Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on Tuesday 14 February 2017

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 14 February 2017 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. **Call to Order, 5:05 PM**

2. **The 17 January 2017 minutes** (pdf) were approved as posted.

3. **Announcements and information**
   The Speaker encouraged everyone to sign the roll found at both doors.

4. **Reports**

   **Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney**

   Speaker McNerney attended the Board of Trustees meetings, Jan. 26 and 27, but left most of the information shared at those meetings to the reports from others, in consideration of the full agenda. Speaker McNerney did mention the Placement of Core Values on plaques in every classroom. The Speaker was inspired to work with administration to develop the plaques after seeing similar plaques at Hollins University. The plaques serve as a reminder to students and ourselves about our community. He stated that a similar plaque will hold the Honor Code.

   The Speaker mentioned that the Ad hoc Committees on Grievance and Hearing are meeting regularly and accomplishing much work. These committees are expected to provide reports in March.

   The Speaker mentioned a forum held by the Faculty Senate and the local chapter of the AAUP on shared governance on February 10. He yielded the floor to Bill Olejniczak who shared a brief report.

   Olejniczak said that two faculty members from Francis Marion University were invited to campus to share thoughts on shared governance and what FMU might be doing right to be consistently listed in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*’s “Great Colleges to Work For.” FMU is a South Carolina public university, which is governed by the same oversights and constraints and the same state legislature as the College of Charleston. FMU has some advantages of space and flexibility over the College of Charleston. The FMU faculty shared their views, and Olejniczak reported they were interested in gathering what are they doing well and what can we replicate.

   Following is a summary of what FMU faculty said, according to Olejniczak:

   1) **Clarity of vision.** FMU knows exactly what its function is; meeting the higher educational needs of a particular region of SC. All faculty and staff understand and buy into that vision.
2) The vision is shared. Steps are taken to form community, everyone pulls together for a common purpose. Sense of shared commitment has been achieved by practical steps in terms of pay. Even when the state did not mandate pay raises, FMU found a way to offer minimal pay raises. Rewards are prioritized according to need. Christmas bonuses are granted to all those below a certain pay threshold.

Also contributing to the shared vision is a relatively small administrative staff. Faculty and staff share in task development with limited administrative supervision. People feel they have a stake in determining and implementing policy.

3) Transparency. Information on campus is available, transparent, and factual. Their Chair of Faculty (the equivalent of our Speaker of the Faculty) is included in the weekly meetings of senior staff, which includes budgeting discussions. Department chairs have direct access to their Provost.

4) Research is generally well-supported. Faculty members can draw up to $2750 per year in professional development funds. Departments can supplement this amount as they see fit. A college-wide research committee can reward stipends up to $4,000. For the last several years, the Provost has authorized a stipend for individuals on sabbatical.

5) Social interaction is important. Social events are routine, inclusive, and supported. Guests from the community, students, staff, faculty and Trustees all attend events. Some examples are annual faculty-staff breakfast and annual December party.

6) Leadership of Fred Carter, their president. Dr. Carter has been President for 15 years. When asked, FMU faculty expressed that they believe the culture attributed to Dr. Carter can continue, since it's been well-established over the last 15 years.

Speaker McNerney said that Simon Lewis will share draft of the notes in the shared governance listserv and over Yammer.

There were no questions.

The Speaker spoke about his continued communication with the Board of Trustees about faculty input for evaluations of Provost and President. The Speaker took many questions at January’s Board meeting, and expressed that he senses the Board will consider this further. The Speaker is gathering information from the leadership at other South Carolina institutions as well as those others in the Colonial Athletic Association to find out about their evaluative processes. He intends on collecting this data to share it in a report for Board and at the March Senate meeting.

There were no questions.

Provost Brian McGee (pdf)

Provost McGee spoke about the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The plan has been finalized and prepared for review by SACSCOC.
Provost McGee mentioned that the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs (LCWA) is led by Interim Dean Tim Johnson (Classics) and they are now planning the search for the new Dean of LCWA, in collaboration with faculty and other constituents of the School. The faculty have made clear their desire for a thoughtful process.

Provost McGee spoke of some of the elements of the Tenure and Promotion process that could be improved. A memo has been sent to the Faculty Welfare Committee with some questions, and the Provost thanked the Committee and the Deans for their work on improving the process.

The Provost reported that the name of the proposed major, Commercial Real Estate Finance, was approved by the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs for the Commission on Higher Education (CHE), the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and the full Board of Trustees. The Provost plans to meet with the Faculty Curriculum Committee about the name and proposal.

Provost McGee spoke about the launching of a new larger Bridge programs with Trident Technical College announced by President McConnell on January 23, 2017. The Provost thanked everyone who was involved in working on the launch and development of the program. It is a work in progress, and classroom management issues will occur in Fall semester. The Provost thanked Chairs working with the registrar to meet classroom needs. He encouraged everyone to please continue to have patience.

