (normally to exclude all College holidays and from the day after spring commencement through August 15) of receipt of the notice of proposed dismissal. The procedures followed by the Faculty

[continues on p. 150…]

For reasons stated at bottom of FAM p. 126 above, the By-Laws Committee takes the view that the ad hoc Committee recommendation in the last ¶ above is a bad idea. The By-Laws Committee suggests retaining the 20-day period.
h. Other matters referred by the President to the committee where a due process hearing is necessary.

2. Requesting a Hearing

a. A Notice of Grievance must be filed by the grievant faculty member with the Chair of the Faculty Hearing Committee, with copies to the President, Provost and the grievant’s Department Chair and Dean, within twenty-five working days of the act complained of and shall contain the following information:

(1) the date of the act complained of and the name of the person or persons alleged to have been responsible for the act;\(^{49}\)

(2) a clear, detailed statement of why the grievance falls within the jurisdiction of the Faculty Hearing Committee;

(3) a detailed description of evidence in support of the position of the grievant;

(4) the names of potential witnesses for the grievant, with a short statement of the subject matter of their potential testimony;

(5) the specific remedial action or relief sought;

(6) a brief summary of the results of previous discussions on the issues involved which the grievant has had with the person or persons responsible for the action complained of, if such discussions have been held; and

(7) a preference as to whether a hearing, if held, is to be open to the public or closed to all except the committee and those involved in the hearing.\(^{50}\)

Failure to file a Notice containing this information within the specified time limitation shall be a waiver of grievance and of all rights under these procedures, absent a finding of good cause for a reasonable delay, as determined by the Hearing Committee.

\(^{49}\) If the grievance is based upon a Notice of Dismissal, a copy of the Notice or letter giving notice should be attached to the Notice of Grievance.

\(^{50}\) The President and Provost may also express a preference for an open or closed hearing by informing the chair of the committee of the preference before the committee’s first meeting.

For reasons stated at bottom of *FAM* p. 126 above, the By-Laws Committee takes the view that the ad hoc Committee recommendation in 2.a above is a bad idea. The By-Laws Committee suggests retaining the 20-day period.
b. The committee assigned hearing panel will meet within five ten seven working days after receipt of the Notice of Grievance by the Chair in order to determine whether the grievance has been properly and timely filed and whether the nature of the grievance is within the jurisdiction of the Hearing Committee. If the committee hearing panel decides that the grievance should be heard, it shall set a date for the hearing, which must be held within twenty fifteen working days of the committee panel meeting. The committee panel shall also decide, taking into account the preferences expressed, whether the hearing will be open or closed.

c. Within two working days after the committee panel determines the matters set out in (b) above, the panel chair shall notify in writing the grievant, the President; the Provost; the Dean; and, where applicable, the Department Chair of the decision of the committee as to whether or not the grievance will be heard.

(1) If the decision is negative, the committee panel chair will specify the committee’s reasons for not hearing the grievance.

(2) If the decision is positive, the committee panel chair shall include in this written notice the date, time and place of the hearing and the committee’s decision as to whether or not the hearing will be open or closed.

d. Within two working days of receipt of the committee panel’s decision as to whether or not a hearing will be held, the Provost shall give written notice to the committee panel and the grievant of the name of the representative who will be representing the College at the hearing. The college representative may be any of the following persons, so long as they are not an attorney and has no conflict of interest in the proceeding: the Provost, a Vice President, a Dean, a Department Chair or any other member of the College community deemed appropriate by the Provost.

3. Pre-Hearing Procedures

a. If the grievant intends to have counsel at the hearing, he/she the grievant shall notify the committee hearing panel and the college representative at least ten (10) working days prior to the date of the hearing. Failure to so advise within this time period may result in a delay of the hearing.

b. The Hearing Committee assigned hearing panel has the authority to determine whether there are conflicts of interest among proceeding participants. If the conflict of interest involves a hearing panel member, that individual will be asked to step down from that particular panel, and another committee member will be appointed to substitute by the Chair of the Hearing Committee, subject to the approval of the Hearing Committee as a whole. If the conflict of interest involves the college’s representative, that individual and the Provost will be so advised, although a decision about recusal in that case rests ultimately with the Provost.
Other perceived conflicts of interest will be dealt with as the hearing panel deems appropriate. Such determinations may be appealed to the Hearing Committee by the grievant, the college’s representative, or any other affected party, for reconsideration.

