Special Faculty Meeting - MUSC and College of Charleston Merger - May 7, 2013

**Present:** Speaker of the Faculty Senate Lynn Cherry; Provost George Hynd; Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Policy Advisor in the Office of the President, speaking on behalf of President George Benson; and College of Charleston Faculty and Staff.

A video recording of the meeting can be viewed at http:// facultysenate.cofc.edu/cofc-musc.php. Brian McGee's Powerpoint slides can be viewed here [insert URL].

Speaker Cherry explained that the impetus for the meeting was faculty and staff concerns precipitated by a recent newspaper report and general conversations of the possibility of a merger between the College of Charleston (CofC) and the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC). The meeting was designed to allow the faculty to hear from CofC administration and to ask questions and exchange ideas.

Brian McGee spoke first, followed by Provost Hynd, after which both took questions from the audience.

**Brian McGee's Presentation**

McGee spoke on behalf of President George Benson, who could not attend the meeting and sent his regrets. McGee opened by stating that "there is no written plan to merge MUSC and the College of Charleston. There is no study committee of the College and MUSC to merge the College and MUSC. There has been no board vote or lengthy discussion of this in public or in any other fashion....What we are doing now is having a very early conversation on an idea that took on a life of its own, thanks to some enthusiasm inside the College and even more enthusiasm outside the College and giving you some background and context for past and present discussions of merger and other kinds of collaborations between the College of Charleston and MUSC."

See McGee's Powerpoint presentation here [insert URL]

McGee gave basic information about the history of MUSC and its current number of faculty member, students, organization, and operating budget. "They are," he pointed out, "much smaller than us by majors count; they are much smaller than us by faculty count; they are much larger than us by budget."

He also gave a run-down of past discussions, studies, and initiatives related to merging the College and MUSC, along with some of ideas for the form a merger might take.

The history of merger conversations include:
• 1824 - when the Medical College was formed, the original intent was to become a department of the College, but that plan was rejected by the Board of Trustees, so they founded their own school.

• 1968 - during the College's transition from a private to a public institution, the Board of Trustees for the Medical College endorsed a merger with the College of Charleston and their budget for FY1969 actually included the merger. The merger, however, was stopped by a report of a conference committee that found that the College's physical plant was not sufficient for a university. The College went on to enter the state system separately as a liberal arts college.

• 1973 - the College's Board of Trustees again endorsed "the idea of looking again at a merger" in 1975. There were a "series of complicated conversations" beginning in 1975, but they died down after 1978.

• 1981-82 - a major study was conducted, led by Dewey Wise, a state Senator representing Charleston. Neither the College nor MUSC "wanted anything to do with the merger," however, so the idea died again.

• 1991-92 - President Harry Lightsey supported a merger and tried to establish a committee to study it, though it did not get far.

• 1995 - another failed effort to promote a merger

• 1998-2000 - another committee studied the merger idea, the result of which was to say that there was "not enough political will to merge" the schools but that some of the needs that might be met by a merger could be met by a new initiative. The Lowcountry Graduate Center emerged as a direct result of this process.

The current context of conversations about a merger was established with President Benson's "New Charleston" speech, in which he described a number of options for the future of the College, including a possible merger with MUSC. While the President did not state a preference for this option, the idea caught on with politicians and with community leaders associated with the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, leading to a series of conversations and a newspaper article. Mayor Joe Riley is also in strong support of a merger.

Past discussions have addressed the idea that the two institutions have very different characters and missions. Some wondered whether the College and MUSC could be merged without doing violence to the special nature and character of each.

In the past, MUSC presidents have suggested a "close association," perhaps even a sharing of academic or, more likely, administrative units, but not a full merger.

President Lightsey suggested a graduate consortium that would merge the graduate programs of the two schools but leave the undergraduate programs separate.

A variation on the idea of a merger could be a "confederation model," characterized by "two free-standing campuses" that might even maintain their own names but which are united under a single system of some sort.
Another variation might be a more traditional merger in which the two schools would become one entity, with a single president, a single provost, with merged administrative units and academic departments.

**Provost George Hynd's Presentation**

Provost Hynd's Powerpoint slides can be seen here [insert URL]

Provost Hynd acknowledged a number of ongoing collaborations between the College and MUSC, collaborations that may be largely unknown to faculty and staff and to the public:

- Student advising -- Karen Eippert, a former employee of MUSC, advises School of Science and Mathematics students for possible careers in the Health Sciences
- 11 CofC faculty advising MUSC students
- Undergraduate research collaborations
- Cross-appointed faculty at the College who either have joint faculty appointments at MUSC or courtesy appointments
- Research and teaching collaborations -- Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, and Physics, among other departments, are engaged in collaborations and joint research projects and teaching and instructional activities with MUSC faculty
- Non SSM faculty are also collaborating with MUSC faculty on program development and teaching and learning
- Joint graduate and fellowship programs
- 11 MUSC faculty are teaching or advising our students
- 13 CofC faculty are collaborating with 25 MUSC faculty
- External funding (keeping in mind that this can fluctuate year by year): currently two grants are funded jointly between CofC SSM and MUSC. Three grants are funded jointly between CofC School of Education, Health, and Human Performance and MUSC.

Provost Hynd outlined some of the foundations for and the supporting elements for these collaborations.

- 18% of our student population are in the School of Science and Mathematics (SSM)
- 1022 students are Biology majors; 221 are in Chemistry and Biochemistry; 108 are in Geology.
- Many students come to the College for the strong sciences program in a liberal arts context. Employers report that this kind of training, with its emphasis on the study of culture, writing, and so on, is very appealing.
- 22 to 24 out of the 40 to 45 students each year who go on to medical school, go to MUSC. We have another 130 students who go to other health professions.
Additionally, the College sits in a particular position in relation to other colleges and universities. The state has comprehensive universities and comprehensive research, or R1, universities. The latter include Clemson University, the University of South Carolina (USC), and MUSC. Among the many comprehensive, Masters degree-granting universities in the state, the College is the largest. With our number of students in undergraduate and graduate programs, we sit just underneath Clemson and USC.

Charleston, moreover, is in the fastest recovering area of the state, which is also the region of the state poised for the most dramatic growth. But the same region does not have a comprehensive research university, and we are turning out students in the Sciences and Mathematics at essentially the same rate as Clemson and USC.

Having discussed the current collaborations between CofC and MUSC and the foundations for these collaborations, Provost Hynd discussed the formation of a joint committee on collaboration by the boards of trustees of both CofC and MUSC. The committee is composed of CofC trustees Dan Ravenel and Demetria Clemons, Provost Hynd, and Executive Vice President for Business Affairs Stephen Osborne. MUSC members of the committee include two of their trustees, Provost Mark Sothmann, and Executive Vice President for Finance and Operations Lisa Montgomery. The committee's purpose is to "explore present and future collaborations that build on each institution's strengths." The committee, as of the time of this special faculty meeting, have only met once.

The Provost then turned the meeting back over to Brian McGee for an update on the current state of affairs in a larger context.

**Brian McGee**

McGee stressed that, other than the formal committee Provost Hynd described, there is "no formal conversation between the College of Charleston and MUSC at this time addressing collaboration or any sort of merger talks."

Mayor Riley has expressed keen interest in a possible merger and thinks the timing is good for this. The rationale of the mayor, other politicians, and the business community, representatives of whom have met with the mayor, is that the city, as an economic engine for the region, is "notable by its lack of access to a comprehensive research university," that other great cities have comprehensive research universities to support their research needs, and they see in a hoped-for merger of CofC and MUSC a way to address the perceived deficit and benefit the city, region, and state.

Business community and, at times, political "enthusiasm" has driven merger discussions in the past, as well.

**Questions and Discussion**
Speaker Cherry opened the floor at this point for questions, concerns, and ideas. The questions and response are reported below. For a full record of these, or, for that matter, of the reports of Provost Hynd or Brian McGee, please see the videorecording of the meeting here [insert URL].

-----

Bryan Ganaway (Honors College) posed "a hypothetical" to the Provost: "if you had the opportunity to say 'yes' or 'no' on whether or not a merger would be a good idea, what would you say?"

Provost Hynd replied that his reply would to the yes or no question would be "interesting question," in that there are a number of positive possibilities such as we have already seen with current and ongoing collaborations. But interesting ideas might come forward in the discussion of a merger that could impact the direction that discussion could help lay the groundwork for better conversations.

-----

Helen Delfeld (Political Science) asked what the downsides to a merger might be.

McGee replied that past conversations identified some of those potential downsides. Alumni love the institution, its identity and character, and the undergraduate focus, and wouldn't support any move that would alter those things.

Another downside is the standard risk that comes with change: we're blind as to the future even as we enter into it. Some mergers of other schools have had mixed reviews. CofC and MUSC might also look at their current success and justly question why it makes sense to change at all.

Provost Hynd offered an example of a merger that has not been as successful it promised to be in Augusta, Georgia [the merger of Augusta State University and Georgia Health Sciences University].

The provost also added that, if we go down the road of a merger, he would want the process to be seen as adding value that requires investment. "The worst thing," he said that could happen is the merger is pursed as a "cost saving," which seems unrealistic. A merger would require a "very significant investment of resources from the state and potentially others as well."

McGee added that the President's position, likewise, is that cost-saving cannot be a rationale for any merger between MUSC and CofC. The rationale has to be better serving the city, the state, and our students.

-----
Scott Peeples (English) asked if in the discussions so far the assumption has been a merger would not simply be a combination of what CofC and MUSC already do but mean adding more students and additional programs, such as graduate programs, to become a research institution and not just "MUSC plus CofC."

Provost Hynd replied that discussions so far have not employed the term "merger," and he reiterated that no internal committee to CofC has been establish to explore the merger idea. If we were pursuing the idea, the process would rely on full participation from faculty and everyone else at CofC for guidance.

To make a comprehensive research university, the Provost stressed, a merger of MUSC would have to build PhD programs outside the sciences as well.

McGee added that in discussions in which the President and he have been involved, interest from the business community, for example, has been for a comprehensive university, not just a health sciences institution, but the business community has not suggested what kinds of programs there should be. The work of making those determinations, he stressed, would have to be done by faculty.

The President has also stressed, according to McGee, that, regardless of what graduate programs are developed, the College has to keep its high level of commitment to its undergraduate programs. One might see such a balanced model in William and Mary.

Steven Jaume' (Geology) offered a follow-up comment to Scott Peeples's query. He reported being glad to hear that there has been discussion about the importance of comprehensiveness and not just a focus on science.

Lou Burnett (Biology) related a disappointing "experiment" in collaboration that he offered as a cautionary tale that "speaks to the different cultures" of CofC and MUSC. In the early 90s, both CofC and MUSC were pursuing Environmental Studies programs. MUSC secured millions of dollars worth of federal funding for an environmental hazard assessment program. They were interested in developing a graduate program in Environment Science and partnered with CofC, offering a portion of their money, around one million dollars. CofC faculty worked on developing and putting into place a program with three legs: public policy, science, and risk assessment. But when MUSC's money ran out, they lost interest, and CofC could not replace the loss of risk assessment and biometry faculty housed at MUSC. Burnett stressed that department chairs at MUSC have extensive control over money, and while the MUSC faculty themselves were interested and dedicated, the administration was unwilling to continue supporting the program, and the MUSC faculty had to drop out. As a result, risk assessment is no longer part of the program offered by CofC. Burnett closed by saying that, while he was excited about this particular collaboration, there's a cultural consideration that we have
to be aware of, have out "eyes wide open" about, in any discussions of future collaboration.

Provost Hynd replied that at MUSC, under "responsibility-based management," every school is a cost center, and that the financial differences between our institutions mean that we operate differently academically, as well.

-----
Todd Grantham (Philosophy) offered a comment, noting that the College's faculty is comprised of many who came here precisely because it is a liberal arts and sciences institution, people who may have had other choices but who chose to come here or remain here because of the kind of place it is. Were there a merger and a conversion to a comprehensive research university, that faculty would still be here, a group of "wonderful, talented faculty" dedicated to a certain model of education. The faculty would be one of the big things that would have to change in a merger.

Provost Hynd replied by saying that he believes it's possible to have outstanding undergraduate education in the same context as outstanding graduate education.

-----
Reid Weisman (Biology) asked what MUSC's bond indebtedness is.

Provost Hynd replied that, from a business standpoint, there would be many issues to resolve, including the relative indebtedness of both institutions. This would all need to be worked out because, at a minimum, we would need new facilities, and the state would probably not foot those bills.

McGee added that CofC has an A1 bond rating from Moody's, but that MUSC might get better terms for bond borrowing due to the particular features of that institution.

-----
Tom Heeny (Communication & President of the College's chapter of the American Association of University Professors) stated that AAUP has "no official opinion on the outcome of these discussions if, and only if, the faculty are involved from the start."

Heeny also commented that there is a lot to be said for the two institutions remaining separate, given that both are doing well, and that there are strong collaborations already, but that we should be aware of legislation currently under consideration at the state capital. Heeny noted that President Benson informed him in a prior meeting of Senate Bill 535, which would alter Clemson's legal authority, adding to it a "research authority." The bill has not been decide on, but Heeny reported having asked the President if, in this coming year, a bill could possibly be introduced pertaining to a CofC/MUSC merger. The President said yes.
Heeny asked the faculty to stay involved.

Heeny also noted that, while the AAUP has no position on the outcome of the ongoing discussions, from the AAUP's point of view any discussions pertaining to the future of the institution ought to be in public meetings with written records and votes on the record.

-----

Claire Curtis (Political Science) offered a follow-up to Tom Heeny's comments, asking the Provost if he can commit to keeping the faculty updated on the deliberations and decisions of the committee on collaboration.

Provost Hynd replied that he would be glad to do that.

-----

Curtis also asked, imagining a merger, what kind of time line there would be, who would make the decision, and what the fastest time to completion might be.

McGee noted that the timeline would not be in the hands wholly of the school. While the faculty should be involved and paid attention to, in the end, it would be in the legislature's hands. The timeline has varied widely in other mergers. He also noted that, following his own "musing" about how it might work here, if there were some will to explore the possibilities, a committee-driven dialogue could start in the fall.

Provost Hynd added that, apart from the complexity and depth of the issues for the faculty, two different boards of trustees, and other stakeholders to consider, there is also the question of whether or not there is political will at the level of the state to make a change happen. He also stated that it would be worth taking several years to develop conversation and get at the issues and then proceed, rather than getting a legal mandate from the state without such a process behind it.

-----

Rich Bodek (History) noted that a letter to all CofC faculty received in hard copy from President Benson, very optimistic about the possibilities of merger, differs markedly from a letter from MUSC President Raymond Greenberg to MUSC employees. The latter was "much more cautious, much more measured." Bodek asserted that this "bespeaks radically different cultures at the two institutions." Given the vast differences in the institutions and their cultures, Bodek, asked of the Provost, "what fears, what cautions, what worries do you have? ... What do you see as the possible pitfalls of working more closely together?"

Provost Hynd replied that the financial model is an issue of great concern. The financial model would have to sustain the mission of a comprehensive research institution, while also respecting the core missions of both schools. As it concerns
CofC, the model would need to support what we do now, while also supporting the faculty that would need to be added to support the R1 mission. William and Mary might be a model of an institution that supports both undergraduate and graduate missions.

-----

Brian Lanahan (Teacher Education) asked about the implications for faculty salary, should CofC be merged into a comprehensive research university with MUSC. Given that typical faculty in liberal arts and sciences settings earn less than typical faculty in R1 settings, what could be done to ensure fairness of compensation?

McGee replied that this concern speaks to the concerns over institutional identity that many of us have, which is inextricably tied up with how we value faculty. The President is aware of how we already lag behind averages for faculty compensation in similar institutions, and compensation is and will be an issue he is pursuing, not matter how things turn out in relation to a possible merger with MUSC.

-----

Richard Nunan (Philosophy) pointed out that the local interest in a merger is well established, but asked what the interest is in Columbia over this potential merger.

Provost Hynd replied that at a recent Commission on Higher Education meeting, there appeared to be benign interest in the conversation they're seeing in their papers. But if there were serious conversation in Columbia, USC and Clemson, Provost Hynd remarked, surely would have "thoughts about it."

-----

Irina Gigova (History) offered a comment. Many students are coming to the College for precisely the kind of institution that we are already. If we turn into a research institution, we might loose those students, and we would be competing for the students who might also be interested in Clemson and USC. We might find it hard to compete, whereas at the moment our character allows us to compete by offering something different. A merger with MUSC would, thus, undermine our success.

Another concern is funding. Since there is little money coming from the federal government and from the state, we have to fall back on fund raising. Gigova expressed concern about the sustainability of the financial model, should we merge with MUSC

-----

Daniel Greenberg (Psychology) asked what the business community thinks a merger would accomplish that we're not already doing.

McGee replied that from the business community's point of view, there are gaps between what's offered by a health and medical sciences research institution and a liberal arts and sciences undergraduate institution. Their interest seems to be in certain
fundamental and applied research that might attract businesses. They're thinking about the transformation of Charleston in recent years and imagining a research university capable of valuing and rewarding cutting edge research and that is, thus, capable of feeding into high tech enterprises, particularly in high tech manufacturing, IT, aerospace, etc. The business community is concerned that they cannot get these things from MUSC and CofC and that it will be difficult to get it from universities elsewhere.

-----

Bob Podolsky (Biology) asked if there are any other models for the future of the College being considered here or at the level of the state that we should know about or about which we should be concerned. Is there another potential future we are trying to avoid? In what context are we considering this model, other than the model we are already in?

Provost Hynd replied that he knows of no other models being floated. Another conversation that the college is having currently deals the strategic plan's call to establish a PhD in Marine Biology, on which conversations are ongoing and about which discussion has been affected by Coastal Carolina’s recent addition of a Marine Sciences PhD.

McGee added that the strategic plan also includes an emphasis on continued collaboration with other institutions and noted that Podolsky's question speaks to the structural concerns all university's are faced with at this time: trying to map out a future in an environment of decreasing state support and increasing costs.

-----

Jen Wright (Psychology) asked, setting aside what the business community believes they stand to gain from a merger, what the Provost feels is the upside for us, given our mission, who we are, and why we are here. A second question was, given that there is an external push for an R1 institution in the Lowcountry, if we don't do this, will someone else? What's the likelihood of someone else stepping in?

McGee, addressing the second question, replied that the President does, indeed, think someone will come in, whether it's Clemson, USC, institutions from Georgia, or possibly even private institutions. Whether or not, another institution could do it as well as CofC and MUSC, there my be reason to doubt, but there appears to be an opportunity, and it is likely that somebody else will try to fill the gap.

Provost Hynd concurred with McGee, reporting that there are rumors of a USC branch in Charleston. Clemson is manifestly interested in establishing an engineering foothold in the Lowcountry.