The Provost offered a few comments on the night's agenda. There is a proposal to create a new committee, to support and sustain adjunct faculty. He encouraged some consideration of how the workload will be shared with the Faculty Welfare Committee.

The Provost mentioned near the end of the agenda a discussion on a Grade Forgiveness policy that has been worked on by the Student Government Association, and introduced by the Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid Committee. The Provost thanked everyone for their work on the topic and appreciates the work of students.

The Provost accepted questions.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if the Faculty Welfare Committee's responses to the Provost and Deans suggestions for improving the Tenure and Promotion process publicly available?

The Provost replied that the email received from the Committee reflect different points of view, and are the beginnings of a conversation.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator (at large, HSS) spoke from his perspective as a senior faculty member that he has become aware of a high degree of anxiety experienced by junior faculty about the new student complaint system. Senator Kelly asked for reassurance that a possible abuse of the system would not occur, including that it would not be used to suppress academic freedom on campus. Some student groups seem to be publishing guidelines on registering complaints against faculty who are expressing "leftist ideas, or something like that."
The Provost explained that the system was designed to more conveniently comply with regional accreditation. It is not designed to create a new panopticon to examine faculty, but it is designed as a successor to previous systems to allow students, after exhausting the informal complaint process, to enter a formal complaint process. The Provost has not ready any complaints using the new system; they are managed and passed back to Chairs, like in the old system.

The Provost noted that faculty academic freedom rights are unabated and unchanged and are listed in the Faculty Administrative Manual (FAM), last clarified and expanded in 2011.

The Provost attested there is "no secret agenda," and faculty rights in the classroom remain unchanged and uncircumscribed.

In regards to the new system, the Provost said it would be months before enough data was collected to reveal if there is an uptick in complaints received.

The Provost considers it irresponsible to encourage complaints for no other reason than to pursue an ideological agenda. The first goal of any complainant should be to resolve it informally with the faculty member, and in rare cases in mediation with the Chair or the Program Director.

The Provost said he does not see any change by policy or process, other than adopting a newer technology.

Senator Kelly said the statements are reassuring and asked for an assessment of type of complaints once a year's worth or more of data is collected.

The Provost said it would be added to the list for February 2018.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) wondered if junior faculty are worried about the accumulation of electronic data. He asked if this was now part of an electronic institutional memory?

The Provost replied that a similar question was asked at the recent forum. We do need to be able to count number of complaints and their resolution status. The Provost will work with the Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning (OIEP) to make sure that is the only data that is being collected.

Richard Nunan, Senator (Philosophy) commented that the context of this discussion seems to be narrowly focused on student use of the complaint system to register complaints of ideological nature. Senator Krasnoff brought up the example, not necessarily from the College of Charleston, of complaints of sexual harassment that had gone on for years, despite a history of complaints. He stated that it is not a balanced view to consider that the only vulnerable people are junior faculty and suggested that there needs to be a system for taking student complaints seriously.

Provost McGee said that complaints such as this should be taken very seriously no matter how they come to us, and that Senator Krasnoff made a good point about why we must have robust student complaint systems.
Lisa Covert, Senator (at-large HSS) spoke from her perspective as a junior faculty member. Senator Covert stated that there is a need for transparency, and she is not clear how decisions are made to decide what information gets kept and what is discarded. She stated that she hears the Provost's assurance that the student complaint process is not intended to be misused, but that as administrations change, as misunderstandings occur, and through a lack of transparency, how the information is used and where it goes needs to be clarified. It would be useful to know how decisions are made about how long complaints are kept and how it decided who has access to the complaint system.

The Provost stated that because of time, he would offer an abbreviated answer. The process for how student complaints are managed is available to be reviewed in multiple places. The Provost states that a grade complaint is managed differently from a sexual harassment complaint. How they are handled is in some cases responsive to federal regulations or federal and state law and are governed by College of Charleston policy 9.1.10 (http://policy.cofc.edu/documents/9.1.10.pdf).

The Provost reaffirmed that policies concerning student complaints have not been changed, just the technology to gather complaints centrally, then parcel them out. The distribution of complaints is made by a small number of employees in Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

There were no additional questions.

Executive Vice President of Business Affairs, Steve Osborne gave a financial update using information that had been shared with the Budget and Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees at their January meeting.

Osborne said that a year ago, he presented to the Faculty Senate on resetting the budget, including some mid-year budget reductions. Those have been incorporated successfully in this year's budget. Based on the resetting of the budget model, he said there is an increase in enrollment of instate students. Osborne said that this year, the budget will be fully balanced, and the institutional reserve of 2 million dollars will be restored. For this year, Osborne expects no budget reductions, a stable budget, and a slight surplus at the end of the year based on enrollment for this year.

Osborne spoke about the budget at the state level. He said that the revenues at the state level through the end of December are tracking closely to the estimate developed by the Board of Economic Advisers. Revenues through the end of December were running about 31.6 million dollars ahead of their estimate. That's a positive number even though it is less than 1% of a 7.5 billion dollar budget. The State does have a capital reserve fund of about 139 million dollars. The lottery fund estimate was 376 million dollars this year. Osborne said this is important to CofC because the College receives some funding for technology as long as sufficient lottery funds are available. Osborne said at the state level, there is stability for the rest of this year.