be. At a mutually convenient time, but at least three working days prior to the hearing, the committee panel chair shall hold a pre-hearing meeting with the parties in order to:

In X.I.2.b, the ad hoc Committee recommends lengthening the time period for a jurisdictional decision by the Hearing Committee to ten days. Five days does seem a little short, even for a jurisdictional decision which does not seriously assess the substantive merits of the grievant’s complaint. The simple logistics of scheduling a meeting involving six faculty members may take a week on its own. Seven working days seems a good compromise to the By-Laws Committee.

For reasons stated at bottom of FAM p. 126 above, the By-Laws Committee takes the view that the ad hoc Committee recommendation to reduce the time between the hearing panel’s jurisdictional decision and the scheduling of the hearing (also in paragraph X.I.2.b) is unwise. The By-Laws Committee suggests retaining the 20-day period.

Paragraph X.I.3.b is new, inserted here to signal that deliberation in which the panel may engage concerning conflict of interest questions is normally a pre-hearing matter. (Of course that might not always be the case.) It has been moved from the original location proposed by the ad hoc Committee on Hearings, which would have inserted it in the activities to be conducted at the pre-hearing meeting. In the view of the By-Laws Committee, that is rather late in the day to be making decisions about some conflict of interest issues. More importantly, the deletion of red language in X.I.2.d, and the added blue language in X.I.3.b represent substantive modifications, additions, and elaboration of last year’s recommendation from the ad hoc Committee on Hearings.

In the view of the By-Laws Committee, the language proposed to be stricken from the ad hoc Committee on Hearings’ recommendation concerning X.I.2.d reflects the By-Laws Committee’s conviction that, however desirable and prudent such a policy might be, the Faculty Hearing Committee does not have the statutory authority to compel the Provost to reverse a decision on who has been appointed as college representative. Perhaps more to the point, the current Provost is unlikely to concede that authority to the Faculty Hearing Committee. Quite possibly, the same may be true of future provosts, as a matter of respecting statutory lines of authority.

On the other hand, the By-Laws Committee does recognize, and agree with, the ad hoc Committee’s observation that it is on occasion important for a hearing panel to speak out on what it perceives to be various sorts of conflicts of interest, including ones concerning potential conflicts of interest involving the college representative. A Provost can of course ignore such advice on grounds of honest disagreement with the judgment, but once that judgment becomes a matter of a hearing record, the Provost may be doing so at the institution’s peril. In other respects the X.I.3.b blue language is designed to give some executable force to the ad hoc Committee’s proposal.
(1) exchange the names of witnesses to be called at the hearing;

(2) exchange documents and other evidence to be used at the hearing;

(3) enter into stipulations of fact;

(4) achieve other appropriate pre-hearing objectives to ensure a fair, effective, and expeditious hearing.

Witnesses and evidence not exchanged at this meeting will not be allowed to be presented at the hearing except for good cause shown, as determined by the committee.

4. The Hearing
   a. Attendance

   (1) If the hearing is to be closed, attendance shall be limited to:

      (a) members of the committee hearing panel, including the alternate

      (b) the grievant

      (c) the grievant’s advisor or lawyer, if desired

      (d) the college representative

      (e) the college’s General Counsel

      (f) witnesses while giving evidence

      (g) AAUP observer, if requested by either party or the committee

      (h) recording equipment operator and/or court reporter, if any.

   All participants in a closed hearing will be asked to maintain the confidentiality of the hearing to the extent reasonably possible.

   1. (2) If the hearing is to be open, the only parties to be excluded will be the witnesses, who may not attend the hearing.
may withdraw any portion or all of the grievance, with the consent of the Committee hearing panel. In all cases of withdrawal with consent, the grievant shall not have the privilege of reopening the same grievance at any time in the future.

c. Sequence of Events

(1) Grievant may make an opening statement.

(2) College representative may make an opening statement.