Addressing the first question, the Provost said that, putting aside all unknowns, we might get better facilities; more classroom space; more faculty, given the building out of graduate programs; hire faculty that can bring in external resources; and hire faculty
with different missions. There would also, likely, be graduate assistantships, which become essential for research productivity.

-----
Joe Kelly (English) directed a question to Dan Ravenel of the Board of Trustees, who was in the audience. Not asking him to speak for the board, Kelly asked him if he could speak to where the board is right now on these issues.

Trustee Ravenel replied that, from his viewpoint, "there are no firm opinions; [they] haven't had any voting; there have been no committees assigned." His view is that "if the College doesn't fill the gap that is perceived, real or imagined, someone will, and the legislature will take great pride in making that decision. Do we want them to do that, or do we want to take the initiative and have a more considered proposal that will really solve problems?"

-----
Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy), noting that the Provost has been "pretty negative about the financial side" of things, asked what the financial gains of a merger might be. Given many of the difficulties already discussed, including high start-up costs, where would the financial gains come from? Additionally, Krasnoff observed that, from his standpoint, he doubts that it is possible to move from being an outstanding primarily undergraduate institution with just a few graduate programs to a research institution with a number of PhD programs across the board and expect them to be outstanding as well. "They almost certainly will not be outstanding, at least at the start," given our competition. There would seem to be "enormous costs" involved. While one might argue new programs would bring in more students, and thus, bring in more tuition revenue, that would also seem to create a "treadmill": we would bring in more revenue, but we would also need to lay out more money to support those students.

Provost Hynd replied that, with an awareness of the issues, he would describe his position as on the "cautious side of neutral." If there was a move toward an R1 status, there would need to be short, medium, long range plans. We would need to stage things strategically for incremental growth in identified programs, to include developing financial plans to support programs so that they could be successful. We would need to be very thoughtful about these matters.

McGee noted that answering such a question is difficult at this stage, though we could outline what success might look like in terms of needed resources for the work of the institution, including faculty compensation. McGee concurred with the Provost's assessment that there would need to be a deliberate plan for growth.

-----
George Pothering (Computer Science) asked if there is anything in our strategic plan that anticipates any of the discussion about CofC and MUSC merging.
McGee replied that other than the strategic plan's statements about increasing collaboration, "no," there is not.

-----

Garret Mitchener (Mathematics) noted that, to him, it sounds as if, financially, it's not even possible to consider a merger. Is there reason to believe there is money to do it?

McGee replied that examples, good and bad, of other mergers would argue that it is possible, especially with a confederation model. But that model might not be the best in our case, so it raises the question not of whether it could be done, but whether it is a good idea to do it.

Provost Hynd agreed that models might be instructive, for instance Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis (IUPUI), a collaborative model of one institution, with two independent organizations collaborating on one campus, but other models might be investigated as well.

Mitchener asked where the money came from for IUPUI.

McGee replied that IUPUI operates on a confederation model that presumes the same cash flows from the previous year for each original campus, with the prospect of figuring out the finances for the continued collaboration over the long haul. But if the question is whether or not there is a revenue neutral way to do this, that model might suit, or there might be other models to be determined by thoughtful further study.

-----

Deanna McBroom (Music) stated that, coming from her experience as a person involved in a nearly 25-year collaboration with faculty at MUSC, we should definitely consider "thinking about and dreaming about the possibilities that we could evolve" with stronger collaboration with MUSC. Her collaboration paved the way for a Vocal Institute and clinical research. She encouraged faculty to imagine collaborations that we have not yet thought of.

-----

Elaine Worzala (Director of the Carter Real Estate Center) spoke in support of what had been said previously about the importance of understanding the depth of investment needed to run successful graduate programs. Underfunded graduate programs can be particularly hard on faculty: sufficient resources and fair compensation are a must. She also spoke from her experiences at a past institution that hired a number of new faculty to support a new initiative that ended up being underfunded and under supported. The result was that many of the faculty left and a generally tense atmosphere remains. Faculty who had come in under one culture found a different culture, producing a good
deal of animosity. It is essential, she suggested, that we take into account such experiences if we move forward with building graduate programs.

-----
Tom Heeny (Communication & President of the CofC chapter of AAUP) raised a concern about the legislature potentially taking the lead in charting the course for a merger. He adduced the example of Rutgers University, who have been forced by the New Jersey state legislature to absorb a medical school in an unfunded mandate in which the university is tasked with raising or otherwise coming up with 100 million dollars to see the merger through.

-----
Steven Jaume' (Geology) asked if the enthusiastic business community has said they would contribute to the cost of a merger.

McGee replied that nothing in that way has been discussed, but added that the Chamber of Commerce, convinced that the idea of a merger has great merit, have voted to form a blue ribbon task force to study it and, if they like the outcome, promote it.

Provost Hynd added that we cannot conclude at this point that support from the local and business community would not be available.

-----
Todd McNerney (Theater) asked how a merger would impact the undergraduate student and what students would get or gain from the merger. He added that he hopes we will invite student comment and feedback on any ideas about merging.

Provost Hynd replied that he understands the concern and that we don't want to lose what we have and what we are at the College but also that all institutions are going to have to evolve. He further asserted that if we stay strong in the department-level focus on the student, we will be able to maintain the character of the institution that we have now. Adding graduate level programs could add value to the undergraduate experience by introducing opportunities that we do not currently have.

McNerney reiterated his concern that, in some cases, "as that R1 agenda increases, faculty interaction with students" decreases. Students may not be connected to the faculty so much as to graduate students.

McGee, in reply, stated that the President has said a number of times on this very question that the College has to be an institution passionate about and dedicated to undergraduate education, any future that does not include that won't happen.

-----
Debra Boyle (Philosophy) asked if there has been any conversation about increasing undergrad programs under a merger.

McGee replied that, to his knowledge, there have been no discussions of increasing undergraduate programs and such an outcome would be unlikely, given the physical limits of the College.

-----

Speaker Cherry closed the meeting at this point by noting that the faculty want to be involved in any discussions about the future of the College and want transparency so that we can stay informed.

In the fall, this conversation will continue, possibly with another special meeting.
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MUSC: By the Numbers

- Founded 1824
- Renamed 1969
- Six Colleges (e.g., Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy)
- Enrolled UGs: 198
- Grad. Students: 2,480
- Faculty: 207
- FY10 Operating Budget: $587 million
History of Merger Conversations

- 1824
- 1968
- 1973
- 1975-1978
- 1981-1982
- 1991-1992
- 1995
- 1998-2000
- 2013

“I am a realist and in the face of financial constraints, editorial opposition, and a parochial mentality on the part of certain persons, the creation of a university at Charleston is impossible at this time.”

Dewey Wise, State Senator
January 26, 1982
Past Proposals for the Relationship

- Clear Separation
- “Close Association”
- Graduate Consortium
- Merger
  - Confederation
  - Consolidation

Current Collaboration with MUSC

- Student Advising
- Undergraduate Research at MUSC
- Cross-appointed Faculty
- Research & Teaching Collaborations
  - Biology
  - Chemistry
  - Mathematics
  - Physics
  - Other Disciplines
- Joint Grant/Fellowship Programs
## COLLEGE of CHARLESTON
### SCHOOL OF SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS

### SNAPSHOT OF SSM

1840 majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL + MBIO</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM + BIOC</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI + DISC + CITA + INFS</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOL</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS+ASTP+ASTR</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate Programs: Marine Biology, Environmental Studies, Computer Science, Math

## COLLEGE of CHARLESTON
### SCHOOL OF SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS

### UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES, AY 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>C of C</th>
<th>Clemson</th>
<th>USC - Col.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology + Marine</td>
<td>182 (3)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>182 (3)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry + Biochemistry</td>
<td>58 (1)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>33 (3)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>25 (1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>15 (3)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
<td>8 (2)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total S & M (% grads)         | 321 (15.9%) | 390 (11.8%) | 545 (12.2%) |
Total Graduates               | 2025       | 3318       | 4462       |
SSM CofC / MUSC Collaborations

**College of Charleston – Students going to Medical School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number Accepted</th>
<th>Number to MUSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22 (to MUSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MUSC Faculty Teaching or Advising CofC Students** 11

**CofC Faculty Advising MUSC Students** 11

**CofC & MUSC Faculty Collaborations** 13 – 25

**Undergraduate Research Collaborations** 20

**External Funding** 2

**Other Active Collaborations** 2

---

EHHP CofC/MUSC Collaborations

**Masters in Child Life** (Being Developed with HSS)

**Faculty Consulting with MUSC to Improve Teaching & Learning at MUSC**

**Strong 15 year Partnership with Orthopedic Faculty & Residents**

**External Funding Partnerships** 3 grants recently submitted

**Number of Joint Appointments**
Committee on Collaboration

- Membership
  - CofC: Dan Ravenel, Demetria Clemons, George W. Hynd, Steve Osborne
  - MUSC: Two Trustees, Mark S. Sothmann & Lisa P. Montgomery

- Purpose: To explore existing and future collaborations that build on each institution's strengths
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 2 and 9 April 2013

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 2 April 2013, at 5:05 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium). After Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of 12 March, 2013 were approved as circulated. The meeting was then continued on Tuesday, 9 April at 5:12 P.M.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry reported on the following items:

- Special thanks to Sarah Owens, Faculty Secretary (completing her 3rd year as Secretary), George Pothering (Parliamentarian), and Heather Alexander (Faculty Secretariat).

- Special thanks to all faculty committees and to the chairs of those committees. A lot of work has been accomplished this year and has been reported on to the Senate. Speaker Cherry plans to continue having committees report to the Senate at meetings next year.

- Reminder that textbook orders for fall semester are due 15 April, 2013. Please submit orders as soon as possible.

- On 3 April, President Benson will host his spring faculty/staff Town Hall meeting at 3:30 P.M. in the Stern Center Ballroom. President and various senior Executive Vice-Presidents (EVPs) will be on hand to answer questions that faculty/staff may have.

- April Board of Trustees meetings are scheduled Thursday and Friday, 18 & 19 April. If you plan to attend any committee meetings and/or the meeting of the Board on Friday morning, please let Clara Hodges in Academic Affairs know so that there is sufficient seating made available.

- Information Technology (IT) – Fiscal Year 2014 IT Plan Prioritization: IT held an open forum for interested faculty and staff on Wednesday, 13 March. Members of the FY 14 Planning team were asked to respond to and rank order the 52 various projects based on criteria which included Institutional Impact and Strategic Alignment. Members met again on Wednesday, 27 March to see the list of prioritized items/projects and to hear IT’s plan for moving forward. The top four project priorities were:
  - Classroom Technology Upgrade & Expansion
  - Wireless Services / Converging Wireless Networks
  - Equipment Replacement
  - PC Replacement Cycle
There were a significant number of other items that were identified as important, many of which are inter-connected with each other (i.e. exploring/developing distance education is dependent on improved equipment replacement, PC replacement cycles, wireless, etc.). The group of faculty and staff tried to emphasize to IT that budget requests and budget priorities should seek to do the greatest good for the money. Rather than fully funding 3 or 4 top priorities at the expense of no improvement in any of the other top 15 or 20 priorities, most argued that IT should request funding to make significant/substantive progress on multiple fronts even if it means taking slightly longer to fully realize/accomplish top priorities.

Bob Cape, Senior Vice President / Chief Information Officer, told the FY 14 Planning Group that he and IT will go through the list of priorities and prepare a budget request which will then be submitted to the EVPs and President, and will then be considered in the total budget requests for FY14 which will go to the Board of Trustees. The Board will make their decision regarding tuition and fees and the College’s budget for FY 2014 in June.

Scott Peeples (at-large) wanted to know about some of the 5-20 items that were as pressing as the top 4. Speaker Cherry said that the other items were secure email, gateway replacement, disaster recovery (major hurricane), college storage requirements, IT risk assessment, cloud opportunities, security upgrades, distance education, etc. Some were things that will help support the operation of IT. Mr. Peeples said he does not want things to slow down too much. The Speaker said these are very important and many of them are interconnected.

The President

President Benson limited his report to two topics: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Accreditation and collaboration between the College and the Medical University of South Carolina (MUSC).

1. SACS


President Benson thanked everyone at the College who contributed to the development of the report. It was truly a team effort. SACS has been our regional accreditor for over a half-century.
The College must be accredited by SACS in order for our students to receive federal financial aid and other federal funds such as research grant money. Accreditation by SACS is essential to the fulfillment of our institutional mission.

As President, it is his responsibility to sign the major SACS reports to affirm that they are honest and accurate. He takes that responsibility very seriously. He knows that some of our faculty and staff think that accreditation should be easy for the College to achieve, since we are a selective and highly ranked institution, with a history of educational excellence. However, nothing is easy about SACS accreditation.

Accreditation begins with the assumption that an institution like ours does NOT comply with SACS standards. And the burden of proof that we do meet those standards is on us. Complying with SACS standards on an ongoing basis and documenting our compliance is an enormous undertaking, requiring thousands of faculty and staff hours - year after year after year - not just when a report is due. In one way or another, every employee at the College has some sort of obligation for compliance with SACS standards. For faculty in particular, complying with standards and demonstrating our compliance with SACS standards are a basic professional obligation. In the past, the College experienced a major accreditation review once every 10 years. The College’s accreditation was reaffirmed in 2007, only a few weeks after President Benson arrived at the College.

Recently, SACS initiated a requirement for a Fifth-Year Interim Report. That means that the College is now submitting a major report about five years after our last reaffirmation, and about five years prior to our next full SACS review. The full SACS review still occurs once every 10 years and includes an on-campus visit by a SACS accrediting team.

It is clear from the work that was done in the development of the Fifth-Year Interim Report that there are many areas in which the College does very well in support of our students, faculty, and staff and in complying with federal and state regulations. The President said we should be proud of our accomplishments. However, any accreditation review is also an opportunity to learn where we can do better and how we can continue to improve as an academic institution. One such area for potential improvement is assessment, which determines whether each unit or division of the College is doing what it is supposed to be doing. Assessment is a university-wide responsibility and includes continuous improvement efforts conducted by every division of the College.

President Benson said assessment expectations for universities are much higher now than they were at the start of his academic career. Assessment in universities was inspired by activities that emerged in the corporate world during the quality revolution of the 1990s. The newest generation of faculty will spend much more time on assessment work than did his own generation of faculty. Much time has been spent recently on academic assessment, which is the determination of whether our students learn what we say they should learn. There was a time when the College had a three-year planning, execution, and reporting cycle for academic program assessment. These assessments were usually conducted in the individual academic departments. By the end of our last SACS review, the three-year cycle was no longer consistent with best assessment practices. Following consultation with a vice president at SACS, the three-
year cycle was shut down in April 2007 by the old Office of Accountability, Accreditation, Planning and Assessment. They planned to switch to a new assessment cycle in 2008 or 2009.

Unfortunately, due primarily to personnel changes, our new program assessment cycle was not implemented until fall 2011. As a result, at the time we completed our Fifth-Year Interim Report last month, we did not have what SACS calls “mature data,” which come from multiple years of centrally directed program assessment. However, from 2007-2011 our individual schools and departments continued to complete various assessment projects, and made good use of those assessment data for program improvement. But, some schools and departments did much more assessment than others, and this decentralized assessment work does not always allow for multi-year comparison and review.

In the Fifth-Year Interim Report, our academic program assessment history and our current assessment cycle was explained. President Benson said we believe that our current approach to program assessment will fully meet SACS expectations for the foreseeable future. However, because we do not yet have mature, multi-year data derived from our new program assessment cycle, and because it took us several years to move to our new institutional cycle, we have informed SACS that we might not have fully and consistently complied with the SACS standard for academic program assessment during the last few years.

The College gave this response of “not compliant” to SACS for two reasons: First, the College had assessment weaknesses identified during our SACS review in 2006-2007, which led to the College being monitored by SACS for two years. While we were removed from monitoring in 2009, it is his belief that we should be very conservative in evaluating and presenting current and future assessment information to SACS, given our previous monitoring status. Second, there is a good case to be made that the College has engaged in continuous academic program assessment since 2007. And SACS reviewers might decide that we are in compliance with their program assessment standard. However, we have heard from SACS representatives that it is better to report non-compliance when there is doubt about which choice to make — compliant or non-compliant.

The College anticipates receiving feedback from SACS about our Fifth-Year Interim Report in June. At that time, SACS could request additional information or documentation, or they could require additional reports of us. Or, we could be notified that the process for this particular reporting cycle is complete and that we are current until our 10-year review takes place in 2016-2017.

If SACS reviewers believe that the College has been non-compliant in conducting academic program assessment, the College probably will need to complete a “referral report” about our ongoing work to become compliant. That referral report would be due to SACS in September.

Because by September we will have more mature data, President Benson said he is confident that we will be able to demonstrate both our compliance with the SACS standard for academic program assessment, and our continued development of a robust culture of assessment at the College. He clarified that a referral report is not desirable, but such a report should not threaten our accreditation by SACS, as long as we respond appropriately and continue to do the necessary
assessment work. He thanked the faculty, staff, and administrators who have worked diligently to prepare the Fifth-Year Interim Report and to modernize and professionalize our institutional approaches to assessment.

2. MUSC

President Benson referred to his presentation to the Senate in January that described the rapidly transforming economy of Charleston, a term he coined as “New Charleston.” Senators received a copy of that presentation in February, and he answered questions about the presentation at a special meeting of the Senate on 12 February. He thanked those who have provided feedback and suggestions.

In his “New Charleston” presentation, he discussed some possible short-term and long-term steps that the College might need to consider in order to ensure that we remain relevant and competitive in our rapidly evolving economy.

One of the long-term solutions he proposed was the merging of the College and MUSC. This is not a new idea. There have been at least two past attempts to do this – once in the early 1980s and another in the late 1990s. But a lot has changed since then, and he believes that it may be time to give this idea a fresh look. To that end, there are ongoing informal discussions taking place between the leadership of the College and MUSC.

The goal of these talks is to determine whether there are good enough and strong enough reasons to even consider a merger. He wants to stress that these discussions are very preliminary. Obviously, any serious consideration or study of a merger would require significant opportunities for our entire College community to weigh in. The Senate will be apprised of the progress of these discussions.

The talks between him and MUSC President Ray Greenberg have also focused on looking for opportunities to increase the collaboration between the two universities. This resonates well with everyone, and a joint committee has been established to study the possibilities for further collaboration. He said it is important to recognize that the College and MUSC already enjoy a very collegial and cooperative relationship.