Osborne next spoke about the College of Charleston's financial management. He shared a couple of external ratings. Elliott Davis, the College's external auditor, presented their findings to the Audit and Governance Committee of the Board of Trustees in January. It was a clean and
unqualified audit with no findings or management recommendations. In conjunction with this, Osborne and others published their comprehensive annual financial report (CAFR), available at http://controller.cofc.edu/documents/external-financial-reports/cafr-2016.pdf.

Osborne mentioned that the College had two external bond ratings done recently by Moody's Investor Service and Fitch Ratings. The bond ratings were part of a bond refunding issue that was performed in January. The bond rating by Moody's was an A1 rating with a stable outlook. The Fitch rating for the bond issue was an A+ rating for that specific issue and the overall financial [unintelligible] was a AA rating. Osborne stated that the AA rating is the highest the College has ever received, that it's the first time the College has received a AA rating.

Osborne gave a capsule of the refund issues. The two refund issues were for bond issues that were originally done in 2007 for the George and Liberty Street residence halls, the arena, part of the Science center and the School of the Arts. The issues that were done in January totaled 74 million dollars. They were sold in January, and as a result of these refunding issues, the College will see a total bond refund savings of approximately $26 million with 16 a half million of that in auxiliary services and the other 10 million realized in the E&G capital fund. Osborne said that overall we were fortunate and the timing in the market was good. He stated that right now the financial picture of the College is sound.

There were no questions.

**Assistant VP of Admissions and Financial Aid, Jimmie Foster**

Mr. Foster shared with Faculty Senate enrollment numbers for Fall 2017. In the cycle of admissions, they are in the middle of review for Freshman applicants. They expect decisions to be made by April 1, and will expect deposits by May 1. Foster shared the goal for projections of the Class of 2120 is 1205 residents, 915 non-residents. He stated his department had a successful year in terms of building prospects (students who reach out to the College as interested students). They also purchase names through SAT and College Board and other means.

Foster stated a record number, 50,000, represents the largest applicant pool in the school’s history. They expect to finish with around 13,000 Freshmen applications.

Foster credits this to the hard work of staff in recruitment. It will be up 10% from last year, and he attributed this to the staff's hard work.

Foster stated that a new SAT began in March, and test scores are higher. Nationally, they are at about a 40 point increase, the College's increases are higher at about 50-60 points for both in-state and out of state applications. Foster expects this is due to the stronger number of applicants or to the scores of test takers or both. There is a 70 point increase in students of color.

Foster said that they will have the highest number of resident applications, about 6,000 state applications. He said part of this is due to an increase of population in the region. The highest number of applications are expected to be received from students of color at 3,000. For comparison to last year, that number was about 2400.
The average SAT of those students who have applied to the College of Charleston is a 3.7 and 1190, which includes in state and out of state students.

Foster expects the acceptance rate to be 1230.

These are not final numbers.

Foster asked if there were any questions.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) asked what impact the Top 10 Percent rule has on applications?

Foster said last year about 244 students from the designated counties applied and were admitted, and 81 of those students were enrolled. Foster said they have spent time in those counties and the high schools know them. Gains in student enrollments have occurred from rural counties. He quoted Senator Kelly as saying the light above the door was not on for some of those students and now it is. They are encouraged by the increase in students from the Top Ten Percent program.

Foster mentioned that most nonresident applications are coming from states where other Colonial Athletic Alliance member schools are located, like New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Virginia.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if Foster could speak to what impact the bridge program would have on the applicant pool and SAT scores.

Foster said that previously, those students were admitted to the College provisionally, and now will be admitted as transfers in the Spring. Those students haven't been offered yet, so their numbers are not included in the numbers given in today's report. He stated that counselors and student support services staff are excited about working with these students and the students are looking forward to being part of our community on a daily basis.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked for specific numbers.

Foster said the numbers are from memory, not official numbers, but that our admit rate peak in 2004 was low 60s. Last year, the admit rate was slightly over 81%. This year so far, with incomplete numbers, is slightly below 75%.

There were no more questions.

**Dean of Professional Studies, Godfrey Gibbison** reported on the Adhoc committee task force interim report on the General Studies major. (pdf)

Dean Gibbison said that members of the task force are encouraged to share information about the General Studies major widely, and to please ask any members of the task force questions.
The information shared reflected thoughts and suggestions and Gibbison said that now is the appropriate time to gather feedback.

Gibbison revisited the charge of the committee. The Provost had asked the Committee to research General Studies curriculum at other universities and to answer several questions. The questions included if we offered a General Studies program, what would be the administrative structure, would it be offered online, face to face, or both, what impact on faculty workload, and the use of roster faculty and adjuncts?

Other questions offered by Gibbison included if the program was offered online, would enough courses be available online, as the entire General Education requirement would have to be offered online in order for students to complete it? They would need to complete several minors online as well.