(3) Grievant presents witnesses and evidence on his or her behalf, subject to cross-examination by the college representative, and members of the Committee panel, including the panel alternate.

(4) College representative may request the committee to rule against the grievant and terminate the hearing because the grievance is not supported by the evidence presented by the grievant. The grievant may argue against this request. If the request is granted, the committee shall terminate the hearing and prepare its report. If the request is denied, the hearing proceeds to the next stage.

(5) College representative presents witnesses and evidence, subject to cross-examination by the grievant, and members of the Committee panel, including the panel alternate.

(6) The committee panel may call new witnesses, or recall previous ones, whose testimony it deems relevant or helpful. New witnesses are subject to cross-examination by the grievant and the college representative.

(7) Rebuttal evidence (either testimony or documents) may be presented by either party, the grievant doing so first.

(8) The grievant may make a closing argument, followed by the college representative. The grievant may rebut the closing argument of the college representative if he/she so desires.

(9) If the committee panel would find them helpful, it may request that additional written arguments be filed by both parties, with a copy furnished to the opposing party, within a reasonable period of time stipulated by the Committee panel.

5. Post-Hearing Procedures

The panel alternate has been added in (3) and (5), on the theory that we would want to allow that individual to participate in questioning witnesses, because of the possibility of being involved in subsequent deliberations. Normally, the alternate would step down after the completion of the hearing, as reflected in X.I.5.a on p. 187 (next page).
Following the hearing, the committee assigned hearing panel, exclusive of any remaining alternate, shall meet in closed executive session with all other persons excluded. In this session, the committee panel shall prepare its report, based upon the evidence presented at the hearing. The written report shall contain:

(1) Statement of purpose of the hearing;
(2) The issues considered by the committee;
(3) Findings of fact as to each major issue raised by the parties; and
(4) Recommendations, if desired.

The committee panel’s report shall be forwarded to the President, the grievant and the College representative within ten working days of the conclusion of the hearing. As soon as reasonably possible after the conclusion of the hearing, normally within fifteen working days. The findings and recommendations, if any, of the committee are advisory only and shall in no way bind or commit the President to any suggested course of action. The report must have the concurrence of a majority of the committee panel. A minority position may be expressed either in a section of the committee panel’s report or as a separate report.

If the findings and/or recommendations are adverse to the grievant, he/she they shall have ten working days from the date the report is submitted to the President within which to submit in writing to the President for consideration any specific objections he/she they may have regarding the conduct of the hearing or alleged errors in the findings of fact. A copy of these objections must be furnished to the committee panel and to the college representative.

Within ten working days after receipt of the committee panel’s report, and receipt of any objections about the conduct of the hearing or correction of errors of fact from the grievant, or notice of waiver of that right by the grievant, the President shall either submit to the grievant, the committee panel and the college representative his/her their written decision on the case or refer the matter back to the committee for further response and recommendation before rendering a final decision.

The President will not be bound by the findings or recommendations contained within the committee’s report, which are advisory only.

The President may request that the committee make available to him the a recording and/or transcripts of the hearing and any all other evidence presented.

Concerning the reference to the alternate in X.I.5.a., if the alternate had to replace a regular panel member, there is no “remaining alternate”. Otherwise, this is when the alternate steps down.
If the President’s decision is contrary to the recommendations of the Committee panel, the President will include within his/her decision a statement of his/her reasons for not accepting the recommendations of the committee.

If the President’s decision is adverse to the grievant, he/she the President shall give written notice to the grievant of his/her right to appeal the decision to the College of Charleston State Board of Trustees, when applicable.
VI.J. **APPEAL TO STATE COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

*Appeal to the College of Charleston Board of Trustees*¹

A. The State College of Charleston Board of Trustees will hear appeals of grievances on the grounds specified in I.A., B and C X.I.1.a through f, listed at the beginning of this the previous section (on “Grievances Before the Faculty Hearing Committee”). In their sole discretion, they may choose to hear appeals of other matters.