Among the academic areas in which the College and MUSC already collaborate include:

- Nearly a dozen MUSC faculty currently teach or advise our students. In most instances, these are MUSC professors and post-doctoral students serving as adjunct faculty in our Department of Biology. In addition, the Department of Biology has two visiting assistant professors who were postdoctoral fellows at MUSC.
- About a dozen College faculty serve as advisors to MUSC students.
- Faculty at the College and MUSC collaborate on a variety of research projects in the fields of biology, chemistry, mathematics, and physics.
• Our undergraduate students regularly conduct faculty-mentored research at MUSC. This past November, MUSC researchers held a recruiting session to offer CofC undergraduates opportunities to conduct research in their labs at MUSC.

• Our universities jointly participate in grants and fellowship programs. For example, our Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry has participated with MUSC on grants that have provided valuable scientific instrumentation for our faculty and students.

These are just some of the many collaborations. The President thanked the faculty and staff who make these connections possible. Regardless of whether the universities ever merge or not, it is his expectation that our collaborations with MUSC will continue to grow and strengthen over time.

In closing, President Benson said he realizes that he have covered two very important issues this evening. Each could easily be the subject of an entire Faculty Senate meeting. He welcomes e-mails and meeting with faculty to discuss these issues.

There were no questions at this time.

The Provost

Provost Hynd reported gave the following Power point presentation:
Provost’s Report
2012 - 2013

Office of Academic Affairs
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- Q & A
Dean Searches

Dean Searches Completed
• Humanities & Social Sciences
• Honors College

Libraries Dean Search
• Dean Fran Welch, Chair
• 26 applicants
• Two Finalists
  1. David Stern, Illinois State University
  2. Adam Murray, Murray State University

Academic Program Approvals

Fully approved
Archaeology
Foreign Language Education
Marketing
Finance

Approved by Faculty
African American Studies (Awaiting CHE and SACS review)
Bachelor of Professional Studies (Awaiting SACS response only)

In planning stages
Neuroscience (CHE planning summary submitted)
### 3rd Year Review, Tenure & Promotion

#### 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd year review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (including tenure only reviews)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Instructor promotion or renewal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotion to Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd year review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (including tenure only reviews)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Instructor promotion or renewal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotion to Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd year review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (including tenure only reviews)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr Instructor promotion or renewal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotion to Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sabbaticals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>One-semester</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2014 (and yet final)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$60K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$80K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$220K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$435K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sabbaticals

Why are some sabbatical proposals not funded?
1. Low priority assigned by dean
2. Lack of evidence of scholarly work (or creative activities) since the last sabbatical;
3. Poorly developed proposal; or
4. Project was not substantive enough to warrant a sabbatical.

In many cases, it is a combination of a couple of these factors, rather than just a single one.
Academic Affairs Highlights

SACS Fifth Year Interim Report
- 18 of the 81 SACSCOC standards were included in the report.
- Some of the Federal Requirement standards covered in the report mandated policies and procedures including the new Student Credit Hour Policy.
- SACSCOC will respond to the report in June and may request a number of referral reports at that time.
- The next reaffirmation is scheduled for 2016-17, so the College has only three years to update data collection and reporting processes for the other standards.

Online Course Evaluation
- Upgraded course-instructor software & tested mobile online course evaluation app.
- Deadline for completion extended through final exams.

Academic Affairs Highlights

Distance Education
1. Recommendations submitted to President Benson
2. Center for Faculty Development Proposed

Writer’s Retreats
1. In collaboration with Conscuela Francis and Addlestone Library, 8 writer’s retreats hosted this academic year (2 over Winter Break; 3 over Spring Break; 3 in May)

General Education Assessment
- Sponsored General Education Assessment Workshop
- Worked with the and Faculty Senate on certifying courses for general education credit
Joe Kelly (at-large) wanted to know more about the CofC Campaign. The Provost said it is based on the Strategic Plan. Deans have been talking to faculty to identify priorities for their schools. These items were scored and prioritized by a leadership team. Categories were developed such as: scholarships, endowed professorships, program development, institutional support, etc. We are now in the silent phase (also known as the leadership phase). A number of donors have already pledged support (alumni, faculty and staff, etc). There are development officers for different schools and everyone will have an opportunity to be engaged. The intention is to go public with the announcement of the campaign in October, 2013.

Simon Lewis (guest) had a question about sabbaticals. Is there any discussion about boosting the pay for the full year? The Provost said no, but he is willing to talk to Mr. Lewis further.
Doryjane Birrer, Chair of the Faculty Research and Development Committee, gave the following report. This information is based on the first two rounds of funding. The committee received a total of 36 proposals, 25 of which were funded for a total of $75,237. 48% of funding went to the School of Sciences and Mathematics, 20% to the School of the Arts, 18% to the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, 8% to the School of Education Health and Human Performance, and 6% to the School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs.

Only a third of the proposals requested were starter grants, even though this is their mission. Over 40% of the proposals came from three departments: Mathematics, Hispanic Studies, and History. Some departments had no proposals whatsoever such as English, Philosophy, or Religious Studies.

Ms. Birrer listed some of the reasons why proposals do not get funded. For example, the narrative did not make clear the significance of research within a specific field; the narrative used too much jargon or was not framed for a non-specialized audience; there were insufficient reasons for travel; or some proposals contained typos or were not well-written.

Ms. Birrer then opened the floor to questions.

Bob Mignone (guest) wanted to know if there was a dollar amount given to the committee. Ms. Birrer responded that the committee has a total yearly budget of approximately $90,000. About $60,000 (summer) is allocated to round two.
Faculty Welfare Committee

Simon Lewis, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, gave the following Power Point presentation. He thanked Allison Welch for making the Power Point. Mr. Lewis explained that a check mark on the power point indicates progress/completed; a question mark is still a query, and an X denotes no progress yet.

Faculty morale issues

- Update on recommendations from January report
  1. Online teaching evaluations
  2. Communication about T&P procedures
  3. Evaluation of chairs and deans

- Current work
  4. Grievance process
  5. Adjunct conditions

Faculty Welfare Committee, 4/2/2013
Online teaching evaluations – Recommendations 1 & 2

1) Simplify student participation
   ✓ single click from emails
   ✓ extend opportunity through end of finals

2) Opt-out system
   ? require students to either complete or actively opt-out of each evaluation
   ✓ discontinue faculty-based incentives

✓ Expected S13
? FWC will continue to monitor response rates

Online teaching evaluations – Recommendation 3

3) Report measures of data validity
   ✓ standard deviation & standard error
     • include error bars on graphs
   ✓ make available for past semesters

✓ Academic Affairs, IT and IR are working on this

new concern – order of responses: “Highly Disagree” on top
Communication about T&P procedures – Recommendations

1) Single annual period for FAM revisions
   - e.g., one month, ideally over summer

2) Stable T&P requirements for each faculty member
   - e.g., evaluate each tenure candidate based on standards and process in FAM at time of their hire
   - FWC continuing to discuss with Academic Affairs
   - T&P expectations based on departmental criteria

Evaluation of chairs and deans – Recommendations

1) Regular, anonymous evaluations of chairs and deans by their faculty
   - two-levels-up reporting for accountability

   chairs – FAM specifies annual schedule
   - currently not uniformly applied
   - FWC urges immediate compliance from all Schools

   deans – have not been evaluated by faculty since ~2007
   - FWC recommends biennial schedule
   - FWC/AA working toward some form this spring
Phil Dustan (at-large) asked about the online evaluations. He said the 18 page PDF we get back is not user friendly. Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, said they have added a summary table. There needs to be a conversation about a shorter summary for Tenure and Promotion (T&P). The problem has to do with the software and this is what it produces. But the vendor knows this is a problem.

Jannette Finch (Library) said that Library administrators should also be evaluated. She does not ever remember this happening.

John Huddleston (Religious Studies) said he does not think it is a good idea to administer the evaluations during final exams (for example, some students might want to retaliate against a professor if they fail the exam). Mr. Lewis said that we need to have students actually completing the evaluations, once that problem is solved then they can look at timing. Steve Litvin (Hospitality/Tourism Mgmt) said he remembers that the Senate was very adamant about not doing the evaluations during exams. Bob Mignone (guest) said that we might get more responses, but the data might be negative. Margaret Hagood (at-large) said the final exam is part of the course, and should also be part of the student evaluation. Glenn Lesses (guest) said that years ago as a chair, he read data recommending against evaluations during major events, like exams. Vince Benigni (Communication) asked why we cannot use the app first during the regular time. Further discussed ensued regarding the effects of conducting students evaluations during final exams.
Ms. Caveny-Noecker said the Faculty Welfare Committee has recommended this. Students have asked also for this. 9 April is the launch date. There are already a set of posters that announce the dates, but new ones could be made.

Mike Duval (English) said that if the evaluation data is dated, this will be valuable information to find out how students respond to the evaluation during final exams.

Old Business

Glenn Lesses, Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, introduced the following five motions.

Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual

The first two motions were made by the By-Laws Committee at the April 2012 meeting of the Faculty Senate. These motions were then referred back to the By-Laws Committee based on recent practice in applying Article VI, section 1 of the By-Laws. Since the April meeting was the last Senate meeting of 2012, the motions have to be re-introduced to the Senate in 2012-2013. Rather than introduce by-laws revisions periodically throughout the year requiring several ratification votes by the faculty, the By-Laws Committee decided to introduce all recommendations for revision together so that if the Senate approves the recommendations there can be a single ratification election.
TITLE: Motion of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws V.3.B.2.a: Composition of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs, adding two additional members (Provost or designee and Director of Continuing Education).

MOTION: Amend By-Laws V.3.B.2.a as follows:

2. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs
   
   a. Composition: Five faculty members, at least one of whom is also a member of the Graduate faculty. The Dean of the Graduate School is a non-voting ex-officio member of this committee. The Registrar is an ex-officio member. The Dean of the Graduate School, the Registrar, the Provost or designee, and the Director of the Center of Continuing Education and Professional development are non-voting ex-officio members.

RATIONALE:

The Provost or designee and the Director of the Center of Continuing Education and Professional Development have been attending the committee members as guests. The addition to the Provost or designee as a non-voting ex-officio member would formalize his/her role in graduate curriculum matters. The addition of the Director of the Center of Continuing Education and Professional Development as a non-voting ex-officio member would keep the committee informed of new continuing education initiatives.

The Senate voted on the “Composition of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs, adding two additional members (Provost or designee and Director of Continuing Education),” which was approved without discussion.

TITLE: Motion of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws V.2.B.3: Composition and Duties of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual.

MOTION: Amend By-Laws V.2.B.3 as follows:

3. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual
a. Composition: Three faculty members. *Ex-officio* members are the Speaker of the Faculty, the Faculty Secretary, *and* the Provost (or Provost’s designee). and the Vice President for Legal Affairs. *The Senior Vice President for Legal Affairs (or designee) is a non-voting, ex-officio member.* (Rev. April 2007)

b. Duties:

1. **To review any motions to amend the Faculty By-Laws and report to the Faculty Senate.**

2. **To review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual;**

3. **To propose changes for the improvement of these documents and to forward the recommended changes to the administration and/or the Faculty Senate as appropriate;**

4. **To incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documents; and**

5. **To make non-substantive changes to the Faculty By-Laws to correct unintended grammatical and spelling errors, address minor problems of stylistic consistency, and correct inaccurate administrative titles. Such a non-substantive change shall not constitute an amendment to or repeal of the Faculty By-Laws. Such changes shall be made only when unanimously approved by the Committee. Notice in writing shall be given to the Faculty Senate within 60 calendar days of such changes being approved by the Committee. Such changes shall be repealed if an appropriate motion to amend something previously adopted is approved by a simple majority of the Committee, the Faculty Senate, or the College Faculty.**

**RATIONALE:**
The change to the committee’s composition clarifies the non-voting status of the Senior Vice President for Legal Affairs or designee. The Senior Vice President for Legal Affairs sits on the committee to advise the committee on the legal ramifications of amendments under consideration, but is not involved in the committee’s decisions in the way that the other ex officio members are.

Article VI, Section 1 of the By-Laws states: “Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the Senate its recommendations on the motion and any amendments at the next Senate meeting.”
This amendment specifies that duty under the committee description to clarify what the committee’s work includes.

Calvin Blackwell (guest) asked if you are nonvoting, do you count as a quorum. Mr. Pothering said nonvoting members do not count.

The Senate voted on the Motion to amend By-Laws V.2.B.3: Composition and Duties of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual, which was approved.

**TITLE:** Motion of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws V.2.B.1.a: Composition of the Academic Planning Committee, adding one additional member (the Registrar or Registrar’s designee).

**MOTION:** Amend By-Laws V.2.B.1.a as follows:

1. Academic Planning Committee
   a. Composition: Seven faculty members and one student. The Provost (or Provost’s designee) and Registrar (or Registrar’s designee) are non-voting ex-officio members.

**RATIONALE:** The Academic Planning Committee has requested this revision and the By-Laws Committee recommends the change. Currently, the Registrar attends Academic Planning Committee meetings as a guest. The Academic Planning Committee often requires input from the Registrar not only to help guide in curricular decisions but also prevent motions from going forward that will need to be changed due to restrictions imposed by the scheduling and degree auditing systems utilized by the Registrar. This motion simply regularizes and makes official current practice. The motion also incorporates current practice that the Provost often appoints a delegate to attend the meetings.

The Senate voted on the Motion to amend By-Laws V.2.B.1.a: Composition of the Academic Planning Committee, adding one additional member (the Registrar or Registrar’s designee), which was approved without discussion.
TITLE: Motion of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws V. 2. A: membership of Senate committees.

MOTION: Motion of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws V.2.A as follows:

Section 2. Standing Senate Committees

A. Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting and are elected by the Senate during the April Senate meeting. At least one member of standing Senate Committees must be a Senator.

RATIONALE: Through 1999-2000, the following sentence was included in the FAM: “The majority of members of standing Senate committees must be Senators.” However, this sentence was omitted from the FAM beginning in 2001 (Note: the Secretariat has not been able to locate the FAM for 2000-2001). Heather Alexander has reviewed the Senate archives, but has not been able to find any indication that this omission was anything but inadvertent. The Committee on Nominations and Elections, however, has continued to apply this criterion for membership on Senate committees. Given the smaller composition of the Senate, it has become increasingly difficult for the Committee on Nominations and Elections to find an adequate number of senators to serve on the three standing Senate committees. Furthermore, the distinction between Senate standing committees and standing College committees has become much less clear over the past few years. Consequently, we recommend replacing the sentence that the By-Laws Committee believes was inadvertently omitted from the FAM with a weaker Senate membership requirement that still maintains a distinction between Senate and College committees. The proposed requirement stipulates that standing Senate committees include at least one Senator in their membership. Reducing the overall number of Senators required will assist future Committees on Nominations and Elections constructing membership slates for standing Senate committees.

Calvin Blackwell said that Nominations and Elections (he is chair) supports this motion. It is difficult to get faculty to serve on committees.

The Senate voted on the Motion to amend By-Laws V. 2. A: membership of Senate committees, which was approved.
TITLE: Motion of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws VI.1: Senate option for amendment introduction.

MOTION: Motion of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws VI.1 as follows:

Article VI. Amending Procedures

Section 1. Senate Option for Amendment Introduction

Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any meeting of the Faculty Senate. Unless made initially by the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, the motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the Senate its recommendations on the motion originating elsewhere and any amendments at the next Senate meeting. Motions made by the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual can be considered at the Senate meeting at which they are introduced. Motions to amend or repeal these by-laws require a two-thirds vote in the Senate for approval. Approved motions must then be ratified by a simple majority of regular faculty members voting by electronic ballot on the motion. (Rev. Jan. 2007)

RATIONALE: The language of VI.1 is a muddle. Currently, the section leaves open whether By-Laws motions that originate with the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual need to be referred automatically to the By-Laws Committee. Recent Senate practice has been to refer even these motions back to the By-Laws Committee for its recommendation at the next Senate meeting despite no explicit evidence that the FAM has this requirement. Furthermore, Senate interpretation of the FAM on this issue has occasionally been different in the past. It is part of the charge of the By-Laws Committee to make recommendations for By-Laws revisions. It seems unnecessary for By-Laws motions that are put forward by the By-Laws Committee to be routinely reviewed by the By-Laws Committee itself. In the case of a Senate decision to amend substantively a motion originating by the By-Laws Committee, it remains open for the Senate to remand motions originating from the By-Laws Committee back to the Committee for further consideration. It is also possible for the Senate to defeat any motion recommended by the By-Laws Committee. Finally, remember that no By-Laws revision takes effect without a ratification election by the Faculty, which means that there is sufficient notice for any revisions to the Faculty By-Laws.

The Senate voted on the Motion to amend By-Laws VI.1: Senate option for amendment introduction, which was approved without discussion.
New Business

Dan Greenberg, Co-Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, introduced the following proposals.

Faculty Curriculum Committee
April 2013 Meeting
List of Proposals Approved by the Committee
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Web Site)

I. Course Proposals: All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deactivated) will be voted on as a single group, unless a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote. Senators are asked to contact the Faculty Speaker or the Faculty Secretary in advance, if they wish to separate a proposal from the group. Of course, this action can also be done on the floor of the Senate.

Astronomy
Prerequisite cleanup

Mathematics
Deactivate unused courses (MATH 115, 140, 260, 290, 355)

History

Physics
Deactivate unused courses (PHYS 119)

Spanish
Modify description of SPAN 447

Teacher Education
Cross-list EDFS 326 and EDFS 687

Honors College
Convert special-topics to new courses (HONS 168, HONS 216)

Hospitality/Tourism Management
Change prerequisites for HTMT 350

Communication
Change course numbers for 110 and 111 (to 280 and 281); change descriptions for 110, 111, 215, 310, 315, 336, 380, 410, 480, 481, and 495

Geology
Change Course; Create New Course
• GEOL 441: change descriptions
• Create new course: GEOL 469
• Create new course: GEOL 288

The Senate voted on all the course proposals for Astronomy, Mathematics, History, Physics, Spanish, Teacher Education, Honors College, Hospitality/Tourism Management, Communication, and Geology, which were approved without discussion.

A motion was made and seconded to suspend the meeting and to continue the following Tuesday, 9 April. The Senate voted on the motion, which was approved without discussion. The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 P.M.
The Senate resumed on 9 April and began with the program changes below.