Gibbison reported that another question to be answered is who will we be serving with this program, who are the students likely to take advantage of this major, and very importantly, how will we provide student services.

Gibbison shared that there is a population of stop out students from the College of Charleston. Over 5400 students from the last 5 years. These are junior and seniors who did not go on to graduate someplace else. A lot of the students have stopped out in good standing. The average stopout has a 2.5 GPA. He said about 60% of stopouts are juniors and seniors, and 2/3 of them are South Carolina residents.

Gibbison said some current students might want the breadth of a general studies major.

Other students may want to finish a specific major, like math, but may have stopped out due to lack of online access, or work or family responsibilities and may be able to finish a degree if more courses were offered online. Over time, these components necessary to offer the degree may help a wider population of students.

The committee is interested in faculty and staff feedback, and will share a survey (survey closes March 3, http://cofc.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_24hgleyA6CbvW4J).

The current thinking of the committee is that students should be able to complete course work both online and face to face, in order not to restrict students.

Gibbison reported that the committee spent a lot of time looking at the curriculum of programs across the country. The committee thinks an introductory course is important and provides an orientation to the program. Students should complete the General Education requirement, and on campus students could choose from any two majors if they meet prerequisite requirements, and the committee thinks it could develop paired minors. In their opinion, the paired minors could help craft the synthesis experience.

Also considered is requiring students to do much of their course work at the 300 level or higher. They would like 21 hours or more to be at the 300 level or higher. If a student is taking courses
online, they would have to choose from a more limited list of minors. In the next few years, probably six to eight minors would be available.

Gibbison said the committee thinks it's very important that veteran faculty who have taught online and developed courses are able to participate in the program. They think it is important for faculty to have incentives to develop rigorous 300 and 400 level courses online. Also important for lab courses to be developed online or as hybrids when possible. They have spent some time exploring how universities provide these services, including looking at some vendors. There are several SSM faculty on the committee that have been helping with this.

As far as administrative structure, Gibbison said there should be a program director, an oversight committee to ensure quality. Some places have adopted a revenue sharing structure, for those departments that are heavily involved to provide good incentives to remain involved. That revenue could be shared back to faculty in several forms. They hope to see what kind of form that would be based on the survey results.

Gibbison said they have been talking with some consultants on developing student focus groups to gauge interest.

That concluded Dean Gibbison's report.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked for confirmation that the conversation surrounding the development of a General Studies major is still ongoing. He received assurance that this was the case. Kunkle then asked if it was the consensus of the committee that the major should be available entirely online?

Gibbison said that the thinking right now was that it should be available in both delivery modes, face to face and online.

Kunkle asked if all online, would there be the same Gen Ed requirements? He pointed out that the current minors policy states that minors cannot overlap.

Gibbison affirmed this was true, that students would be completing distinct minors.

**Gayle Goudy**, (Guest and Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee) wanted clarification that the committee is talking with vendors to form focus groups, not to provide instruction.

Gibbison said that the program would be taught only by College of Charleston faculty, and hopefully, by veteran faculty with experience teaching online to insure vested interest in the program.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) asked about upper level online courses and labs online? He wanted to know how that be handled. He asked about the number of minors available online, and if it possible to having the number that Dean Gibbison envisioned.
Gibbison and the Committee, with the help of Doug Ferguson, Faculty Coordinator for eLearning and Distance Education, determined having all Gen Ed available online is close. At this point, there are probably 3-4 minors that are 50% or more available online.

Gibbison responded that there is a subcommittee studying science labs online. They looked at some of the packaged labs, and found that the ones they looked at weren't as inquiry-based as the College would require.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) and member of the General Studies Task Force Committee said that the lab sciences are not supportive yet of online alternatives. They were considering the potential of offering a separate lab course (developed by the College, not a vendor) that would not count toward a science major, but would be designed to fulfill GenEd requirements and for those students completing the General Studies major. It is still under discussion.

Nunan said that meant that a science minor would not be possible, and Gibbison stated that in some cases, a student may have completed the lab requirements already and they would transfer. A student could also take the one lab in person and the rest online.

Julia Eichelberger (Guest and Member of the General Education task force) said that while it's very important to offer a science course fully vetted and approved by CoC faculty, the degree can still work in the interim while waiting to figure out how to deliver quality online labs.

Kendall Deas, Adjunct Senator, asked if special incentives are necessary for course development? He noted that adjuncts might be required to teach in this program?

Gibbison replied that the Committee has looked at many universities and the wide range of incentives they offer. They do not presume to guess what might incentivise faculty to develop courses.

Bill Olejniczak (Guest) asked if the task force was considering all the minors, or did they have ideas about which would be offered.

Gibbison said that any minors for which a student meets prerequisites should be available. Some minors might make better pairings, which could be suggested to students. For students who are fully online, they have seen that more limited choices work best, at least while the program is being developed.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) and member of the General Studies Task Force Committee, advocated for academic and practical reasons that it makes sense to limit the minor pairings at first, and each pairing would have an administrator charged with the students in that pairing.