B. When an appeal to the State College of Charleston Board of Trustees is sought, the grievant must file a Notice of Appeal within ten working days of receipt of the President’s final decision. This Notice must be in writing and sent to the Chair of the Board, with copies to the President, the committee panel chair and the college representative. The Notice of Appeal must identify the issues to be raised in the appeal and the grounds for the appeal. Upon receipt of the Notice of Appeal, if he/she the panel chair has not already done so, the chair of the committee shall transmit to the President, for presentation to the Board, the tape recording of the hearing, as well as all documentary evidence introduced at the hearing.

C. If the appeal must be heard by the Board, or if the Board decides to hear a discretionary appeal, the Chair of the Board will establish a reasonable timetable for disposition of the appeal which will be communicated to all parties.

D. At the Chair’s discretion, appeals will be heard by the entire Board or by a committee of not less than three Board members appointed by the Chair for that purpose.

E. Appeals will be heard on the record established in the grievance procedure at the College. The Board shall have available for its review the tape recording of the hearing, the evidence submitted at the hearing, the report of the Committee panel and any subsequent decisions or recommendations which followed the Committee panel’s report. Briefs and oral arguments will be permitted but are not required. Oral arguments may be made by the parties or by their attorneys. The Board shall submit its decision in writing to the grievant, the President, the chair of the Committee panel and the college representative. The decision of the Board is final.

VII.K. **PROHIBITION AGAINST RETALIATION**

*Prohibition Against Retaliation*

A grievant shall not be harassed, intimidated, or otherwise penalized for utilizing these grievance procedures.

¹ The State College Board of Trustees passed this policy concerning appeals by faculty members in January 1985.
Section VI.H.5.a.6 \((FAM\ 139)\); similar language appears in VI.H.3.b \((FAM\ 137)\)

H.5 Preparation and Submission of...Packet for Superior Rating

a.(6) Candidates seeking a superior rating must also furnish clear evidence that they continue to perform at the level expected for the promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the criteria of the Faculty/Administration Manual, as indicated in Sect VI.A.4.c. for instructional faculty and VI.C.4.d for library faculty.

Insert new subsection VI.H.6 (following discussion of PTR packet preparation for Superior rating, and preceding current sections 6 Dept. Chair’s & Dean’s Recommendations, 7 PTR Committee’s & Provost’s Recommendations), 8 Remediation Plans, & 9 Appeals). All those remaining subsections are to be renumbered as 7, 8, 9, and 10, respectively:

6. Specific Criteria for a Superior Rating

Awarding of a superior rating to a faculty member who has previously achieved the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, requires clear evidence that the candidate has continued to perform at the level expected for that earlier promotion, in accordance with the criteria set forth for such promotions in the Faculty/Administration Manual, as indicated in Section VI.A.4.c. for instructional faculty and VI.C.4.d for library faculty.

It should be noted, however, that the somewhat streamlined review process for a Superior Rating at this career level reflects the recognition that, having once satisfied the standard for promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, expectations for sustaining this level of achievement might be met in a variety of ways. While sustaining an active research record, including scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications, or professional evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts), is still a critical element in any successful application for a superior rating, it may be recognized that, while specific departmental policies governing publication standards may exceed the College-wide norm for tenure and for promotion (preamble of Sect. VI.A.4), application of such higher standards may not always be appropriate to require for a superior rating, unless a departmental policy explicitly states that they are. Faculty at the rank of Professor are occasionally called upon to fulfill time-consuming leadership roles in professional service, sometimes for lengthy periods, either within the College or in their larger professional community. They are also occasionally called upon to shoulder teaching duties outside of customary expectations because of departmental or institutional needs. Such responsibilities can make the fulfillment of higher departmental publication standards for tenure and promotion quite onerous, and evaluators at the various levels of PTR review may be mindful of those realities in the cycle of academic careers. There are multiple avenues to the fulfillment of exemplary performance in one of the specified competency areas and satisfactory performance in the other two, or to performance at the level of significant achievement in all three areas.