II. Program Changes:

Anthropology  
Change Courses; Create New Course; Change Major
- Change course description and credit hours (ANTH 203)
- Change number of credit hours in major accordingly
- Create new course: ANTH 353 (conversion from special topics) and incorporate into major
- Add HONS 168 to major
- Deactivate ANTH 316 and 334
- Change description of ANTH 323
- Change minor to account for above changes

Comparative Literature  
Change Minor
- Add existing courses to minor: ENGL 226, ENGL 299, ENGL 319; LTRS 110, 120, 210, 220
- Remove courses from minor: ENGL 203, 204, 301, 302, 304, 306, 307, 308, 311, 338, 354, 355; LATN 321, 322; LTGR 150, 450; SPAN 453
- Only one film course (down from two) may count towards minor

Data Science  
Change (broken) Psychology Cognate
- PSYC 103 + 15 hours in PSYC

Biology  
New Course; Change of Majors and Minors
- Create new course: BIOL 354
- Change minors and majors accordingly

Psychology  
New Course; Change Courses; Change of Major
- Create new course (PSYC 315) and add to major
- Change title for PSYC 356
- Change prerequisites for PSYC 386, 387, 410

Historic Pres/Community Planning  
New Courses; Change of Major
- Create new course: HPCP 215
- Create new course: HPCP 280
- Add to major

Political Science  
New Course; Change of Major; Change of Minor
- Create new course: POLI 361
- Change major and minor accordingly

History  
New Course; Change of Major
- Convert special-topics to new course: HIST 247
- Change major accordingly

International Business  
Incorporate Minors into Major
- Add BLSP and BLFR to minors that count towards INTB

Economics  
Change Major; Change Courses
- Require ECON majors to take MATH 120 and MATH 250 to fulfill general-education math requirement
- Change math prerequisites for ECON 317 and 318 accordingly
- Require ECON majors to take ECON 419
- Change prerequisites for ECON 419
- Change titles and course descriptions of ECON 306 and 419
- Change prerequisites for ECON 400

Information Systems  
Create New Courses; Change Major; Change Minor
- Create new courses (CSCI 315, 459)
- Add ENTR 320 and 321 to major requirements
- Remove FINC 303 and MATH 307 from major requirements
- Add ENTR 320 to minor requirements
- Modify math prerequisites for major and minor
Asian Studies  
Change of Minor  
- Create new courses: ARBC 343, 420; ARST 100, 273, 420; LTAR 221, 270, 382; CHST 100, 270; LTCH 210, 220 (largely conversions from Special Topics)  
- Incorporate new courses into minor  
- Change courses (ARB 313, 314)  
- Add existing courses to minor: LTAR 250; RELS 235; POLI 245, 344, 346  
- Remove courses from minor (HIST 285, 377; ENGL 290)  

International Studies/LACS  
Create New Course; Change Concentrations, Major, and Minor  
- Remove deleted history courses from all concentrations, major, and minor  
- Add ARST 100, ARST 273; LTAR 221, LTAR 270, LTAR 382; CHST 100, CHST 270; LTCH 210, 220; RELS 235 to Asia concentration  
- Add LTAR 221, 270, 382; CHST 270; LTCH 210, 220 to International Comparative Literature concentration  
- Create INTL 120 (conversion from Special Topics); add to major and minor  
- Add HONS 166 to International Politics, History, and Geography concentration  
- Add HONS 166 to minor  

Music  
New Courses; Change Major  
- Create new courses: MUSC 349, 374, 438, 439  
- Change major accordingly  

Exercise Science  
Change Major  
- Move HEAL 216 from core to electives  
- Move EXSC 440 from electives to core  
- Create EXSC 499 (Bachelor's Essay)  

Public Health  
Change Major  
- Add URST 320 to required courses  
- Allow MATH 105 to count towards math requirements  

Arts Management  
Change Program; New Course; Change Courses  
- Change title and description of ARTM 350  
- Create ARTM 370 and add to major  
- Increase hours required for major (from 42 to 45)  
- Change prerequisites for ARTM 240  
- Change prerequisites for ARTM 420  

The Senate voted on all of the above program changes, which were approved without discussion.  

III. New Programs:  

Physics  
New Concentration; New Course  
- Create new concentration in computational neuroscience (CBIO)  
- Create new course (PHYS 394) and add to concentration  

The Senate voted on the new concentration and course in Physics, which were approved without discussion.  

International Business  
Delete Minor; Create New Minor  
- Delete (unworkable) LAIB minor  
- Create new Global Trade (GLTR) minor
The Senate voted on the new minor (and deletion of the old) in International Business, which was approved without discussion.

Robert Westerfelhaus, member of the Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs, introduced the following proposals.

**Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs**

*(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)*

**MA in Communication**

**New Course Proposals**
- COMM 520: Communication Campaigns
- COMM 530: Race, Gender, Class and Media
- COMM 540: Uses and Effects of Media
- COMM 690: Communication Pedagogy
Course Change Proposals
COMM 584: Ethics in Communication (Title Change from Contemporary Problems in Communication Ethics)

Course Deletion Proposals
COMM 507, COMM 521, COMM 524, COMM 525, COMM 535, COMM 538, COMM 549, COMM 594, COMM 698

Program Change Proposals
Deletion of courses from requirements (COMM 521 or COMM 580)
Addition of courses to requirements (add COMM 680 as core course choice)
Prerequisite Clean-Up

Jeff Wragg (Physics/Astronomy) asked if COMM 690 Communication Pedagogy is a course for educators or communicators. An answer was given that this course is designed for educators of communication (how to manage a class and deliver course content).

The Senate voted on the proposals related to the MA in Communication, which was approved.

______________________________

MS in Computer and Information Sciences

New Course Proposal
CSIS 641: Advanced Cybersecurity

Program Change Proposals
Deletion of courses from electives (Citadel Courses: PMGT 651, PMGT 652, PMGT 653)
Addition of specialization in Cyberspace (CSIS 614, CSIS 631, CSIS 632, CSIS 641)

The Senate voted on the proposals related to the MS in Computer and Information Sciences, which were approved without discussion.

______________________________

MS in Mathematics

New Course Proposals
MATH 540: Statistical Learning I
MATH 541: Statistical Learning II

Approval to Cross-list
MATH 540 to be cross-listed with MATH 440
MATH 541 to be cross-listed with MATH 441

The Senate voted on the proposals related to the MS in Mathematics, which were approved without discussion.
MAT in Special Education, Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education and MED in Languages

Approval to Cross-list

EDFS 687: Introduction to Educational Technology to be cross-listed with EDFS 326

MAT in Special Education – Change Course Requirements - Prerequisite Clean-up

Mr. Wragg said he sees quite a stretch between a course that is cross-listed at the 300 and 600 levels. What concerns did the committee address? Mr. Greenberg said that the Curriculum Committee reviewed this concern and said the syllabus makes clear the different requirements for undergraduate and graduate students. The content is similar at both levels, and because of the low enrollment in the two courses, this is also a logistical move.

The Senate voted on the proposals related to the MAT in Special Education, Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education and MED in Languages, which were approved.
Committee on General Education

Bob Mignone, Chair of the Committee on General Education, introduced the following motion.

**Motion to Approve For General Education Status**

The Committee on General Education moves that the following courses be approved for General Education Status within the Requirements that they are listed under.

**Introduction:** This motion would certify each of the following as satisfying the General Education Humanities requirement, based on the current Senate approved Approval Criteria for the Humanities requirement.

**MOTION:** Approve the following courses for General Education Status under the Humanities General Education Requirement:

**HUMANITIES:**

**Asian Studies (NEW COURSES)**

1. CHST 100 Introduction to Chinese Studies
2. CHST 270 Chinese Cinema
3. LTAR 221 Islamic World Literature
4. LTAR 270 Arab Cinema
5. LTAR 382 Arab Women Writers
6. LTCH 210 Traditional Chinese Literature
7. LTCH 220 Modern Chinese Literature in Translation
8. ARST 100 Introduction to the Arab and Islamic World
9. ARST 273 The Role of the Qur’an and its Place in Contemporary Islam

The Senate voted on the nine new courses in Asian Studies for General Education Status under the Humanities General Education Requirement, **which was approved without discussion**.

**Education (NEW COURSE)**

1. EDFS 201 Foundations of Education

The Senate voted on the new course in Education (EDFS 201) for General Education Status under the Humanities General Education Requirement, **which was approved without discussion**.
Hispanic Studies (NEW COURSE)

1 SPAN 333 Topics in Hispanic Cultures

Rationale: The CGE in consultation with the Faculty Committee for Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness, evaluated these courses and agrees that they meet the Approval Criteria for the Humanities requirement, and that they are expected to be adequately assessed, based on the student learning outcomes, evidence and assessment rubrics for the Humanities requirement.

The Senate voted on the new course in Hispanic Studies (SPAN 333) for General Education Status under the Humanities General Education Requirement, which was approved without discussion.

Mr. Mignone said they will be continuing with the assessment of General Education (Gen Ed) in the fall. The committee will be working on two main items: 1) Eliminating the disciplinary areas in the humanities requirement and allowing the approval criteria to govern which courses satisfy this Gen Ed requirement. 2) This year we expect to complete the re-certification of existing general education courses seeking to remain as such, and next year we expect to evaluate new courses seeking Gen Ed status. We will likely recommend that beginning in fall 2014 the general education curriculum will remain fixed for a period of years that will represent one full assessment cycle.
**2013-14 Nominations for Senate Committees, Standing College Committees and the Honor Board**

Calvin Blackwell, Chair of Nominations and Elections, thanked everyone who volunteered to serve on committees (210 faculty members volunteered from a total of about 500). This is ten percent more than the previous two years. He also thanked the Nomination and Elections’ members. He said that if you want to be on a committee – it’s helpful to say any committee on the survey. If you do not want to serve on a committee then you do not need to fill out the survey.

He accepted any further nominations to the three Senate Committees: Academic Planning, Budget and the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual. There were no nominations from the floor.

The Senate voted on the three Senate committees (see slate below), **which were approved without discussion**.

Mr. Blackwell took further nominations from the floor for all the other committees listed below. He also said that he would take nominations by email (make sure permission is received first from the nominee), and in a few weeks they will have elections. There were no nominations from the floor at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Name</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Planning</td>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>International and Intercultural</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Jeffrey</td>
<td>Yost</td>
<td>Accounting and Legal Studies</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Jones</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>Shawn</td>
<td>French and Italian</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Moscowitz</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Perkins</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Pothering</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Standards, Admissions and Financial Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avendano</td>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bakanic</td>
<td>Von</td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bowring</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>William Quinn</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Byrum</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stackel</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Librarian II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Swickert</td>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Galuska</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Goudy</td>
<td>Gayle</td>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Keenan</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Tonks</td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Quesada</td>
<td>Gioconda</td>
<td>Marketing and Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>Mobley</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Librarian I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Veal</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Health and Human Performance</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Doig</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Finch</td>
<td>Jannette</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Librarian II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Heeney</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>McLeod</td>
<td>Brumby</td>
<td>Hospitality and Tourism</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By-Laws and FAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Daniels</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Accounting and Legal Studies</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Heldrich</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  Bjerken</td>
<td>1  Bowers</td>
<td>1  Angela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Bond</td>
<td>2  Gonzalez</td>
<td>2  Cormack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Hanahan</td>
<td>3  Greenberg</td>
<td>3  Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Lafortune</td>
<td>4  Jaume</td>
<td>4  Hurd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Olejniczak</td>
<td>5  Lloyd</td>
<td>5  Mitchener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Overby</td>
<td>6  Page</td>
<td>6  Parisi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Rozzi</td>
<td>7  Przeworski</td>
<td>7  Vulava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Young, Paul, Mathematics, Professor
- Bjerken, Zeff, Religious Studies, Professor
- Bond, Joshua, Theater, Professor
- Hanahan, Devon, Hispanic Studies, Instructor
- Lafortune, Stephane, Mathematics, Professor
- Olejniczak, Bill, History, Professor
- Overby, Jason, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Professor
- Rozzi, Susan, Health and Human Performance, Associate
- Bowers, Terence, English, Professor
- Gonzalez, Marvin, Marketing and Supply Chain Management, Professor
- Greenberg, Daniel, Psychology, Professor
- Jaume, Steven, Geology and Environmental Geosciences, Associate
- Lloyd, Mary Elizabeth (Beth), Teacher Education, Professor
- Page, Matthew, Health and Human Performance, Professor
- Przeworski, Andrew, Mathematics, Professor
- Vasquez, Felix, Hispanic Studies, Professor
- Vassilandonakis, Yiorgos, Music, Professor
- Angela, Flenner, Library, Librarian I
- Cormack, Margaret, Religious Studies, Professor
- Harris, Renard, Teacher Education, Professor
- Hurd, Mark, Psychology, Professor
- Mitchener, William, Mathematics, Professor
- Parisi, David, Communication, Professor
- Vulava, Vijay, Geology and Environmental Geosciences, Associate
### Faculty Advisory Committee to the President

1. **Collins Paul**  
   - Theater  
   - Assistant Professor

2. **Danaher William**  
   - Sociology and Anthropology  
   - Professor

3. **Francis Conseula**  
   - English  
   - Professor

4. **Harris M. Scott**  
   - Geology and Environmental Geosciences  
   - Associate Professor

5. **Lee Michael**  
   - Communication  
   - Professor

6. **Litvin Stephen**  
   - Management  
   - Professor

7. **Marcello Forconi**  
   - Chemistry and Biochemistry  
   - Professor

8. **Podolsky Robert**  
   - Biology  
   - Professor

9. **Thompson Olivia**  
   - Health and Human Performance  
   - Professor

10. **Verlinden Marianne**  
    - Hispanic Studies  
    - Senior Instructor

11. **Wright Jennifer**  
    - Psychology  
    - Professor

### Faculty Welfare

1. **Clark Andrew**  
   - Biology  
   - Hospitality and Tourism  
   - Assistant Professor

2. **Crotts John**  
   - Management  
   - Professor

3. **Gomez Michael**  
   - Hispanic Studies  
   - Professor

4. **McNerney Todd**  
   - Theater  
   - Professor

5. **Qirko Hector**  
   - Sociology and Anthropology  
   - Professor

6. **Simon Lewis**  
   - English  
   - Professor

7. **Skinner Emily**  
   - Teacher Education  
   - Professor

8. **Slater Sandra**  
   - History  
   - Professor

### First Year Experience

1. **Alwine Andrew**  
   - Classics  
   - Assistant Professor

2. **Delfeld Helen**  
   - Political Science  
   - Assistant Professor

3. **Flynn Susan**  
   - Teacher Education  
   - Instructor

4. **Maldonado Bird Beatriz**  
   - International and Intercultural Studies  
   - Assistant Professor

5. **Nefeld Jonathan**  
   - Philosophy  
   - Assistant Professor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Riggs-Gelasco</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Berg</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>Calvert</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mignone</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Roxane</td>
<td>Delaurell</td>
<td>Accounting and Legal Studies</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Smail</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Health and Human Performance</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Warnick</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Librarian II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ewalt</td>
<td>Jo Ann</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frazier</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Hakila</td>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Mary Blake</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Namjin</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grievance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abdellatif</td>
<td>Attafi</td>
<td>French and Italian</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jin</td>
<td>Renling</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Siegler</td>
<td>Elijah</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grievance Alternate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barnette</td>
<td>Scooter</td>
<td>Health and Human Performance</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam</td>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teklu</td>
<td>Alem</td>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Carmichael</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hearing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lindner</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gavidia</td>
<td>Jose</td>
<td>Marketing and Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Huddleston</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kattwinkel</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Krasnoff</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lavrich</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wiseman</td>
<td>D. Reid</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Honor Board**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anguelova</td>
<td>Iana</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kai</td>
<td>Bo</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pehl</td>
<td>Malte</td>
<td>International and Intercultural Studies</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sancho</td>
<td>Gorka</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Robertson</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Steere-Williams</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Honor Board Advisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ashworth</td>
<td>Kristen</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hladky</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moran</td>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Jin-Hong</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Della Lana</td>
<td>German and Slavic Studies</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Worzala</td>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Economics and Finance</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Honors Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Burkett</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oprisan</td>
<td>Sorinel</td>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>International and Intercultural Studies</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shanes</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Jewish Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Trish</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Devet</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Doire</td>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foody</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>International and Intercultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Klous</td>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Health and Human Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Signori</td>
<td>French and Italian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Westerfelhaus</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Denis</td>
<td>Keyes</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Tenure Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Calcagno</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Economics and Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Felts</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moreira</td>
<td>Maria Luci</td>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strauman</td>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Tenure Review Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baginski</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>German and Slavic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barfield</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Health and Human Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bielskyk</td>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Katherine G</td>
<td>Johnston-Thom,</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Varallo</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Auriffeille</td>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Hispanic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chartas</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chou</td>
<td>Chen-Huei</td>
<td>Marketing and Supply Chain Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Hale</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>McDaniel</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>William S.</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Triblehorn</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student Affairs and</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Athletics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DeMaria</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Health and Human Performance</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Doughty</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gentile</td>
<td>Kristen</td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ragusa</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rigney</td>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bidwell</td>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Senior Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rosko</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tenure, Promotion,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>and Third Year Review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gigova</td>
<td>Irina</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lazzaro</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Peacock</td>
<td>Cliffton</td>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strauch</td>
<td>Katina</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Librarian IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tenure, Promotion,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>and Third Year Review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Alternate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragile</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lesses</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Darryl</td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Swanson</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Xie</td>
<td>Yu</td>
<td>Marketing and Supply Chain</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Speaker Cherry called for nominations for serving on the Nominations and Elections Committee (they cannot nominate themselves). There were no nominations from the floor at this time. She said she would send out an email for nominations.

**Faculty Welfare Committee**

Speaker Cherry announced that for procedural reasons, the Faculty Welfare Committee will withdraw their motion from the agenda. The Faculty Welfare Committee plans to bring the issue of adjunct representation to the Senate at some point next year.
Joe Kelly (at-large and co-chair of the President’s Commission on Diversity, Access, Equity, and Inclusion) presented the following motion:

**TITLE: Motion to Add Pedagogical Diversity Training to Merit and T&P Evaluations.**

*Change to FAM, VI. A. 1. b. 6. (g.) and VI. B. 2. b. 6 (g)*

**INTRODUCTION:**

*This change in the FAM would formalize what is probably already in practice in many departments: the inclusion of pedagogical diversity training in lists of evidence demonstrating merit in teaching evaluations.*

**MOTION:**

The Senate recommends to the Provost that the FAM be amended as indicated below:

Current Policies:

VI. A. 1. b. 6. (g.)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops and field trips.

VI. B. 2. b. 6 (g)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops and field trips.

Proposed Changes:

VI. A. 1. b. 6. (g.)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops, pedagogical diversity training, and field trips.

VI. B. 2. b. 6 (g)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops, pedagogical diversity training, and field trips.

**RATIONALE:**

The changes support the third goal of the Diversity Strategic Plan (CREATE A SUPPORTIVE ENVIRONMENT THAT IS DIVERSE, INCLUSIVE, AND WELCOMING TO ALL) and is related to these tactics:
3.2 Train faculty in best practices for the inclusive, multicultural classroom and assess the effectiveness of this training.

3.8 Implement required regular diversity training for faculty and take appropriate steps to assess the effectiveness of this training.

3.13 Recognize, in merit evaluations, evidence of "inclusive classroom" practices, such as incorporating into a curriculum the contributions made by diverse persons in a particular discipline.