Gibbison said a list of pairings could be developed, and each pairing will have a faculty adviser to offer guidance.
Jolanda van Arnhem, Senator (Library, At-large) offered her perspective from several angles. As an adjunct, she has taught 24 courses. As a former no-traditional student, van Arnhem said she appreciates the support for the stopout population that is not currently served. She next asked what are the 4-5 minors that Doug Ferguson identified?

Gibbison, with assistance from Doug Ferguson, said that Business Administration and Sociology are quite close to being available online.

van Arnhem asked if any consideration was given to offering Arts Management and a low residency type of structure for other areas?

Gibbison said they are looking at the list of those minors that are close to being online, and that they any department that would like to participate.

van Arnhem offered that independent studies might be another component of filling in a minor.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked how quickly students can get to the 300 level and 21 hours in most minors.

Gibbison said some minors, like Philosophy, Geography and Economics, offer 300 level after two courses are completed. Other minors it takes longer, and some require at least one course at the 300 level.

Daniel Greenberg, member of the General Studies task force, said his subcommittee found similar results. For many minors, not that much coursework is required to get to the 300 level. If there is a lot of demand, there might be a need to offer targeted help to departments with additional resources.

Provost Brian McGee thanked the General Studies task force committee for looking at the entire 122 hour curriculum. He noted that it a near certainty that graduates of the College of Charleston who took an entire distance lab course from another university, and transferred in. The Provost emphasized that this underscores the importance of developing robust offerings in science labs.

Responding to a question from Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM), the Provost stated that our accreditors do not allow us to refuse transfer credit based on mode of delivery.

Jon Hakkila, Guest, commented that it would be difficult to get to the 300 level in physics because of the sequential nature of the minor; the student would have to take "a whole slew" of math and physics courses.

Adjunct Senator Oksana Ingle reported on Adjuncts at the College of Charleston (original ppt)(updated ppt posted 2/8).

Senator Ingle said she started as an adjunct at the College of Charleston in 2008, but was naive and did not understand what it really meant to be an adjunct until this last year. She taught
courses, developed new courses and promoted the Russian program. Her goal was to become full time faculty and she loves the College and teaching. Only in the last year, did she realize the road she started on was a dead end.

Senator Ingle paused to thank Julia Eichelberger and the Faculty Welfare Committee committee for their work on adjuncts. They worked for four years to prepare a detailed report on adjuncts at the College, which was presented to the Senate in Spring 2016. She said her report would not be possible without their work.

Ingle said her presentation asks three basic questions about being an adjunct at the College: Where are we, where do we want to go, and how can we get there?

Ingle provided a definition of the word, adjunct. From Webster's, "Something joined to or added to another thing, but not essentially a part of it." [italics from Ingle]

Where are we? She stated that many adjuncts view themselves as instructors or professors instead of contractors. She attributed one reason to they are paid as W-2 employees, not as 1099 contractors.

Ingle stated that 30% of undergraduate courses are taught by adjuncts. But in thinking of this in terms of the definition, they are still "not essentially a part of it."

Ingle said that adjuncts live with uncertainty at the beginning of each semester, at the last minute their courses can be cancelled.

She said that adjuncts do the same amount of work as full time faculty. They spend the same time preparing, teaching, grading, doing paperwork, being available to students, but they earn less than minimum wage.

Ingle said that recently, President McConnell said that it is obscene how little adjuncts are paid.

Job scrutiny for an adjunct boils down to pleasing students and ensuring that the College retains students. Ingle said those are not motivating factors and not good for students or instructors.

Ingle said that adjuncts have nowhere to go professionally, and they are stuck in a system that has not changed since the 1960s. Ingle addressed the Senate as thinking that adjuncts are a small part of the faculty and are therefore unessential to the overall success of the College. She showed a slide with information (source: http://irp.cofc.edu/) 364 adjuncts make up 41 % of all faculty. Of these 364, only 40% are eligible for health insurance benefits. Ingle said that even when adjuncts teach full time (12 credit hours or more), they are treated as part time because they are paid on a contract basis, which is misleading.

Ingle asked what does an "obscenely" low salary look like? She said it varies from department to department and showed a slide containing a breakdown of how adjuncts are paid per course over a semester and a year. 2 courses is $2,550 per course, or $2,650 if you have a PhD. $100 more for having a higher degree. If you teach 3 courses, the salary jumps to $450 more per course. If
teaching 4 courses, it jumps another $325 per course. The difference may not seem like much, but it is significant over the course of a semester and a year. It more than doubles and almost triples for those who get more courses. [for clarity, please refer to Oksana Ingle’s PowerPoint]

Ingle stated that even though adjuncts are employees for tax purposes, in reality they are contractors, but they don't even receive a contract. They receive a "teaching effort."

She presented a slide with her "teaching effort," and demonstrated the confusing amount of detail.