We have had issues in the past with different PTR Committees focusing in some years on the potential implications of the streamlined PTR standards, and in other years on a more literal interpretation of the language about mirroring precisely the perceived expectations for the initial promotion to the rank of Professor. This attempts to clarify the superior rating standard, with an eye to reducing such inconsistencies of interpretation from one PTR committee to the next.
Memorandum

From: Deanna M. Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and Richard Nunan, Chair, Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual on behalf of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (George Pothering, Mike Lee, Liz Jurisich, Jannette Finch, Deanna Caveny-Noecker)

To: Faculty Senate

Date: March 5, 2018

Re: proposed revisions to Section VI.H, Post-Tenure Review, of the Faculty/Administration Manual

Colleagues,

The attached text outlines proposed changes to the Faculty/Administration Manual language on post-tenure review, addressing several matters.

During the Fall 2016 semester, the 2016-17 Post-Tenure Review Committee discussed post-tenure review schedules and deferrals. Their deliberations resulted in four recommended clarifications or revisions to the post-tenure review process, which were subsequently communicated to Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker via email by Chris Fragile, Chair. The proposed revisions to Articles VI.H.1, 4a, and 9b in the attached are intended to operationalize the 2016-17 Post-Tenure Review Committee’s recommendations. A copy of their recommendations is attached for your convenience.

Additionally, in January 2017, Provost McGee communicated to the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review some possible reforms to the tenure and promotion process that had been identified by him and our dean colleagues. His memorandum included a recommendation on the frequency of promotion applications, suggesting that faculty members be limited to two unsuccessful promotion applications in a row and “precluded from applying for promotion for a third consecutive year, though another application or applications could be filed after the ‘off’ year.” While that has not been implemented for reviews for promotion to Professor, item (2) in Article VI.H.1 below is intended to introduce a parallel notion for post-tenure review.

With the last major revisions to our post-tenure review process, effective with the 2014-2015 academic year, we collaboratively sought to streamline the post-tenure review process for candidates seeking a satisfactory rating. The proposed changes in Article VI.H.6 are intended to further streamline reviews in the case where a department chair is seeking a satisfactory rating, while maintaining the role of the department chair for other post-tenure review candidates in their department in that case.
Deanna,

Thank you for coming to our PTR meeting today. I felt like it was a productive discussion. Based upon our conversation with you and further discussions by the committee, we would like to suggest the following clarifications/revisions be made to the PTR process:

1. Clarification should be made that all tenured faculty must go up for either promotion or some sort of post-tenure review at least once every 6 years. With the new, streamlined process for getting a satisfactory PTR, we see few reasons (see #4 below) for this not to be standard practice.

2. Faculty at the rank of professor should be eligible to seek a superior ranking on post-tenure review in any year, starting 6 years after their promotion and not more frequently than once every 6 years, irrespective on when their last satisfactory PTR occurred. This is to clarify that the “clock” for superior is not tied to the “clock” for satisfactory. To us, this seems fair given that someone who goes up for superior one year and only gets a satisfactory is eligible to go up for superior again the next year. That same option, of going up for a superior the year after a satisfactory (or any other year), should be available to all faculty.

3. The period of review for either type of PTR should be the period since promotion or the last review OF THAT TYPE. So, a satisfactory review period should never exceed 6 years, though for a superior, the period could be much longer.

4. With these clarifications/revisions, we do not feel there is any need to retain the deferral option, except possibly in the case of faculty approaching retirement. If a faculty member is not ready to seek a superior rating, they should still be reviewed for satisfactory.

We have not tried to propose specific language as it would probably be best to sit down and carefully revise the whole PTR section of the FAM. We’d be happy to work with you and other committees on campus, as necessary, to pursue these revisions.

Regards,
Chris Fragle
for the PTR committee
VI. EVALUATION OF FACULTY

H. Post-Tenure Review

1. Post-Tenure Review Schedule

Each tenured faculty member must undergo post-tenure review at least once every sixth year, except that a tenured Associate Professor or Librarian III may elect to undergo review for promotion to Professor or Librarian IV, respectively, instead, with the understanding that the post-tenure review clock is reset by the promotion review.