Mr. Dustan asked if there is evidence of racism amongst the faculty. Mr. Kelly said yes. Mr. Dustan said he thought sexism is even more prevalent and would like to add “gender training” to the motion. Mr. Kelly said that the diversity training already addresses sexism. Mr. Dustan proposed an amendment to add “gender training” to the motion, but it was not seconded.

Paul Young (Mathematics) asked about the rationale behind the word “pedagogical” before “diversity training.” Mr. Kelly said that the committee originally wanted only “diversity training.”

Brian Lanahan (at-large) said he thinks that it would be clearer to take out “pedagogical.” He made a motion, which was seconded to strike pedagogical: pedagogical diversity training.

Deborah Boyle (Philosophy) said “pedagogical” brings to mind, teaching or training styles. She thinks it should be removed. Mr. Mignone said that it reads less awkwardly if you take out pedagogical. Ms. Welch said that the Faculty Welfare Committee supported it without the word “pedagogical” (they preferred it that way). Mr. Young said that he is against the motion. He thinks pedagogical needs to be there because it talks about this in the rationale.

The Senate voted on the amendment to the main motion to remove pedagogical, which was approved.

VI. A. 1. b. 6. (g.)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops, pedagogical diversity training, and field trips.

VI. B. 2. b. 6 (g)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops, pedagogical diversity training, and field trips.
Scott Peeples (at-large) proposed a another amendment to the main motion, which was seconded:

VI. A. 1. b. 6. (g.)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops, pedagogical diversity training, and field trips, as well as pedagogical diversity training.

VI. B. 2. b. 6 (g)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops, pedagogical diversity training, and field trips, as well as pedagogical diversity training.

Mr. Duvall added the following amendment to Mr. Peeples’ amendment.

VI. A. 1. b. 6. (g.)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops, pedagogical diversity training, and field trips, as well as diversity training for the purposes of teaching.

VI. B. 2. b. 6 (g)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops, pedagogical diversity training, and field trips, as well as diversity training for the purposes of teaching.

The Senate voted on Mr. Duvall’s amendment, which was opposed.

The Senate returned back to Mr. Peeples’ amendment:

VI. A. 1. b. 6. (g.)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops, pedagogical diversity training, and field trips, as well as pedagogical diversity training.

VI. B. 2. b. 6 (g)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops, pedagogical diversity training, and field trips, as well as pedagogical diversity training.

The Senate voted on Mr. Peeple’s amendment, which was opposed.
The Senate then returned back to the main motion introduced by Mr. Kelly (with the removal of “pedagogical”):

Tom Caroll (at-large) asked if he goes to a conference on diversity training that would count. Mr. Kelly said that was not his intent, because this is in the section that is relevant to teaching.

The Senate voted on the main motion (with the removal of “pedagogical”), which was approved.

VI. A. 1. b. 6. (g.)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops, pedagogical diversity training, and field trips.

VI. B. 2. b. 6 (g)

Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops, pedagogical diversity training, and field trips.

Presentation of Degree Candidates

Lynne Ford (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration), on behalf of the Provost, made the following motion: “Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Trustees that candidates certified by the Registrar’s Office or the Graduate School as having completed all requirements be awarded degrees at commencement.” The resolution was approved by proclamation of the Senate.
Constituents' Concerns

Mr. Benigni noted that he and the Provost would be attending the Colonial Academic Alliance (an extension of the Colonial Athletic Association, which we will join this year) Undergraduate Research Conference at the University of Delaware 12-14 April. The College plans to fund up to 10 students campus-wide to attend the conference each year.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 12 March 2013

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 12 March 2013, at 5:06 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium). After Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of 5 February and 12 February, 2013 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry reported on the following items:

1. The College will be participating in “The Chronicle’s Great Colleges to Work For” survey. The Faculty Welfare Committee had asked President Benson to participate in this survey. A random sample of faculty, staff and administrators will be surveyed beginning next Monday, 18 April. Surveys must be completed by Monday, 15 April. Speaker Cherry encourages anyone who is selected to please participate in the survey.

2. The College will submit our SACS 5th year interim report on Friday, 15 March. Speaker Cherry thanked everyone who has assisted with the process this year – this work is important to the College and it has truly been a full campus effort. She said that this report does not mark the end of our work. We will continue to work on issues related to our accreditation, especially the assessment of our general education curriculum and assessment of our majors. This process will be an ongoing process and will require our time and energy every year.

3. IT Strategic Plan – Open Forum tomorrow afternoon 13 March at 3:00 P.M. in the Stern Center Ballroom. All interested faculty and staff should attend if they can and/or provide feedback to members of the Strategic Planning Committee. Bob Cape, Senior Vice President / Chief Information Office, sent an email which included the list of 44 topics/items/issues that were identified by the planning committee at the 13 February meeting. Speaker Cherry said she will be happy to forward the email if someone did not get it. The 44 item list will be prioritized based on feedback and will be the basis for the IT Strategic Plan. Please plan to attend the meeting tomorrow or provide your comments/feedback to a member of the IT Strategic Planning Committee. Faculty members include:
   - Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs,
   - Maureen Hays – Interim Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences
   - Lynn Cherry – Speaker of the Faculty
   - Heath Hoffman – Chair of the Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology
• David Desplaces – member of the Distance Education Task Force and faculty in Management and Entrepreneurship
• Vijay Vulava – member of the Faculty Education Technology Committee and faculty in Geology
• John White – Interim Dean of the Library

4. Speaker Cherry asked Senators to please sign up for campus committees for 2013/14; please encourage your department colleagues to sign up for committees. Calvin Blackwell, chair of Nominations and Elections, says they need at least 180 volunteers to fill all committee assignments and currently only about 120 people have volunteered for a committee. If anyone has questions about committees or how to sign up, please contact Calvin Blackwell directly.

The Provost

Provost Hynd reported briefly on the following items:

Provost Hynd encouraged attendance at the IT Strategic Planning Committee meeting. He said he would like to see the committee address the computer replacement cycle, the campus wireless network, outdated classrooms, and the online evaluation system.

The Provost briefly reported on the tenure and promotion process. He thanked the campus-wide committee for their hard work. There were a total of 38 individuals who came up for promotion: 10 for professor, 22 for associate professor, and 6 for senior instructor. 22 individuals were evaluated for post tenure review. He said decision letters will be mailed shortly.

There were no questions at this time.
New Business

Dan Greenberg, Co-Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, introduced the following proposals.

Faculty Curriculum Committee  
March 2013 Meeting  
List of Proposals Approved by the Committee  
[All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Web Site]

I. Course Proposals: All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deactivated) will be voted on as a single group, unless a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote. Senators are asked to contact the Faculty Speaker or the Faculty Secretary in advance, if they wish to separate a proposal from the group. Of course, this action can also be done on the floor of the Senate.

Mathematics: Change prerequisites for MATH 111 and MATH 120

The Senate voted on the Mathematics proposals, which were approved without discussion.

First-Year Experience: New Courses: FYER 1XX and FYET 1XX

Burton Callicott (Library) asked about the research component and wanted to know if it is primary or secondary research. Mr. Greenberg said that it is primary research – right now the students will spend two weeks in a number of labs.

The Senate voted on the course proposals for the First-Year Experience, which were approved.

II. Program Changes:

American Studies: Delete minor (owing to lack of enrollment)

The Senate voted on the program changes for American Studies, which were approved without discussion.

Teacher Education: Delete foreign-language education minor (replaced by major)

The Senate voted on the program changes for Teacher Education, which were approved without discussion.

Latin American & Caribbean Studies: Change of Major and Minor
• Remove SPAN 326, SPAN 327, SPAN 329
• Add SPAN 333

The Senate voted on the program changes for Latin American & Caribbean Studies, which were approved without discussion.

Linguistics

Change of Minor
• Add COMM 215 and CSCI 470

The Senate voted on the program changes for Linguistics, which were approved without discussion.

Geography

Change of Minor
• Add POLI 333 and POLI 306

The Senate voted on the program changes for Geology, which were approved without discussion.

Religious Studies

New Courses; Change of Major
• Create new courses: RELS 223, RELS 365, and RELS 451
• Add to major

The Senate voted on the program changes for Religious Studies, which were approved without discussion.

Theatre

Deactivate course; Change Course; Change of Major, Concentrations, and Minor
• Deactivate THTR 180 and remove from major, minor, and concentrations
• Change title of THTR 381
• Add THTR 200, THTR 201, and THTR 202 to Performance concentration
• Remove THTR 382 from Theatre major
• Add THTR 230 to Theatre major
• Add ARTH 104 to Costume Design and Scenic/Lighting Design concentrations
• Add THTR 270 to Lighting Technology concentration
• Add THTR 318 and THTR 345 to Costume Design concentration

The Senate voted on the program changes for Theater, which were approved without discussion.

Hospitality and Tourism Management

New Course; Change Major, Minor, and Concentration
• Create new course: HTMT 355
• Add to major, minor, and concentration

The Senate voted on the program changes for Hospitality and Tourism Management, which were approved without discussion.
English
Create, Modify, and Deactivate Courses; Change of Major, Minor, and Concentration
• Deactivate the following ENGL courses: 222, 240, 301, 307, 308, 311, 338, 348, 354, 355, 401
• Modify the following ENGL courses: 207, 220, 302, 306, 314, 317, 319, 320, 321, 326, 339, 347, 349, 357, 377, 378, 399, 402, 403
• Create two new ENGL courses: ENGL 367 and ENGL 368
• Change major, minor, and Creative Writing concentration accordingly

The Senate voted on the program changes for English, which were approved without discussion.

Dance
Create New Courses; Change Courses; Change Major and Concentration
• Change Performance/Choreography concentration to 18 hours
• Create new courses: DANC 289, DANC 290, DANC 399, DANC 450, DANC 489, DANC 499
• Add new courses to major and performance/choreography concentration
• Prerequisite Cleanup

The Senate voted on the program changes for Dance, which were approved without discussion.

International Studies
Create New Course; Change Course; Change Major and Concentrations
• Create new course (INTL 350) and add to the following concentrations: Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean
• Change credit hours for INTL 401 from 1-4 to 1-6
• Asia concentration: Add LTAR 250, 350, 450; LTJP 450
• Europe concentration: Delete SPAN 322, 323, 329; ENGL 203, 301, 307, 308, 311
• Europe concentration: Add SPAN 313, 418; LTIT 450; LTRS 110, 120; RUSS 331
• Comparative Literature concentration: Add ENGL 226, 319; LTRS 110, 120, 220; LTIT 450; LTAR 220, 450
• Latin American and the Caribbean concentration: Delete SPAN 326, 327, 329
• Latin American and the Caribbean concentration: Add SPAN 333
• Revise language requirement for INTL Asia, Europe, and Latin America and the Caribbean concentrations

Elizabeth Martinez-Gibson (at-large), noted that bullet 5 should not add SPAN 313 – it should be SPAN 323 instead. Mr. Greenberg said that was correct (it is a typo).
The Senate voted on the program changes for International Studies, which were approved.

Brooke Van Horn, Chair of the Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs, introduced the following proposals.

**Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs**

Proposals for the Faculty Senate 12 March, 2013 Meeting

*(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)*

**Graduate Level – Program Deletion Proposal**

Master of Science in Computer and Information Sciences –
Termination of the Service-oriented Computing Graduate Certificate

The Senate voted on the Termination of the Service-oriented Computing Graduate Certificate, which was approved without discussion.
Glenn Lesses, Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, introduced the following motions. He explained that these motions will not be voted on tonight, but at the next meeting.

**Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual**

The first two motions were made by the By-Laws Committee at the April 2012 meeting of the Faculty Senate. These motions were then referred back to the By-Laws Committee based on recent practice in applying Article VI, section 1 of the By-Laws. Since the April meeting was the last Senate meeting of 2012, the motions have to be re-introduced to the Senate in 2012-2013. Rather than introduce by-laws revisions periodically throughout the year requiring several ratification votes by the faculty, the By-Laws Committee decided to introduce all recommendations for revision together so that if the Senate approves the recommendations there can be a single ratification election.

**TITLE:** Motion of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws V.3.B.2.a: Composition of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs, adding two additional members (Provost or designee and Director of Continuing Education).

**MOTION:** Amend By-Laws V.3.B.2.a as follows:

2. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

   a. Composition: Five faculty members, at least one of whom is also a member of the Graduate faculty. The Dean of the Graduate School is a non-voting ex-officio member of this committee. The Registrar is an ex-officio member. The Dean of the Graduate School, the Registrar, the Provost or designee, and the Director of the Center of Continuing Education and Professional development are non-voting ex-officio members.

**RATIONALE:**

The Provost or designee and the Director of the Center of Continuing Education and Professional Development have been attending the committee members as guests. The addition to the Provost or designee as a non-voting ex-officio member would formalize his/her role in graduate curriculum matters. The addition of the Director of the Center of Continuing Education and Professional Development as a non-voting ex-officio member would keep the committee informed of new continuing education initiatives.
TITLE: Motion of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws V.2.B.3: Composition and Duties of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual.

MOTION: Amend By-Laws V.2.B.3 as follows:

3. Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual

   a. Composition: Three faculty members. Ex-officio members are the Speaker of the Faculty, the Faculty Secretary, and the Provost (or Provost’s designee). The Senior Vice President for Legal Affairs is a non-voting, ex-officio member. (Rev. April 2007)

   b. Duties:

      (1) To review any motions to amend the Faculty By-Laws and report to the Faculty Senate.

      (2) To review on a continuing basis the Faculty By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual;

      (3) To propose changes for the improvement of these documents and to forward the recommended changes to the administration and/or the Faculty Senate as appropriate;

      (4) To incorporate any revisions to or interpretations of either document in new editions of the documents; and

      (5) To make non-substantive changes to the Faculty By-Laws to correct unintended grammatical and spelling errors, address minor problems of stylistic consistency, and correct inaccurate administrative titles. Such a non-substantive change shall not constitute an amendment to or repeal of the Faculty By-Laws. Such changes shall be made only when unanimously approved by the Committee. Notice in writing shall be given to the Faculty Senate within 60 calendar days of such changes being approved by the Committee. Such changes shall be repealed if an appropriate motion to amend something previously adopted is approved by a simple majority of the Committee, the Faculty Senate, or the College Faculty.

RATIONALE:
The change to the committee’s composition clarifies the non-voting status of the Senior Vice President for Legal Affairs or designee. The Senior Vice President for Legal Affairs sits on
the committee to advise the committee on the legal ramifications of amendments under consideration, but is not involved in the committee’s decisions in the way that the other ex officio members are.

Article VI, Section 1 of the By-Laws states: “Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the Senate its recommendations on the motion and any amendments at the next Senate meeting.” This amendment specifies that duty under the committee description to clarify what the committee’s work includes.

**TITLE:** Motion of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws V.2.B.1.a: Composition of the Academic Planning Committee, adding one additional member (the Registrar or Registrar’s designee).

**MOTION:** Amend By-Laws V.2.B.1.a as follows:

1. Academic Planning Committee
   a. Composition: Seven faculty members and one student. The Provost *(or Provost’s designee)* and Registrar *(or Registrar’s designee)* is are a non-voting ex-officio members.

**RATIONALE:** The Academic Planning Committee has requested this revision and the By-Laws Committee recommends the change. Currently, the Registrar attends Academic Planning Committee meetings as a guest. The Academic Planning Committee often requires input from the Registrar not only to help guide in curricular decisions but also prevent to motions from going forward that will need to be changed due to restrictions imposed by the scheduling and degree auditing systems utilized by the Registrar. This motion simply regularizes and makes official current practice. The motion also incorporates current practice that the Provost often appoints a delegate to attend the meetings.

**TITLE:** Motion of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws V. 2. A: membership of Senate committees.

**MOTION:** Motion of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws V.2.A as follows:

Section 2. Standing Senate Committees

A. Members of standing Senate committees are nominated by the Committee on Nominations and Elections at least 15 days prior to the April Senate meeting and are elected by the Senate during the April Senate meeting. *At least one member of standing Senate Committees must be a Senator.*
RATIONALE:
Through 1999-2000, the following sentence was included in the FAM: “The majority of members of standing Senate committees must be Senators.” However, this sentence was omitted from the FAM beginning in 2001 (Note: the Secretariat has not been able to locate the FAM for 2000-2001). Heather Alexander has reviewed the Senate archives, but has not been able to find any indication that this omission was anything but inadvertent. The Committee on Nominations and Elections, however, has continued to apply this criterion for membership on Senate committees. Given the smaller composition of the Senate, it has become increasingly difficult for the Committee on Nominations and Elections to find an adequate number of senators to serve on the three standing Senate committees. Furthermore, the distinction between Senate standing committees and standing College committees has become much less clear over the past few years. Consequently, we recommend replacing the sentence that the By-Laws Committee believes was inadvertently omitted from the FAM with a weaker Senate membership requirement that still maintains a distinction between Senate and College committees. The proposed requirement stipulates that standing Senate committees include at least one Senator in their membership. Reducing the overall number of Senators required will assist future Committees on Nominations and Elections constructing membership slates for standing Senate committees.

TITLE: Motion of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws VI.1: Senate option for amendment introduction.

MOTION: Motion of the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual to amend By-Laws VI.1 as follows:

Article VI. Amending Procedures

Section 1. Senate Option for Amendment Introduction

Motions for amendment or repeal of these by-laws may be made in writing at any meeting of the Faculty Senate. Unless made initially by the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, the motion shall be referred to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. The committee shall report to the Senate its recommendations on the motion originating elsewhere and any amendments at the next Senate meeting. Motions made by the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration Manual can be considered at the Senate meeting at which they are introduced. Motions to amend or repeal these by-laws require a two-thirds vote in the Senate for approval. Approved motions must then be ratified by a simple majority of regular faculty members voting by electronic ballot on the motion. (Rev. Jan. 2007)

RATIONALE: The language of VI.1 is a muddle. Currently, the section leaves open whether By-Laws motions that originate with the Committee on the By-Laws and Faculty Administration
Manual need to be referred automatically to the By-Laws Committee. Recent Senate practice has been to refer even these motions back to the By-Laws Committee for its recommendation at the next Senate meeting despite no explicit evidence that the FAM has this requirement. Furthermore, Senate interpretation of the FAM on this issue has occasionally been different in the past. It is part of the charge of the By-Laws Committee to make recommendations for By-Laws revisions. It seems unnecessary for By-Laws motions that are put forward by the By-Laws Committee to be routinely reviewed by the By-Laws Committee itself. In the case of a Senate decision to amend substantively a motion originating by the By-Laws Committee, it remains open for the Senate to remand motions originating from the By-Laws Committee back to the Committee for further consideration. It is also possible for the Senate to defeat any motion recommended by the By-Laws Committee. Finally, remember that no By-Laws revision takes effect without a ratification election by the Faculty, which means that there is sufficient notice for any revisions to the Faculty By-Laws.