The course started in mid-August, but HR did not receive the document until mid September, which is when she received it from HR via email. When she received the email, the document showed only partial information, that led Ingle to expect a different salary than what she received. Once she went to sign her teaching effort, the salary had been adjusted down by $3400, without her knowing it. But she had already been teaching a month--too late to do anything about it.

Next, Ingle asked where do we want to go? Some departments do plan adjuncts schedule a year in advance, and those adjuncts have some certainty about the year ahead. Most other adjuncts live with the anxiety of uncertainty twice a year.

Ingle stated that earning positive student evaluations and achieving student retention for its own sake are humiliating ways to show your worth as a teacher. In the end, this does not benefit the students or the College.

Ingle stated that not being clear about contract terms and not finalizing contracts before classes state is unethical. She admitted that unethical is a strong word, but that any Senator would not do business in this way.

Next, Ingle asked how can we get there? She spoke of the benefits of including adjuncts in decision making or professional development. This makes them feel subordinate and non-essential, even though they are very essential to the students they teach.

Ingle stated that 90% of adjuncts feel they are not compensated fairly, but they have no choice and spoke of this as being psychologically demeaning, defeating the sens of being a professional.

She asked why is there no career path for adjuncts? Why are open positions not recruited from the pool of qualified experienced teachers who already know the College?

Ingle spoke of these issues being discussed in the past, but that change will only occur if it happens from above.

She showed two images drawn by her daughter that captured where we are (adjuncts in subordination), and where we want to go (adjuncts as professional equals).
She admitted that subordination is a strong word, but quoted a Russian poet as saying, "It would be funny if it was not so sad."

Ingle said she tried to present just the facts objectively, after talking with dozens of people.

She spoke of the frustration of learning that the Fall class schedule had been posted, and that she had no say in it, as she had not seen any drafts nor had any discussion. She mentioned that in Russian Studies, three adjuncts built the program, but they have no say. They have three adjuncts and one full time faculty member.

She said that many adjuncts would like to be included as peers and professionals with equal career opportunities. She spoke of adjunct treatment as displaying a lack of professionalism, a lack of collaboration, and a lack of courtesy.

She said she knows it can be better.

She included a quote from President Glenn McConnell, from his welcome back email dated January 11, 2017. Ingle quoted in a slide, "Our hope lies in the future and all that we can accomplish by moving in lockstep as ONE College of Charleston. Together, we can and will be a force for much positive and lasting change on campus, in Charleston, and beyond."

Senator Ingle was loudly applauded.

The Speaker asked if there were questions.

Lisa Covert, Senator (at-large HSS) thanked Senator Ingle for sharing. She asked how to include adjuncts in more meeting and plannings without compensating them?

Senator Ingle responded that there are different kinds of adjuncts. She said there are about 10% of adjuncts who don't work for money. She has asked some adjuncts who don't even know how much they earn. And other adjuncts work for four courses, because that is their source of income. She offered that those adjuncts who want to be included should be included, and those who don't should not.

Jolanda van Arnhem, Senator (Library, At-large) said she thought one problem, from speaking to adjuncts, is that their 3-4 class load was cut after the Affordable Care Act was implemented. She asked what is the difference between an adjunct teaching a four class load and a senior instructor?

Ingle said she has being doing everything like instructors for years because she likes doing it and did not expect to be paid.

Provost McGee addressed van Arnhem's point by saying that Chairs, Program Directors and Deans were expressly told to not take anyone out who was eligible for the Affordable Care Act as a cost-savings measure. Staffing decisions were to be made solely and entirely based on the academic need of the institution.
The Provost would like to know of any cases where people operated differently.

The Provost answered that the difference in compensation for a senior instructor and an adjunct was based on prevailing market wages on a discipline by discipline basis. The lowest compensated entry level instructor colleague in recent years has been in the upper 30s or low 40s, with a higher benefits expense as is the case for an adjunct colleague teaching full time.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) observed that little has changed since he was department chair 10 years ago and called that sad and thought we could do better. He said some of Senator Ingle's suggestions will be controversial, like hiring from within, but other suggestions would find good support from faculty, such as increasing adjunct salaries and planning in advance. Nunan said much of this is common human decency, and we depend on Program Directors and Chairs to know what that is. Perhaps we need more explicit policies, or required sensitivity sessions for those departments that hire many adjuncts.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest** (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said that she has the responsibility for signing adjunct appointment forms and for the processes concerning adjunct employment. She stated that while not defending what they pay, it is more than minimum wage, based on the calculation of two hours outside of class for every contact hour within the classroom, so that would be 9 hours a week, for a 3 credit hour course. She said in an 18 week period, the lowest paid adjunct is making is making $15.74 an hour, if they're an hourly employee. She said most adjuncts are exempt employees and that's why hourly wages are not calculated.