Faculty members holding the rank of Professor or Librarian IV are eligible to seek a superior post-tenure review rating in their sixth year in rank at the College or any subsequent year, provided the faculty member does not receive a superior post-tenure review rating more often than every sixth year subject to two conditions: (1) A faculty member may not receive a superior post-tenure review rating more often than every sixth year, and (2) A faculty member who makes an unsuccessful application for a superior rating may seek a superior again the next year but may not apply for a superior rating more than two years in a row. A Professor or Librarian IV who seeks a superior rating but receives a satisfactory may seek a superior rating in a subsequent year, without waiting another six years. Similarly, a Professor of Librarian IV who seeks a satisfactory rating may subsequently seek a superior without waiting six years from the satisfactory review. Additionally, a faculty member seeking a satisfactory rating is eligible to pursue a superior rating the following year and the subsequent year should his or her initial application for superior be unsuccessful.


The restriction to coming up no more than two years in a row came from the Provost in consultation with the deans, not from the 2016-17 PTR Committee. The same principle has not been applied to the case of standing for promotion to Professor. Under our current policy, upon failure to achieve promotion, a candidate may continue to request such a review in repeat years.
4. Deferments

   a. Faculty members may petition the Post-Tenure Review Committee for the postponement of their post-tenure reviews based on extenuating personal circumstances, exceptional professional commitments, or valid medical reasons which must be documented in the petition. Petitions must be endorsed by the faculty member's Chair and Dean. Postponements will be approved only under extraordinary circumstances and will not normally extend more than one academic year. Decisions by the Post-Tenure Review Committee regarding deferments shall be communicated in writing. Decisions by the Committee may be appealed to the Provost within one (1) week of the candidate's notification. The Provost's decision shall be final.

   (Rev. Aug. 2018)

This modification constitutes a modest move in the direction of the 2016-17 PTR Committee’s recommendation, which was to eliminate all deferments of the six-year PTR cycle other than pending retirement cases. That recommendation seemed a little too uncompromising to the 2017-18 By-Laws Committee. This was our compromise with that particular recommendation.
6. Recommendations by the Department Chair or Panel and the Dean

Post-tenure review is normally conducted by the Department Chair. A departmental post-tenure review panel will be convened only in the case of post-tenure review of the Department Chair or a Department Chair seeking a superior post-tenure rating. When the Department Chair herself or himself is up for post-tenure review and is seeking a superior rating, the most senior tenured member of the department (other than the Chair) will convene, and normally chair, a departmental post-tenure review panel consisting of three tenured faculty members (including the panel chair). Panel members will normally be drawn from the home department according to seniority. When necessary to complete the panel, additions will be drawn, following the same criteria, from departments with related areas of study. The panel may not include Department Chairs from external departments. No tenured faculty member concurrently subject to post-tenure review may serve on this panel. The panel will exercise the same responsibility with respect to the Department Chair’s candidacy that the Chair exercises in all other cases. This departmental panel will also review all other cases of faculty seeking a superior post-tenure rating coming up for post-tenure review at the same time as the Department Chair. The Department Chair or departmental panel will recommend a rating for each such candidate’s performance. The Department Chair will handle all cases of candidates seeking a satisfactory post-tenure rating, except his or her own, which will be handled by the Dean, acting in the capacity of both the Chair and the Dean in such cases.

In the case of a candidate requesting a superior rating, the Department Chair (or the departmental panel) shall forward to the candidate’s Dean by the announced deadline the candidate’s packet with a letter justifying the Chair’s (or panel’s) concurrence or failure to concur with the candidate’s self-evaluation. At this time a copy of the letter shall be forwarded to the candidate. Should the rating of the Chair (or departmental panel) be satisfactory rather than superior, the candidate may forward a letter of rebuttal to his or her dean and his or her Department Chair no later than five (5) days before the first day of the beginning of the Spring Semester.
The Deans will review packets and forward written recommendations to the Office of the Provost.