Jannette Finch (Library) asked about the years that the Senate committees did not have Senate representation. Do we have to go back and redo that business? George Pothering (parliamentarian) and Speaker Cherry said no.

The Speaker explained that these motions will now go back to Bylaws and come back for a vote at the next meeting.
Bob Mignone, Chair of the Committee on General Education, introduced the following motion. He started with the second section “information only” first. He thanked everyone who has been involved in this process.

Committee on General Education

Motion to Amend the Undergraduate Catalog

The Committee on General Education moves that the section titled Statement of Purpose for the Common Requirements of the College of Charleston’s Undergraduate Curriculum be removed from the Undergraduate Catalog.

Introduction: This motion would remove the section encompassed by the Statement of Purpose for the Common Requirements from the Undergraduate Catalog, with the intention of eliminating it as a material consideration in the goals and assessment of general education at the College of Charleston.

MOTION:

Current wording (on page 19 of the current Undergraduate Catalog)

Undergraduate Catalog Requirements Students with continuous enrollment have the option of fulfilling all the graduation requirements from the Undergraduate Catalog under which they entered the College or all the requirements from any subsequent catalog. Students who withdraw and then return to the College must follow the graduation requirements from the Undergraduate Catalog under which they are re-admitted or any subsequent catalog, provided the student maintains continuous enrollment.

Statement of Purpose for the Common Distribution Requirement of the College of Charleston’s Undergraduate Curriculum

Graduates of the College of Charleston complete a challenging course of study that will prepare them to function intelligently, responsibly, creatively, and compassionately in a multifaceted, interconnected world. While their work in the major of their choice will give students specialized knowledge and skills in that discipline or profession, the College’s distribution requirement will equip each student, regardless of major, with crucial intellectual skills in analysis, research, and communication. Their coursework in the liberal arts and sciences will offer students a broad perspective on the natural world and the human condition, and will encourage them to examine their own lives and make useful contributions to their own time and
place. Over the course of their undergraduate careers, all College of Charleston students will develop the following intellectual skills, areas of knowledge, and dispositions:

I. **Research and Communication in Multiple Media and Languages**, including proficiency in Gathering and using information

Effective writing and critical reading  
Oral and visual communication  
Foreign language

II. **Analytical and Critical Reasoning**, including

Mathematical and scientific reasoning and analysis

Social and cultural analysis

Interdisciplinary analysis and creative problem-solving

III. **Historical, Cultural, and Intellectual Perspectives**, including knowledge of

Human history and the natural world

Artistic, cultural, and intellectual achievements

Human behavior and social interaction

Perspectives and contributions of academic disciplines

IV. **International and Intercultural Perspectives**, gained by

Knowledge of international and global contexts

Experiencing, understanding, and using multiple cultural perspectives

V. **Personal and Ethical Perspectives**, including experiences that promote  
Self-understanding, curiosity and creativity  
Personal, academic, and professional integrity  
Moral and ethical responsibility  
Community and global citizenship

VI. **Advanced Knowledge and Skills in Major Area of Study**, consisting of  
Skills and knowledge of the discipline  
Sequence of coursework that fosters intellectual growth

Coursework that extends and builds upon knowledge and skills gained from the core curriculum

The ability to transfer the skills and knowledge of the major into another setting

**Liberal Arts and Sciences General Education Requirements**

Students are urged to pay special attention to both the selection of and scholastic emphasis on the courses within the liberal arts and sciences general education degree requirements. These courses
are designed to provide the students with a solid foundation for further study and an essential part of the undergraduate’s education.

The College may administer placement examinations to determine the level at which entering students are prepared to begin their work in a foreign language and mathematics.

For all undergraduate degrees, the total number of credit hours must include the following:

**First-Year Experience:** All students who have completed less than one year of college when they enter the College of Charleston must complete a First-Year Seminar (FSYM) or a Learning Community (LC) during their first year. (Further…

**Proposed wording** (on page 19 of the current Undergraduate Catalog)

**Undergraduate Catalog Requirements** Students with continuous enrollment have the option of fulfilling all the graduation requirements from the Undergraduate Catalog under which they entered the College or all the requirements from any subsequent catalog. Students who withdraw and then return to the College must follow the graduation requirements from the Undergraduate Catalog under which they are re-admitted or any subsequent catalog, provided the student maintains continuous enrollment.

— **Statement of Purpose for the Common Distribution Requirement of the College of Charleston’s Undergraduate Curriculum**—

Graduates of the College of Charleston complete a challenging course of study that will prepare them to function intelligently, responsibly, creatively, and compassionately in a multifaceted, interconnected world. While their work in the major of their choice will give students specialized knowledge and skills in that discipline or profession, the College’s distribution requirement will equip each student, regardless of major, with crucial intellectual skills in analysis, research, and communication. Their coursework in the liberal arts and sciences will offer students a broad perspective on the natural world and the human condition, and will encourage them to examine their own lives and make useful contributions to their own time and place. Over the course of their undergraduate careers, all College of Charleston students will develop the following intellectual skills, areas of knowledge, and dispositions:

— **I. Research and Communication in Multiple Media and Languages**, including proficiency in gathering and using information

Effective writing and critical reading
Oral and visual communication
Foreign language

**II. Analytical and Critical Reasoning**, including

Mathematical and scientific reasoning and analysis
Social and cultural analysis
Interdisciplinary analysis and creative problem-solving

III. Historical, Cultural, and Intellectual Perspectives, including knowledge of
Human history and the natural world
Artistic, cultural, and intellectual achievements
Human behavior and social interaction
Perspectives and contributions of academic disciplines

IV. International and Intercultural Perspectives, gained by
Knowledge of international and global contexts
Experiencing, understanding, and using multiple cultural perspectives

VII. Personal and Ethical Perspectives, including experiences that promote
Self-understanding, curiosity and creativity
Personal, academic, and professional integrity
Moral and ethical responsibility
Community and global citizenship

VIII. Advanced Knowledge and Skills in Major Area of Study, consisting of
Skills and knowledge of the discipline
Sequence of coursework that fosters intellectual growth
Coursework that extends and builds upon knowledge and skills gained from the core curriculum
The ability to transfer the skills and knowledge of the major into another setting

Liberal Arts and Sciences General

Education Requirements

Students are urged to pay special attention to both the selection of and scholastic emphasis on the courses within the liberal arts and sciences general education degree requirements. These courses are designed to provide the students with a solid foundation for further study and an essential part of the undergraduate’s education.

The College may administer placement examinations to determine the level at which entering students are prepared to begin their work in a foreign language and mathematics.

For all undergraduate degrees, the total number of credit hours must include the following:

First-Year Experience: All students who have completed less than one year of college when they enter the College of Charleston must complete a First-Year Seminar (FSYM) or a Learning Community (LC) during their first year. (Further…
RATIONALE:

The *Statement of Purpose for the Common Requirements of the College of Charleston’s Undergraduate Curriculum* and accompanying six overarching goals and sub-goals (referred to as the *Statement of Purpose*) was passed by the Senate in September of 2006. It was meant as a preamble and blueprint for the package of proposals that would follow. The intention was for the proposals to replace the existing General Education distribution requirements. In March of 2008 the package of proposals meant to reform general education at the College of Charleston was defeated by the Senate. It was a failure of the second general education reform effort in as many decades. The *Statement of Purpose* survived as an artifact of the voting method used by the Senate to consider the package of general education reform proposals. The *Statement of Purpose* was a blueprint for a general education structure that never got built, yet as long as it remains in the Undergraduate Catalog we will be expected to reconcile it with the general education structure that, by the will of the faculty, remains. Reconciliation has proven to be difficult and assessment impossible. It is therefore the conclusion of the Committee on General Education that the most effective way to proceed is to remove the section from the Undergraduate Catalog.

Attached are relevant memos from President Benson and Provost Hynd. Excerpts from the memos are given below to provide context for this motion.

In a memo dated October 3, 2012 and addressed to Speaker of the Faculty, Lynn Cherry, President Benson, on the subject of Assessment of General Education, stated: “After some reflection, I now share the conclusion previously reached by some other faculty and administrators at the College: Our general education curriculum and the learning outcomes associated with general education are difficult to assess in ways that facilitate continuous improvement. The College must move quickly and decisively to rectify this situation.” President Benson’s memo concluded with the statement: “The most straightforward path to effective general education assessment is to make prompt revisions to our ‘Statement of Purpose for the Common Distribution Requirements’, as described on p. 19 of the *Undergraduate Catalog.*”

On January 9th, 2013, Bob Mignone, Chair of the Committee on General Education received a memo from Provost George Hynd “requesting that the Committee on General Education take appropriate action to amend the Undergraduate Catalog for 2013-2014 to remove the section titled, ‘Statement of Purpose for the Common Distribution Requirements of the College of Charleston’s Undergraduate Curriculum.’”

The CGE agreed with the rationale given by Provost Hynd. As quoted it reads: “As you may recall, the list of intellectual skills, areas of knowledge, and dispositions included in this
section were created and approved by the Faculty Senate coincident to the long discussion on reforming the General Education curriculum. When the overall curriculum package failed, this statement remained and has been edited over the years such that it now implies that our General Education distribution requirement (described on page 20) delivers these outcomes. It does not and cannot. While the Committee on General Education has tried in a number of ways over a period of several years to reconcile the existing curriculum structure and set of requirements with the revised Statement of Purpose, that effort has not been successful. We cannot effectively demonstrate student performance on this lengthy list of outcomes through our current curriculum.”

(See Attachments 1 and 2)

Mr. Mignone explained that the memo from Provost Hynd was the wrong memo. The correct memo will be posted on the Senate website.

A question was asked about the definition of “one year of college” (in the section on First Year Experience). Is that clearly defined somewhere? Mr Mignone said he had copied that wording from previous language.

The Senate voted on the motion to amend the undergraduate catalog, which was approved.

Courses Approved For General Education Status

History

Pre-Modern
- Classics
  1. CLAS 105 Course Name: History of the Classical World
- Jewish Studies
  1. JWST 210 Jewish History I: Ancient to Modern
- History
  1. HIST103 World History To 1500
  2. HIST 115 Pre-Modern History
  3. HONS 120 Honors Colloquium in Western Civilization. (This is a six-hour course that currently counts for both history and humanities gen ed credit. The course will also be submitted, via the appropriate form, under the Humanities requirement.)

Modern
• Jewish Studies
  1. JWST 215 Jewish History II: Modern to Present
• History
  1. HIST 104 World History Since 1500
  2. HIST 116 Modern History
  3. HONS 130 Honors Colloquium in Western Civilization. (This is a six-hour course that currently counts for both history and humanities gen ed credit. The course will also be submitted, via the appropriate form, under the Humanities requirement.)

Foreign Languages, Classical or Modern

• Arabic
  1. ARBC 202 Intermediate Arabic II
• Chinese
  1. CHNS 202 Intermediate Chinese II
• Classics Language
  1. GREK 202 Attic Greek
  2. LATN 202 Intermediate Latin
• French
  1. FREN 202 Intermediate French II
• German
  1. GRMN 202 Intermediate German
• Hebrew
  1. HBRW 202 Intermediate Modern Hebrew
• Hindi
  1. HIND 202 Intermediate Hindi
• Italian
  1. ITAL 202 Intermediate Italian II
• Japanese
  1. JPNS 202 Intermediate Japanese
• Portuguese
  1. PORT 202 Intermediate Portuguese II
• Russian
  1. RUSS 202 Intermediate Russian II
• Spanish
  1. Intermediate Spanish

Mathematics or Logic

• Mathematics
  1. MATH 103 Contemporary Mathematics with Applications
  2. MATH 104 Elementary Statistics
  3. MATH 105 Calculus for Business and Social Sciences
  4. MATH 111 Pre-calculus (4 credit hours)
  5. MATH 120/HONS 115 Introductory Calculus/Honors Calculus (4 credit hours)
6. MATH 207 Discrete Structures I  
7. MATH 220/HONS 215 Calculus II/Honors Calculus II  
8. MATH 250 Statistical Methods I  

- Logic (Department of Philosophy)  
  1. PHIL 120 Symbolic Logic  

**English**  

  1. ENGL 110 Introduction to Academic Writing  
  2. ENGL 215 Interdisciplinary Composition  

**SOCIAL SCIENCES:**  

**Anthropology**  
  1. ANTH 101 Introduction to Anthropology  
  2. ANTH 201 Cultural Anthropology  
  3. ANTH 202 Introduction to Archaeology  
  4. HONS 168 Honors Introduction to Archaeology  

**Economics**  
  1. Econ 200 Principles of Microeconomics  
  2. Econ 201 Principles of Macroeconomics  
  3. HONS 200 Honors Economics I  
  4. HONS 211 Honors Economics II  

**Linguistics**  
  1. LING 125 Introduction to Language and Linguistics  

**Political Science**  
  1. POLI 101 American Government  
  2. POLI 102 Contemporary Political Issues  
  3. POLI 103 World Politics  
  4. POLI 104 World Regional Geography  
  5. POLI 211 Introduction to Public Policy  
  6. POLI 240 Introduction to Comparative Analysis  
  7. POLI 260 International Relations Theory  
  8. HONS 165 Honors American Government  
  9. HONS 166 Honors World Politics  

**Psychology**  
  1. PSYC 103 Introduction to Psychological Science  

**Sociology**
1. SOCY 101 Introduction to Sociology
2. SOCY 102 Contemporary Social Issues
3. SOCY 103 Sociology of the Family
4. SOCY 109 Special Topics in Sociology
5. HONS 167 Honors Introduction to Sociology

NATURAL SCIENCES:

Biology
1. BIOL 101/101L and BIOL 102/102L Concepts and Applications in Biology I and II
2. BIOL 111/111L and BIOL 112/112L; Introduction to Cell and Molecular Biology; Evolution, Form, and Function of Organisms
3. HONS 151/151L and HONS 152/152L; Honors Introduction to Cell and Molecular Biology; Evolution, Form, and Function of Organisms

Chemistry
1. CHEM 101/101L and CHEM 102/102L General Chemistry and Organic and Biological Chemistry
2. CHEM 111/111L and CHEM 102/102L Principles of Chemistry I and Organic and Biological Chemistry
3. CHEM 111/111L and CHEM 112/112L Principles of Chemistry I and Principles of Chemistry II
4. HONS 191/191L and CHEM 112/112L Honors Chemical Principles and Principles of Chemistry II
5. HONS 191/191L; HONS 192/192L Honors Chemical Principles and Honors Organic I

Geology
1. GEOL 101/101L-105/105L Dynamic Earth-Earth History
2. GEOL 103/103L-105/105L Environmental Geology-Earth History
3. HONS 155/155L-156/155L Honors Geology I-Honors Geology II

Physics and Astronomy
1. ASTR 129/129L and ASTR 130/130L Astronomy I and II (lecture and lab)
2. PHYS 101/101L and PHYS 102/102L Introductory Physics I and II (lecture and lab)
3. PHYS 111/111L and PHYS 112/112L General Physics (lecture and lab)
4. HONS 157/157L and HONS 158/158L Honors Physics I and II (lecture and lab)
5. HONS 159/159L and HONS 160/160L Honors Astronomy I and II (lecture and lab)
Devon Hanahan and Bill Olejniczak, co-chairs of the Faculty Compensation Committee, introduced the following motion and Power point presentation. Devon Hanahan thanked Jim Posey, Associate Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning, for his expertise and help on the committee.

**Faculty Compensation Committee**

**Motion for Approval of Compensation Committee Resolution to Raise Faculty Salaries**

**INTRODUCTION**

The faculty compensation committee would like the College of Charleston to offer competitive salaries in order to retain and reward current faculty and to attract qualified incoming faculty. As of now College of Charleston salaries are at the bottom or near the bottom of our CUPA-HR peers, and we plan to match the mean salary of those peers within five years.

**MOTION**

College of Charleston faculty salaries will meet or exceed the mean salaries of the CUPA-HR salary peers institutionally and at each rank. The College will make every effort to achieve this goal by September, 2018. The Compensation Committee, in cooperation with all relevant administrative offices, will assess the progress being made in its annual report each spring to the Senate.

**RATIONALE**

College of Charleston faculty salaries have ranked below those of most CUPA-HR peers at almost every cell (combination of rank and discipline) for at least the past five years. When cost of living is factored in, our salaries are even lower. We also rank at the bottom of our future Colonial Athletic Association peers and near the bottom of our in-state peers.

Included in the College of Charleston’s Strategic Plan is the strategy to “develop and retain a highly qualified and diverse faculty and staff”, and the first tactic aimed at achieving this goal is to “improve salaries for faculty and staff to nationally competitive levels.” Our motion is fully in line with the Strategic Plan.

President Benson’s letter to the faculty announcing the College’s move to the Colonial Athletic Association (CAA) refers to the academic benefits of aligning our school with outstanding, nationally
recognized institutions and the collaboration and resource sharing that will ensue. Raising our faculty salaries will solidify the equality of our status with these peer institutions.