Caveny-Noecker expressed appreciation for Senator Ingle's presentation and commented that an individual’s experience varies depending on what department they are a part of. She also thanked Julia Eichelberger and Faculty Welfare for the work they had done, saying that Academic Affairs had learned some things from their report. [report is found here: http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2015-2016/apr-2016/adjunct_practices_senate_report_2016.pdf ]

She said that some things on campus are better for adjuncts as a whole than they were when she was department chair 10 years ago. She stated that there is a critical mass of commitment to adjunct welfare on campus, but there should be more effort in all departments to:

- integrate adjuncts in our work,
- recognize their critical role at the College of Charleston,
- the contributions that they make,
- be thoughtful about how we engage adjuncts in our work,
- be mindful how we offer them courses,
- improve timing of the scheduling.

Caveny-Noecker said that Chairs have the difficulty of balancing enrollment needs, fiscal responsibility, and the desire to give adjuncts their schedules as early as they can.
Caveny-Noecker said the simple idea of inviting participation is a good one, and said adjunct faculty are able to submit proposals for the writer's retreat, are now part of orientation and are compensated for that. She said to keep the conversation going as we learn from Eichelberger's report and Senator Ingle's presentation.

Tom Baginski, Senator (German and Russian Studies) asked about the contract being adjusted downward.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said some program are very small and have low enrollments. Their department works hard to balance this, but sometimes it becomes a negotiation with the Program Director as they wait for more students to enroll.

Baginski asked about variations in the pay scale.

Provost McGee answered that difficult decisions have to be made by Chairs and Program Directors when a course is below minimal enrollment to communicate to faculty that they won't receive full pay. The timing of when this is communicated varies, and Directors and Program Chairs should be very blunt about the possibility that a course won't make without a sufficient number of students enrolled. If the course is offered anyway, that might only be possible with reduced levels of compensation. The Provost said that kind of information needs to be provided earlier in the process, so there are no surprises. There are differences in staffing from one program to another.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) provided a brief history from more than ten years ago of a former Provost's effort to increase adjunct pay for adjuncts teaching the greater number of hours. This created a tiered pay scale, which is problematic when peoples' course loads change. Caveny-Noecker would like to move away from the tiered scale. She stated this would mean holding the rate relatively stable at the top while we bring it up from the bottom. Her department is open to feedback and suggestions.

Baginski asked if this was a similar system as used for summer teaching? If a class falls below, are adjunct faculty paid per student head?

Beatriz Maldonado-Bird, Senator (at-large, LCWA) contributed that she is married to an adjunct professor and cannot ever recall her husband getting paid on time. She asked if the paperwork could get completed on time. Can due diligence be done so that adjuncts can get their contracts done early enough for them to plan?

Caveny-Noecker said that the Provost's office has been working very hard to process as many adjunct contracts as they possibly can before the first adjunct pay date of the semester. She said they have also worked on adjunct start dates that is prior to the first day of classes, since they recognize that people are doing prep work. The enrollment management issue is a problem. Senator Ingle is affected by working for a very small program that is trying to offer a robust set of courses. Logistical problems exist that they are trying to work out with respect to the
processing of paperwork. We believe an electronic system is helping. They have also worked to negotiate earlier first pay dates for adjunct faculty.

Simon Lewis, Guest (English) expressed appreciation for having this discussion. He pointed out that not only is this a problem for College of Charleston, but that it is a national scandal.

He gave four suggestions:

1) When he worked on Faculty Welfare Committee, there was an effort made to recognize long term adjuncts with a salary increase.

2) If an adjunct has been teaching 3-4 courses continually, then there should be a path to instructorship on a permanent basis.

3) When bonuses are given, there should be a differential maintained so that the adjunct pay rate goes up as well.

4) Adjuncts get no cuts on costs. Parking costs $800 for both Deans and adjuncts. Prorate those incidental costs.

Julia Eichelberger, Guest, said that the report they produced has a list of best practices. [report is found here: http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2015-2016/apr-2016/adjunct_practices_senate_report_2016.pdf]

One best practice suggests rewarding departments and schools for treating adjuncts well, as reflected in the reports the departments produces. Some of the positive treatments might include:

- predicting employment ahead of time,
- how many adjuncts are offered professional development,
- how many invited to meetings (it is their choice to attend or not)

Eichelberger offered that while we are waiting for action from Randolph Hall, individual colleagues can take action in treating their adjunct colleagues more fairly and collegially.

Another suggestion made by Eichelberger is that department chairs or program directors can write a memo of understanding to the adjunct faculty member, detailing how long they will wait for the course to fill, and explain that if the course does not make, they will have to discuss the change in pay. Academic Affairs can help provide language for this sort of communication made in writing. Questions of salary are more difficult to address, but of course very important.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) commented that the estimate of two hours outside of the classroom for every one hour in the classroom was probably inaccurate. He stated that in his experience of teaching for over 30 years, he spent much more time than the estimate doing work related to each course that he teaches.
Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said that this estimate is grounded in the fact that roster instructors teach 12 hour loads. When their department was working on integrating the Affordable Care Act, they looked at other institutions to see how the calculation of average weekly hourly work and the conversion of contact credit hours was being done. In the State of SC, Caveny-Noecker said that the College of Charleston is the only institution using the [unintelligible]. She stated that she did not think she could use a higher number to calculate an average hourly wage for adjuncts.