In the case of a candidate being considered for a satisfactory rating, the Department Chair (or the departmental panel) shall meet with the Dean to discuss a summary of the candidate’s annual performance evaluations. In addition, the Chair or panel will forward to the candidate’s Dean a written statement that the candidate meets the criteria for a satisfactory rating or a brief summary of the ratings received on annual performance evaluations in the area of teaching and a statement that the candidate receives an unsatisfactory rating. At this time a copy of the letter shall be forwarded to the candidate, the Provost, and the Post-Tenure Review Committee. (Rev. Apr. 2009, Aug 2018)

This set of recommendations, designed to minimize the work of the departmental panel, by limiting the panel’s responsibility to encompass only cases where a department chair under evaluation has a potential conflict of interest, is an innovation proposed by the By-Laws Committee rather than the 2016-17 PTR Committee or the Provost. (Hence the blue color-coding instead of red.) The word ‘normally’ is inserted in the first paragraph to provide for the possibility that someone other than the most senior member of the evaluating department might occasionally be called upon to chair the departmental PTR evaluation panel, depending on the circumstances at the time.
9. Appeals
   a. Appeal of decision on completion or remediation plan
   
   …

b. Appealing a Satisfactory Rating
A candidate who receives a satisfactory rating after having sought a superior rating and who alleges that the rating was based upon discrimination, violation of academic freedom or violation of due process may follow the appeals procedure outlined in Art. X.I. If the candidate feels that the satisfactory rating received is incorrect for reasons other than those listed in the preceding paragraph, a formal appeal is not allowed. However, the faculty member may remain eligible to undergo review for a superior rating in the subsequent years or the following year, as outlined above, without waiting six years for the next scheduled review. (Rev. Aug. 2014, Aug. 2016, Aug. 2017, Aug. 2018)

To make the language of this paragraph consistent with the modifications suggested earlier. (See p. 135 above.)
Honors College Reformed Curriculum: The Basics

Logistical Matters:

1) Goal of this proposal is to establish a new structure for the honors curriculum. We can support the curriculum with current courses that are in the catalog. However, once the structure is approved, we plan to work across departments to add courses, to review and refine current course descriptions, and in some cases, to delete current catalog courses.

2) The Honors curriculum will work like the general education curriculum in that the structure will be tied to the catalog year in which it is implemented (presumably fall 2018), but the courses that count toward each category will not. In other words, as we add/revise/delete courses, they will count in a given category both retrospectively and prospectively.

Curriculum Structure:

Students must accrue 25 HONS credits (honors-specific courses) to satisfy the Honors Core

Students must complete 9 hrs of Honors Directed (3 hr independent study/internship and 6 hr Bachelor’s Essay). These do not need to be HONS; can be completed under a departmental course number.

In the first year, students must complete: Honors Academic Writing (4 credit hours), Beyond George Street (Honors 1-credit FYE), Honors Engaged (year-long service learning project)

Students must complete courses in the following categories:

1) Honors Foundations (at least one course; 100/200 level; 3-5 credit hrs each)
   a. Grounded in disciplinary thinking and methodology
   b. Expose students to essential ideas/concepts in a discipline, the methodologies to address them, and tools to understand them.
   c. Encourage students to make connections between theory and practice through active/hands-on learning, exposure to primary sources, and analytical writing assignments.
   d. Courses are accelerated, contextualized or applied in a way that is distinct from non-honors course offering in same area.

2) Quantitative Literacy
   a. Math 120 (or AP credit) OR Honors Calculus OR Honors Conceptual Tour of Mathematics
   b. Honors Statistics will be added to course options

3) Exploring Complexity and Diversity Colloquia (at least two courses; 200/300 level; 3-4 credit hrs each; prerequisite - at least one Honors Foundations course)
   a. Focus on central and enduring question
   b. Courses offered within interdisciplinary themes (Foundations of Western Civilization, Values and Traditions in the Non-Western World, Elements of Human Culture and Expression, Ethics, History and Philosophy of Science, Diversity and Sustainability, Self, Other and Society, Inquiry, Discovery and Innovation
   c. Critical dialogue in small group setting
   d. Encourage rigorous approach to processing information and deepening understanding
   e. Study of foundational texts/sources that have shaped thinking on focal question

4) Advanced Studies (at least one course, 300-level Honors Special Topics or 200- or 300-level Honors Disciplinary; 3-4 credit hours; prerequisite - one Honors Foundations, one Honors Colloquia, others according to needs of course)
a. Deep analysis of subject matter in a particular discipline or across disciplines
b. Focus on advancing ability to synthesize information from divergent sources to derive novel conclusions and innovative solutions.