Compensation Committee

Bill Olejniczak, Co-chair
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### Average Salary of Full-Time Instructional Faculty

#### 2011-2012 All Ranks - Ordered by 2011-12 Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2011-12 Salary</th>
<th>Difference and percent increase/decrease between 2010-11 and 2011-12 in total institutional salary</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Cost of Living Compensated Local Standard of Comfort</th>
<th>Difference in Adjusted and F of C Salary</th>
<th>Percent Increase in Salary Adjusted to Faculty Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida Atlantic University</td>
<td>$44,764</td>
<td>$5,048 (13.0%)</td>
<td>Davie</td>
<td>$4,475</td>
<td>$1,048 (23.7%)</td>
<td>$3,573 (83.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida A&amp;M University</td>
<td>$44,764</td>
<td>$5,048 (13.0%)</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>$4,673</td>
<td>$1,865 (41.7%)</td>
<td>$3,408 (76.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>$44,764</td>
<td>$5,048 (13.0%)</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>$4,180</td>
<td>$1,223 (29.4%)</td>
<td>$5,048 (115.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>$44,764</td>
<td>$5,048 (13.0%)</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>$4,025</td>
<td>$1,865 (41.7%)</td>
<td>$7,913 (183.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Tech University</td>
<td>$44,764</td>
<td>$5,048 (13.0%)</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>$4,025</td>
<td>$1,865 (41.7%)</td>
<td>$7,913 (183.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Gulf Coast University</td>
<td>$44,764</td>
<td>$5,048 (13.0%)</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>$3,813</td>
<td>$1,865 (41.7%)</td>
<td>$7,913 (183.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Tech University</td>
<td>$44,764</td>
<td>$5,048 (13.0%)</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>$4,025</td>
<td>$1,865 (41.7%)</td>
<td>$7,913 (183.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Gulf Coast University</td>
<td>$44,764</td>
<td>$5,048 (13.0%)</td>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>$4,025</td>
<td>$1,865 (41.7%)</td>
<td>$7,913 (183.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There are three or four website(s) that provide cost of living components. Those sites can differ significantly in cost of living estimates.
## College of Charleston

### Average Salary of Full Time Instructional Faculty

#### 2011-2012, All Ranks - Ordered by 2011-2012 Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colonial Athletic Association</th>
<th>2011-12 Salary</th>
<th>Difference and percent increase/decrease between CofC Salary and comparative Institution Salary</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Cost of Living Compared to CofC</th>
<th>Salary to Maintain Equal Standard of Living in Charleston</th>
<th>Differences in adjusted comparison Salary and CofC Salary</th>
<th>Percent Increase Required to Equal Adjusted Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hofstra University</td>
<td>$120,642</td>
<td>$45,477 (37.47%)</td>
<td>Hempstead</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>$88,017</td>
<td>$22,832</td>
<td>34.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>$108,520</td>
<td>$42,185 (39.23%)</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>$76,619</td>
<td>$15,694</td>
<td>18.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td>$103,500</td>
<td>$36,805 (37.67%)</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>$88,407</td>
<td>$22,402</td>
<td>21.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$31,955 (44.80%)</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>$106,236</td>
<td>$40,271</td>
<td>61.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>$93,384</td>
<td>$32,953 (39.20%)</td>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>$70,621</td>
<td>$23,304</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td>$90,020</td>
<td>$28,891 (33.44%)</td>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>$70,503</td>
<td>$23,383</td>
<td>14.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCG-Winston</td>
<td>$70,416</td>
<td>$5,460 (6.66%)</td>
<td>Winston</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>$73,821</td>
<td>$3,405</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>$70,224</td>
<td>$3,725 (1.37%)</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>$70,196</td>
<td>$3,725</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>$80,383</td>
<td>$5,889 (7.29%)</td>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$5,674</td>
<td>14.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towson University</td>
<td>$64,086</td>
<td>$1,887 (2.88%)</td>
<td>Towson</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>$66,474</td>
<td>$3,387</td>
<td>14.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2011-2012 Salary Source:** IPEDS

**Cost of Living and Adjusted Salary Discounted:**<br>Sources of data: the labor force survey by the U.S. Census Bureau, career services of the Texas Workforce Commission, and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The cost of living for each region was derived from the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index. The adjusted salary for each region was derived from the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index and the Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics.

**Note:** There are three or four websites that provide cost of living comparisons. These sites can differ significantly in cost of living estimates.

---

[Graph showing salary distribution by rank]

- **Combined Salary:** $0
- **Instructor Salary:** $50,000
- **Assistant Professor Salary:** $100,000
- **Associate Professor Salary:** $150,000
- **Professor Salary:** $200,000

- **Weighted Average of Peer Means (IPEDS data):**
- **Weighted Average of Peer Means (CUPA-HR data):**
- **Weighted Average of CofC Means:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011-2012 Comparison of CUPA Peer Averages to IPEDS Averages</th>
<th>Weighted Average-CofC Means</th>
<th>Weighted Average-Peer Means (CUPA-HR)</th>
<th>Weighted Average-Peer Means (IPEDS Data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$86,366</td>
<td>$93,101 (+$6,735)</td>
<td>$96,151 (+$9,785)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$68,775</td>
<td>$73,384 (+$4,609)</td>
<td>$74,204 (+$5,429)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$63,134</td>
<td>$63,389 (+$255)</td>
<td>$62,212 (-$922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$53,146</td>
<td>$49,728 (-$3,418)</td>
<td>$42,228 (-$10,918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>$70,900</td>
<td>$74,181 (+$3,681)</td>
<td>$74,333 (+$3,433)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-2013 Comparison to CUPA-HR Salary Peers by Rank, across Disciplines</th>
<th>Weighted Average of CofC Means</th>
<th>Weighted Average of Peer Medians</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$86,366</td>
<td>$90,302</td>
<td>$3,936</td>
<td>$539,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$68,755</td>
<td>$70,777</td>
<td>$2,002</td>
<td>$318,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$63,134</td>
<td>$62,285</td>
<td>$(849)</td>
<td>$(111,219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$53,146</td>
<td>$48,515</td>
<td>$(4,631)</td>
<td>$(199,133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>$70,900</td>
<td>$72,065</td>
<td>$1,164</td>
<td>$547,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linda Jones (at-large) asked what will happen if we approve this motion. Mr. Olejniczak said that if we can get confirmation from the Senate then he is hopeful that the College will be committed to making this happen over a five year period.

Margaret Hagood (at-large) wanted to know what this will cost the College over five years. Ms. Hanahan said there is data on the Power point about money and cost. Ms. Caveny-Noecker added that they have been using different sets of data. They have looked at rank and discipline data. Mr. Olejniczak said that this data will be tweaked in the months to come.

A comment was made about the calculation of means and medians and that this data does not show the full picture. Ms. Caveny-Noecker said that they use the median to set starting salaries in the Provost’s office, but she understands that there is still more to do with this data. Mr. Olejniczak said the Senate should see this as a working and evolving chart.

Joe Kelly (at-large) commented that for less than a million dollars we could do this next year. That number seems modest to him. He would recommend to key the raises into a tuition increase – for example, raise tuition one percent to fund this. Mr. Olejniczak said that the Senate and other committees could work on this. The Provost said that a budget is starting to be developed for the next year with the possibility of merit raises, but they are not sure about health insurance for adjuncts and that is a variable.

David Moscowitz (at-large) asked if the Senate can request money for raises from the Board of Trustees (BOT). Speaker Cherry said that the Senate can make recommendations to the President, and then he can decide if he wants to move it to the Board.

Ms. Jones said she would like to see language in the motion that refers to each school. Speaker Cherry asked her if she wanted to amend the motion. Ms. Jones said yes. She added “and discipline” to the end of the first sentence. See below.

---

**MOTION**

College of Charleston faculty salaries will meet or exceed the mean salaries of the CUPA-HR salary peers institutionally and at each rank and discipline. The College will make every effort to achieve this goal by September, 2018. The Compensation Committee, in cooperation with all relevant administrative offices, will assess the progress being made in its annual report each spring to the Senate.
Heath Hoffman (at-large) said he thinks it’s a problem to get everyone’s salaries up to the mean. He said that not everyone is producing so maybe we should look at the raises in a different way.

Ms. Finch said that this motion is tied to President Benson’s speech to the Senate earlier this spring. She also said that it is hard to compare ourselves to the Citadel. They have wealthy alumni, and they also have engineering and other majors that draw higher salaries.

Margaret Hagood (at-large) asked why the committee chose five years and not something faster. Mr. Olejniczak said they thought this was a reasonable target and timeframe.

Vince Benigni (Communication) said he would like to see us be aggressive. We need compensation and better benefits (health care, child care, etc.). Ms. Hanahan said that they have talked about these issues and they are researching health and child care.

Evan Parry (Theater) commended the committee. He asked if they have discussed where these changes would put us in relation to the other CAA institutions. Ms. Caveny-Noecker said they do not have all the data from all the CAA institutions (there are still blanks in this proposal).

Paul Young (Mathematics) said in relative terms a million dollars is not a lot of money to make this happen (it’s less than a 1% tuition raise). Mr. Kelly wondered if a discussion in the Senate about a tuition raise would help push the issue along to the BOT.

The Senate voted on the motion to raise faculty salaries with the small amendment (adding and discipline to the end of the first sentence), which was approved.

**Constituents' Concerns**

There were no concerns at this time.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:32 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 12 February 2013

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 12 February 2013, at 5:07 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium). This was a special meeting of the Senate.

Speaker Cherry reported that the sole purpose of this meeting is to ask questions and to give feedback to President Benson based on the report that he gave at the 15 January, 2013 meeting. She reminded participants about following Robert’s Rules.

The following summarizes the main questions and answers covered during the meeting.

• A question was asked about President Benson’s report and his reference to “being boxed in and prevented from pursuing educational programs that are being demanded by our community. We could end up frozen in time unable to do much more than we’re currently doing.” Why are we boxed in? President Benson said all of the other universities are rushing in – there are 21 for-profit-institutions in the area. We are at the point in time that we could be marginalized, so we have to be careful. He’s worried about the changes in Charleston – others recognize it and we do not.

• Several questions were asked about expanding a campus in Summerville. Should we double in size? How will that put us in a safer position and aren’t branch campuses underfunded? President Benson said that revenue is a big part of this. Another part is related to our service to the state. The revenue from a branch campus, or small satellites, will then help us invest in this campus. He said it’s frustrating not having resources to work with.

• A question was asked about graduate programs. Have graduate programs been asked about their marketing? He said that they have been pushed aside because we have focused on undergraduates. He said if we don’t act now, others will take our place, but he said this is not a problem if that is what we want to do.

• A question was asked about our graduates who stay here. Are we being asked to tell students to stay here? He said absolutely not. He thinks most of our graduates leave the area. However, he said people will want to come back, maybe have second homes, and retire here. The legislature’s emphasis is on South Carolina, but if you want to be a top university, that is not possible.

• A question was asked about the President’s reference to Authority Status (an authority does not receive any state funding, runs itself like a business). Is this possible? He thinks it is a low possibility, but the College of Charleston, MUSC, and Clemson are the three universities that could do this. He suggests that we would be different because we would do it on a trial basis for ten years, and then let the legislature decide. He thinks this university has the highest potential of any university in the country.

• A question was asked about the financial burdens assumed by the students. Why don’t we talk about that? President Benson said the College is still a bargain. The debt level of our students is nowhere near the national level. We give out between 15-16 million dollars to
our students. He said we are concerned – so if we do increase tuition, we will put a significant amount of that money into scholarships. He said our tuition should be raised near the level of Clemson. Another question was asked about how our the Board of Trustees (BOT) sees increasing tuition up to Clemson level. He said they have not agreed to that yet, but he is trying. They have heard this same presentation. He has argued for higher salaries.

• There was a question about rankings and their importance. Now we are on the “value” list in these rankings so what will happen if we raise tuition? He said he can’t answer that precisely.

• There were several questions about adjuncts and teaching assistants. What does he envision happening with our undergraduate education with all these new plans? Also a concern was express about still valuing our undergraduate program. President Benson said we have too many adjuncts. He said that the undergraduate program will still be the jewel in the crown. It will still be the focus of this institution. He would never advocate loosing it. But we have to be careful because we could lose this if we do not look for more ways of obtaining revenue.

• There was a question about merging the College of Charleston with MUSC. There is a rumor that there is a bill in the legislature. President Benson said he hopes this does not happen. His job is to look out 20-30 years, and when he does that analysis, he sees we are vulnerable. This is a small state and it can’t accommodate so many institutions. There might be a time when we might say to ourselves maybe we should merge with MUSC. If we do it, it has to come from us, but he does not see that happening now.

• A comment was made that this conversation seems much more about revenue than the initial report. How are we going to raise revenue? The President said his first thing would be to raise tuition – that alone would solve a lot of problems. He suggests a multi-phased process: increase tuition and with that we can then invest in new things. He gave the example of computer science. Local businesses like Blackbaud want to invest in our program. If we can generate revenue then we will gain prestige, and pull in more faculty members. The first step is a hard core financial analysis of what we need.

• A point was made that the Bachelor of Professional Studies was not in the initial report. That program will generate revenue. It takes our mission to an entire population that we are not serving. President Benson said this is true and is important. He strongly endorses the program, but we are not there yet.

• Comments were made about the positive outcomes of a proposed PhD Program in Marine Biology and utilizing the resources at Fort Johnson. Such a program could include other programs like a minor in economics, comibing skills in other areas. The President said he would like to talk about this possibility. Another professor said our strength is to be curious and innovative and to create original thought. He thinks a quality PhD program in Marine Biology is possible, but we do not have a culture for that now.
• Lastly a question was asked of the President about his future as our leader. Timetable? President Benson said his contract is up in two years so it is up to the Board. He said we have to do a lot of educating of the trustees, for example, the shadowing program. We will have a retreat this summer – there are new people coming on the Board. He said that he has been talking with others in our community to work with the trustees. Some of our powerful alumni (and non-alumni) who believe in New Charleston can educate the Board on these matters.

The Speaker thanked President Benson. He said he would be happy to come back in the future to discuss these issues.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:04 P.M.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Sarah E. Owens

   Faculty Secretary

---

The President

President Benson welcomed everyone back to the Senate. He said his report would be focused on a concept that he would call “New Charleston.” Within the next month he would like to get together again to discuss these items.

1. The Strategic Plan
The Strategic Plan continues to be revised to ensure that it remains closely linked to annual priorities and available resources. Since the plan’s adoption by the Board of Trustees in 2009, our Strategic Plan is a living document that will evolve as circumstances around us change. The circumstances and times are now changing.

The President briefly summarized the three values identified in the Strategic Plan: Academic Excellence; Student-Focused Community; and Power of Place, which refers to the History, Traditions, Culture and Environment of Charleston and the Lowcountry, and the opportunities they afford students for learning and faculty for scholarship.

He said we already do a very good job of incorporating Charleston’s existing assets into our academic programs — assets such as the port, historic preservation, the ecology of the Lowcountry, the tourism industry, African American history, urban planning, the arts, etc. We are doing a little better at helping to nurture and take care of Charleston’s assets. But as Charleston’s economy has expanded and evolved over the past few years, these traditional assets are no longer the only driving force behind Charleston’s economy and its quality of life. The traditional assets have been joined by new and emerging assets in several areas. He said he would discuss these momentarily.

The revised Strategic Plan — as revised this fall — calls for us to take advantage of and support both Charleston’s existing assets and its emerging assets.

2. New Charleston

As President, he said it is his job to think out 10, 20, 40, even 50 years into the future and make sure the College is on track to achieve its potential…its envisioned future. It is that type of thinking that has inspired this presentation. Charleston is no longer a Navy town. Charleston is developing a complex, modern, diverse economy.
Significant wealth has moved in over the last 30 years, particularly to the barrier islands and south of Broad.
  - Retired CEOs and executives
  - Second homes for celebrities, sports stars, and high-powered business leaders
  - Fortune Magazine ranks Charleston as one of the best small cities in the country for retiring.

Aerospace and Manufacturing
  - Since Boeing arrived in 2009, their local workforce has grown from 0 to 6,000
  - Boeing is the strongest transformative positive economic force to hit Charleston since the Civil War
  - It is not “the #1 tourist destination in the world” designation that has us on the national map … it’s Boeing.
  - Even in Atlanta they talk about recruiting suppliers for Boeing-Charleston
  - In 2012, the Brookings Institution ranked the Charleston metro area No. 1 in the nation for growth in manufacturing jobs.
  - More than 100 automotive industry manufacturers such as Bosch, Daimler, and Force Protection, collectively employ over 6,500 workers.

Technology
  - Charleston is becoming known as “Silicon Harbor”
  - One of top 10 fastest-growing cities for software and Internet technology, according to the Charleston Regional Development Alliance (CRDA).
  - Charleston now has 250 small to medium-sized software firms.
  - From Blackbaud, to Benefit Focus, to People Matter, to two people working in a kitchen
  - Other firms include BiblioLabs, TwitPic, and BoomTown.
  - Google Data Center in Berkeley County (500-acre site near Goose Creek)
  - Some of the growth in technology and software companies has been fueled by the Charleston Digital Corridor, a public-private technology incubator and resource center launched by the City of Charleston in 2001.
In April, the College will host a major technology conference and expo in TD Arena called “Dig South.” The conference will explore the intersection of technology, social media, marketing, and the arts. Dig South is the brainchild of Stan Gray, Director of Strategic Communications in our Division of Marketing and Communications. Modeled on Austin’s famous South by Southwest (SXSW) conference, Dig South will be held in Charleston each April.

The College is seeking $2M from the General Assembly to develop a Digital Technology Incubator and Center. The center will focus on the commercialization of digital immersive and interactive technologies for software applications in medicine, healthcare, education, industry, entertainment, and the arts.

**Hospitality and Tourism**

- Nearly 1,500 new hotel rooms are being built or are in the planning stages on peninsular Charleston. (Increase of nearly 44 percent over the existing 3,281 rooms in the downtown area.)

**Healthcare and Biosciences**

- Charleston is home to more than 35 medical device and pharmaceutical manufacturers and more than 50 research laboratories and development companies
- MUSC’s Strategic Plan calls for developing a Center for Medical Innovation and Entrepreneurialism

**Miscellaneous Activity**

- At CofC, McAlister Development is building Campus Center Apartments.
- The renovation of Gaillard Auditorium is a public-private project to convert the auditorium into a premier concert hall with exhibition space and city offices.
- Construction on Greystar’s Elan Midtown is well underway along the block of Spring Street between King and Meeting streets. This includes boutique apartments, a hotel, retail space, and parking garage. It is the first significant mixed-use real estate development project in downtown Charleston in over 20 years.
o Upper King Street is booming with new retail shops, restaurants, nightclubs, and technology firms.
o The Evening Post, parent company of The Post and Courier, is developing plans for the redevelopment of nearly 12 acres along King and Meeting streets.
o Law firms from around the East Coast are opening offices here:
  ▪ K & L Gates from Boston
  ▪ Carlock Copeland from Atlanta
  ▪ Womble Carlyle from Winston-Salem
o Charleston International Airport served 1.3 million departing passengers in the last fiscal year — an increase of nearly 200,000 over the previous year.
o Southwest Airlines began operations here in March 2011.
o Jet Blue begins service to New York City and Boston on 28 February, 2013.
o The airport is about to undergo a nearly $200 million renovation
o The quality of Charleston’s workforce is finally being systematically addressed through the Anita Zucker-inspired Cradle to Career Program.

All of these activities, rankings, and plans are clear signs that Charleston’s economy is booming.

The President then spoke briefly about the College and its environment. For 227 years the College has focused on turning out 21 and 22-year-olds with college degrees. Overall that has been our singular mission. He said there are some graduate programs, but they are an afterthought. They always have been and unfortunately they continue to be. They are poorly funded and hardly even marketed — except for the new MBA degree.

President Benson said what the College is doing and has done for the last two to three decades is not enough to support and nurture New Charleston. We had a sense of this when we built our Strategic Plan four years ago. And the plan aimed us in the right direction. It calls for more research, more graduate programs — even two or three PhD programs. It calls for more executive education, more adult education, more online coursework, and more economic development initiatives to support existing businesses and help launch new businesses.
The plan recognized the City’s existing assets and pledged to both exploit them and take care of them. These existing assets — some of which he listed earlier — include:

- The Port
- The Lowcountry’s Marine Environment
- The cutting edge urban planning that sustains and builds Charleston
- Historic Preservation
- The Hospitality and Tourism Industry
- African American History
- Southern Jewish History
- The Arts Community

The plan calls for the College to strengthen and invest in the programs and majors that align with Charleston’s assets; thereby creating a truly unique university and an academic experience that cannot be duplicated anywhere else in the world. But the plan developed from late 2007 to the fall of 2009 and did not anticipate Boeing and the changes to follow.