Nunan suggested it's fine to have "administrative fiction," as long as we all recognize it. He suggested it is not a great idea to tell Senator Ingle she is not working for minimum wage based on this fiction.

Speaker McNerney asked if there were other questions.

Meg Cormack, Senator (Religious Studies) thanked Senator Ingle for her presentation, called for a round of applause, and moved to adjourn.

Richard Nunan seconded the motion.

The Speaker opened the floor for discussing the motion.

A short discussion ensued.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) called the question. It was seconded.

The question was called with a majority vote.

Next, a vote was taken in favor of adjourning.

The majority voted in favor of not adjourning.

5. Old Business

None

6. New Business

Gayle Goudy, Chair, Faculty Curriculum Committee introduced curriculum items.

Provost McGee asked for unanimous consent to consider the entire proposed set of proposals for the undergraduate Curriculum Committee as a single omnibus motion.

That motion was seconded.

More discussion ensued.
Unanimous consent was not given. The proposals began to be considered separately and with deliberation.

i. Accounting (ACCT) wants to add ACCT 204 as prerequisite for ACCT 307, deactivate ACCT 336, add ACCT 307 & 308 as prerequisites for ACCT 409 (pdf)

The proposals passed.

ii. Studio Arts (ARTS) wants to add ARTS 119 and six credit hours of upper-level courses to the major requirements, change which ARTH courses count toward ARTS degree, and change prerequisites on ARTS 220, 410, and 430 (pdf)

The proposals passed.

iii. Chemistry (CHEM) wants to add CHEM 232/232L as prerequisites for CHEM 421; add CHEM 231/231L as prerequisites for CHEM 422 (pdf)

The proposals passed.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) asked that the Senate announce and table any curriculum proposals that caused concern.

Discussion ensued. The Speaker asked for one proposal (item xiv) to be pulled from the group for discussion. The Speaker called for a vote for the other curriculum proposals. All curriculum proposals listed below passed.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked about the inclusion of PHIL 175 in the Public Health proposal, for the PBHL BA.

Deborah Socha McGee, Guest and Gayle Goudy, Chair, Faculty Curriculum Committee clarified that PHIL 175 was not included in the proposal (the coversheet of the proposal shows that it was removed from the proposal and initialed by both parties). Satisfied with this change, a vote was called for and the proposal passed.

iv. Classics (CLAS) wants to change the perquisites for CLAS 320, 322, 324, and 325 by allowing students to take these courses after completing 3 credit hours of CLAS courses. (pdf)

v. Communications (COMM) wants to add newly created COMM 216 as a prerequisite to COMM 301, 310, 315, 410, 480, and 481 (pdf)
vi. Computer Science (CSCI) wants to change the prerequisite on a few courses, create two new courses and add them to the CSCI BA/BS and CITA programs; expand the options of the CSCI minor (pdf)

vii. Education (EDEE) wants to change the prerequisites to align better with recent program changes in Early Childhood Education (pdf) and Elementary Education (pdf)

viii. Entrepreneurship (ENTR) wants to expand possible paths into ENTR 320 and 406; Broad overview of changes to ENTR, MKTG, MGMT, and INTB. They also want to create a new internship and add it to the concentration. (pdf) (pdf)

ix. French (FREN) wants to add new courses (FRCS 101 and 102), deactivate FREN 370, and change prerequisite for FREN 380, 381, and 383. (pdf)(pdf)

x. International Studies (INST and INTL) wants to add RELS 215 and the newly created FREN courses to the relevant concentrations in INTL (INAF, INEU, INCL) and to the INST minor (pdf)(pdf)(pdf)

xi. Italian Studies (ITST) wants to create a new course and add it as an elective to the ITST minor (pdf)

xii. MGMT/INTB capstone: Add DSCI 304 or INTB 314 to the prerequisites for MGMT 408 and change capstone requirement in INTB major from INTB 409 to MGMT 408 (pdf)

xiii. Music (MUSC) wants to create three new courses, change prerequisites on MUSC 381, and change requirements within the major and minor. (pdf)

xiv. Public Health (PBHL) wants to add HEAL 217, and HEAL 257 to the options for the PBHL BA (pdf)

xv. Physics (PHYS) wants to Add PHYS 272 to the elective lists in the BA and Minor and remove PHYS 301 from the Operational Meteorology (METR) concentration because it is no longer a prerequisite for a required course. (pdf) (pdf)

xvi. Urban Studies (URST) wants to add electives (ECON 340 and ARTH 396) to Urban Planning concentration as electives and create a new course (URST
397 Special Topics in Urban Studies) and add it to all of their concentrations and restructure Sustainable Urbanism concentration.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded.

The Speaker asked for any discussion on the motion to adjourn.

There was none.

Faculty Senate voted to adjourn.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

None

8. Adjournment, 7:29 PM