He said the recently revised plan does, by recognizing both Charleston’s existing and emerging assets. The emerging assets include the following three industries:

- Aerospace
- Digital Media and Technology
- Healthcare and Biosciences

The President remarked, while the Strategic Plan was extremely well received by the Board of Trustees, and unanimously adopted, it has not been adequately funded. As a result, many of its initiatives are still in the early stages of implementation or have been delayed. Examples of the initiatives called for include:

- Executive Education — through something that was tentatively called the Charleston Institute.
- Adult Education — we are just now restarting and reenergizing the North Campus
- More graduate programs including two or three doctoral programs — Coastal Carolina is ahead of us here.
Hiring more faculty, particularly in the fields that match up with Charleston’s assets and emerging assets (little progress)

Applying for and receiving more research grants (some progress)

Building a conference center at Dixie Plantation (many years away)

Expanding online education (a little progress)

The President said these types of programs and activities are suddenly being recognized by Charleston’s business community as vital to Charleston’s future. And they are looking for our leadership—looking for us to deliver them. For example, the software industry recently asked the College to start producing 200 undergraduate computer science graduates a year. We graduated only 21 last year.

There is growing interest in executive education in the Lowcountry. The College did a feasibility study and looked closely at establishing executive programs through our own “Charleston Institute,” but could not risk the $500,000 to launch it.

The President said this is the picture of the emerging economy and a snapshot of the College in that context. The bottom line is that the College is not yet adequately investing in its Strategic Plan, which means, it is not yet investing enough in New Charleston.

The President listed other organizations that are investing in New Charleston and the growth and revenue opportunities:

- 26 for-profit and non-profit private universities have invaded Charleston: Strayer, Virginia College, Webster University, St. Leo University, ITT Technical Institute, Southern Wesleyan University, ECPI College of Technology, etc.
- Clemson has 85 acres in North Charleston that houses their Restoration Institute (wind turbine testing, The Hunley) and engineering programs. Their architectural center is about to be built on Meeting Street, essentially on our campus. Their Agricultural Research Services Center is on Savannah Highway west of the Ashley.
- University of South Carolina in Charleston:
  - Masters of Social Work at our Lowcountry Graduate Center since fall 2007.
Distance MBA program since 1970.
New MBA Program two blocks from ours
New Executive Education classroom and classes two blocks from our Business School
Store on King Street
Billboards on I-26
Joined the Charleston Regional Development Alliance (CRDA). This means their president sits on the Economic Leadership Council with the four presidents of Charleston’s public universities, the three school superintendents of metro Charleston, and members of the business community.
The President has been told that USC is currently looking for more real estate, including, 25 acres that adjoin Trident Tech. He “can smell” USC-Charleston on the horizon.

The President said there are now 26 for-profit universities; Clemson; USC; the four publics (CofC, MUSC, Citadel, Trident Tech); and Charleston Southern—that’s 33 universities with footprints in Charleston. What does this mean for the College? He believes that if we don’t think carefully now and move quickly, we could be boxed in as these other universities step up to satisfy the demands of New Charleston. He said, for example, could we do engineering now if we wanted to? Probably not because that is already been covered by Clemson and The Citadel. Could we launch an Executive MBA Program? He thinks yes, but we need to hurry. Executive Education? USC and The Citadel are already ahead of us.

The President said we risk being boxed in and prevented from pursuing educational programs that are being demanded by our community. We could end up frozen in time unable to do much more than we’re currently doing. We could end up being marginalized by our own inaction. He said “New Charleston” wants more from the College and needs more from the College. He thinks we should deliver it, and if we don’t others will.

President Benson spoke about a very low-probability event, but one that should not be overlooked in our planning and analysis. He said MUSC was nearly merged into USC within the
last decade. We must keep our eye on USC. The last thing we want it to become a branch
campus. Charleston needs its own university. In general branch campuses are always
underfunded; overlooked; and of inferior quality relative to the main campus.

The President outlined some possible solutions for us to invest in the College and in New
Charleston and keep ourselves from being marginalized and/or absorbed.

Solutions:

Short Term:

1. Raise tuition and fees to Clemson’s level. Their fees are a lot more than ours. This would
immediately generate over $30 million to invest in New Charleston.
2. Align with Clemson and do joint work with them in areas important to New Charleston.
   This will enhance our growth opportunities and help maintain our independence and our
   value to New Charleston.

Long Term:

We need to be able to raise enrollment. USC did: Added 3,600 students during the Great
Recession (That’s all of Davidson and Wofford, plus 800 more students).

1. Open a branch campus (within the next 7-10 years). The best location may be
   Summerville since it will be the epicenter of real estate development in the Lowcountry
   for the next 20-plus years.
2. A Dream: Find a way to take over the Robert Mills Manor (the subsidized housing
   project near campus): Put together a 30-year plan to gradually buy and rebuild the
   residences elsewhere on the peninsula or the neck. This would open up about 2 ½ blocks
   south of Wentworth Street for College expansion.

Medium Term:
1. Convince the legislature to grant the College Authority Status, like the Ports Authority, or Santee Cooper, or the MUSC hospital (an authority does not receive any state funding, runs itself like a business).
2. To preserve a university devoted to Charleston it may be necessary to merge with MUSC (in the very long term, this is not one he is advocating, but you cannot overlook it).

President Benson said despite the negativity implied by some of his remarks, he thinks that the College is doing very well today. Overall, the news is terrific:

- Student applications are at an all-time high
- Fundraising is at an all-time high ($15.8 M in CY2012)
- Students studying abroad are at an all-time high. In fact, with respect to the total number of students studying abroad, among all the master’s-level institutions in the U.S., we rank 10th.
- We are among the top producers of Fulbright Scholars — tied for second nationally among master’s-level institutions. (3 Fulbright Scholars in 2012-13).
- In December 2012, the College was one of only 40 universities listed in a U.S. News national ranking of universities that offer a high quality education but spend less to do so. (Dollars spent per student per index point)
- National awareness of the College is at an all-time high
- We have joined the Colonial Athletic Association – which will offer us significantly more visibility, more academic support, better athletic competition, and enhanced revenue opportunities.
- Our alumni will be the winners – in their job searches.
- We have made great strides in professionalizing the administration of the university, including both people and processes.
- We have modernized the campus and developed a Campus Master Plan to guide future growth.
• We’ve built a strong network of supporters, friends, parents, and alumni clubs across the country.
• The quality of our students is excellent and our student body is becoming more diverse.
• And we have laid out both a Strategic Plan and a Diversity Strategic Plan that are leading the College toward supporting New Charleston and becoming a truly national university.

3. Closing/Discussion

President Benson said he recognizes that some of the ideas and concepts he has discussed might be controversial and that opinions might differ – in some cases dramatically – from what he and others believe the College is and should aspire to become. He said we can respectfully disagree on these points. But what we can’t do is ignore what is happening all around us with respect to Charleston’s economy and the actions and plans of other South Carolina universities. The activities and trends he has mentioned will directly and profoundly impact the College.

He said that many at the Senate meeting have been at the College much longer than him. Some have seen Presidents come and go, and have sat through many pitches and presentations about the future of the College only to see these visions fade as the College reverts to the way it has operated for decades. He said he understands if Senators are skeptical about New Charleston or any new vision.

President Benson said he wants to hear and understand the Senate’s thoughts on this topic. He wonders what Senators would do if they were in his shoes. How can he ensure that the College of Charleston remains true to its roots while adapting and evolving to meet the needs of New Charleston?
Constituents' Concerns

There were no concerns at this time.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 5 February 2013

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 5 February 2013, at 5:06 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium). After Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of 15 January, 2013 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry reported on the following items:

1. Special Senate Meeting Reminder
   - The special meeting will take place on Tuesday, Feb. 12, from 5:00-6:00pm in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty 115). The sole purpose is to give Senators an opportunity to ask questions, make comments, and provide feedback to President Benson’s report from January.
   - The Speaker received a copy of President Benson’s speech shortly before the Senate meeting and will forward the speech to senators.
   - Thorough minutes highlighting the main points of the speech are available on the Senate website (see minutes from 15 January).
   - She asked senators to invite colleagues from departments to attend if they are interested in hearing more about President Benson’s ideas. All faculty members have speaking privileges.

2. Affordable Health Care Act
   - President Benson told The Board of Trustees (BOT) in January that the College is looking into what will be required of the College to meet the guidelines to provide health care to employees including adjunct and full-time temporary employees.
   - Steve Osborne, Executive Vice President for Business Affairs, is reviewing this and will have a cost estimate for the Board, hopefully in April.
   - President Benson told the Board that the College will not follow the plans of some institutions and significantly reduce the number of adjunct and full-time temporary employees.

3. Recommendations of the Online Task Force
   - Online task force (Lynne Ford and Godfrey Gibbison presented a report at the December Senate meeting) presented their report to the Academic Affairs Committee during the January BOT meeting.
   - The Online Task Force recommends that the College move forward deliberately and with energy to expand online education at the College once the necessary infrastructure and resources are in place.
   - Recommend a phased approach:
Phase 1 should focus on improving Information Technology (IT), computing and administrative support infrastructure, developing policies and processes, and significantly expanding faculty development, Teaching, Learning, and Technology (TLT), and online student support services to meet “best practice” standards appropriate to the current level of online engagement. Hopefully this will be completed within one year.

Phase 2 will focus on expansion of online education with the development of selected online graduate programs and a more robust and strategic development of online courses at the undergraduate level and the expansion of summer school offerings.

The Board received the report with great enthusiasm; the task force reiterated that there will need to be tremendous resources dedicated to upgrading our current online infrastructure – both equipment and people – let alone expanding our offerings.

4. IT Strategic Plan

- One of the recommendations from the Huron group is that the College needs to develop an IT Strategic Plan.
- Bob Cape, Senior VP / Chief Information Officer for the College of Charleston, is putting together an IT Strategic Planning Committee which will include faculty, staff and students. The facilitator for the committee will be Jennifer Albrecht of Collegiate Project Services in Columbia.
- The committee is scheduled to begin meeting this month and there will be an open forum for faculty and staff scheduled in mid-March.
- The committee will be expected to develop a prioritized list of projects and initiatives for IT to undertake during the 2013-2014 academic year and to develop budget requests to support the planned work based strongly on the IT estimates of the resources required. The committee will be expected to complete their work by 12 April, 2013 so their recommendations can be incorporated with the College budget process for fiscal year 2013/14.

5. Reminder – March Senate meeting will be on Tuesday, 12 March. Agenda deadline for March meeting is Thursday, 28 February.

Phil Dustan (at-large) wanted to know when the faculty can read the Huron report. The Speaker said that the President has not received a narrative report, but she does have copies of a slideshow that was presented to the BOT. The report was presented orally, but the slides represent the recommendations. There is not a narrative, to the best of her knowledge. Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Policy Advisor, in the Office of the President, said that there is a detailed slide deck – that is the report and that is what was requested.

Joe Kelly (at-large) asked about the timing of the budget requests. Is there faculty input for IT’s budget? Ms. Cherry said that the IT Strategic Planning Committee will be working to rank IT’s priorities for next year. They will then be taking the recommendations for the entire budget request. She said that several members of the Educational Technology Committee have been
asked to serve on the IT Strategic Planning Committee. The Speaker is also on that committee. That committee will be meeting for the first time next week. In March there will be an open forum. By 8 April the committee has to have a strategic plan to present and move forward. Budget requests are submitted by mid April (all departments). Mr. Kelly pointed out that there is not going to be a chance for the Senate to review these recommendations before the end of the semester. The Speaker said she is not sure.

The Provost

Provost Hynd reported briefly on the following three items:

1. **Dean of the Library Search Committee**
   The search committee will start to consider applications on 15 February. Provost Hynd said they this should be a fast search. He hopes to have a new Dean of the Library by 1 July.

2. **Provost Report**
   The next Provost Report will be held on Wednesday 27 February at the Alumni Center, from 8:30-9:30am with a light breakfast.

3. **Academic Ingenuity Event**
   Provost Hynd said we need to do a better job at highlighting the accomplishments of our students, faculty and alumni. Therefore, he is planning on organizing a couple of events each year similar to “TED Talks.” The first event will take place on 9 April at the Sottile Theater. The campus community and the community-at-large will be invited. This will be a fast-paced, one-hour event with a total of nine presenters: three alumni, three students, and three faculty members. After the event there will be video profiles on our social media.

   Heath Hoffman (at-large) asked about the time of the event. Provost Hynd said they do not have an exact time yet, but it will be late afternoon. Mr. Hoffman also wanted to know which Dean will be presenting at the Provost Report. Provost Hynd said Mike Auerbach, Dean of the School of Sciences and Mathematics, will be presenting.
Student Affairs and Athletics Committee

Members: Lanahan, Brian (Chair); Benigni, Vincent L; Vasquez, Felix S; Xie, Yu Henry; Barnette, Scooter

Brian Lanahan, chair of the committee, gave the following brief report.

Mr. Lanahan said the committee met twice this fall. They discussed the statement about the composition of the committee. The committee concluded that the statement needs to be revised to include language about optional student involvement.

A committee member was sent to the BOT meeting to discuss their concerns about the move to the Colonial Athletic League. Additional travel and potential expenses were a concern, but they are satisfied with responses.

The committee reviewed Who’s Who applications: there were 50 applications and 25 accepted. They also reviewed mandate/discussion (by the Speaker) on what exactly they do. Should the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee still exist? They will discuss the topic this semester.

The committee will meet again this spring to discuss additional issues and confer on a slate of end of the year awards.

Mr. Lanahan said faculty members should feel free to contact him or any of the other committee members with questions or concerns that should be addressed by the committee.

Assessment of General Education (Gen Ed)

Lynne Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration, started with a reminder of why this issue has such urgency. Many people still do not know that the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) put the College of Charleston on monitoring probation. Gen Ed Assessment was one of the main reasons for this monitoring. This is very serious. She said that there are two processes going on simultaneously to create a plan that will remedy this problem: certification and preparation for assessment. She gave a special thanks to Bob Mignone, Shawn Morrison and Karen Small for their leadership in creating and executing this plan.

Both of these processes are possible because of the work faculty accomplished at the Saturday, 17 November, 2012 Gen Ed Assessment Workshop. Faculty participated in reviewing student learning outcomes, creating signature assignment guidelines that will allow faculty in a variety of disciplines to create assignments aligned with the student learning outcomes that can be assessed
with a common rubric. This work of aligning outcomes with the definitional criteria and creating the framework for evidence of student learning and the rubric to assess student learning has taken some time. She said that this information is an important step to begin the following two processes.

1) **Certification or Re-certification of Gen Ed Courses (Gen Ed Committee):** Ms. Ford said this is necessary in order to better define what is and what is not Gen Ed at the College. At present, hundreds of courses count for Gen Ed when it is difficult to articulate a rationale for how they came to be on a list. We need a way of creating commonalities across courses. Faculty created and the Senate affirmed approval criteria for use in reviewing courses for each of the seven distribution categories. These criteria will be used to be sure that courses fit the category for which they are proposed. Departments have already, or are in the process of determining, which of their courses will be submitted for Gen Ed certification. The committee is working in phases: English, History, Math/Logic and Foreign Language courses were submitted by January 30th. Natural and Social Science proposals are due by February 15th; and Humanities courses by March 15th. This will allow us to conclude this part of the process by the end of the semester.

2) **Preparation for the Assessment of Gen Ed.** The assessment process will begin in earnest next academic year. We will assess student learning in courses in all 7 categories by sampling at the course and section level. This evidence (student work) will be assessed by faculty drawn from the disciplines that make up each distribution category. The faculty assessment groups will be trained in application of the rubric to the evidence. This information will be reported to the campus as a whole. Ms. Ford said “this process is not set in stone,” and we will inevitably learn and make some future changes. She emphasized that it is important to get the process started.

Ms. Ford introduced the new Faculty Coordinator for General Education: Gia Quesada. She is an Associate Professor in the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain Management in the School of Business. She has a lot of assessment experience. Ms. Quesada has experience with the accrediting body for Schools of Business called the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and has expertise in sampling and analysis statistics.

There were no questions at this time.
New Business

Dan Greenberg, Co-Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, introduced the following proposals.

Faculty Curriculum Committee
February 2013 Meeting
List of Proposals Approved by the Committee
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Web Site)

I. Course Proposals: All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deactivated) will be voted on as a single group, unless a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote. Senators are asked to contact the Faculty Speaker or the Faculty Secretary in advance, if they wish to separate a proposal from the group. Of course, this action can also be done on the floor of the Senate.

Management and Entrepreneurship Change prerequisites for MGMT 377

Management and Entrepreneurship Add course (ENTR 407)

Physics Prerequisite cleanup

Teacher Education Cross-list EDFS 428 and EDFS 741

The Senate voted on the course proposals for Management and Entrepreneurship, Physics, and Teacher Education, which were approved without discussion.

II. Program Changes:

Environmental Studies Change of Minor Proposal
- Add Courses: BIOL 301, PHYS 350, POLI 397, POLI 294, ENTR 407

The Senate voted on the change of minor proposal for Environmental Studies which was approved without discussion.
International Business

Change of Major Proposal
• Change study-abroad requirement
• Add new courses: INTB 499, INTB 344, I NTB 420

International Business
Change of Major Proposal
• Add new course: INTB 390

The Senate voted on the change of major proposals for International Business which were approved without discussion.

Discovery Informatics/Data Science
Change acronym from DISC to DATA

Steve Litvin (Hospitality/Tourism Mgmt) asked if changes to the acronym are going to be a problem (there has been discussion at the Senate in the past on the topic). Cathy Boyd (Office of the Registrar) said they do not perceive any problems. The Senate voted on the change of acronym for Discovery Informatics/Data Science, which was approved.

Brooke Van Horn, Chair of the Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs, introduced the following proposals.

D. Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

Proposals for the Faculty Senate 5 February, 2013 Meeting
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

New Course Proposals and Changes—Passed at Graduate Council on January 18th

**Master of Arts in Teaching – Special Education:**
**Graduate Program Change/Cross-list Proposal Undergraduate with Graduate Course**
EDFS 428 with EDFS 741

The Senate voted on the new course proposal and cross listing with an undergraduate course, which passed without discussion.

**Constituents' Concerns**

There were no concerns at this time.

The Senate was adjourned at 5:56 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 15 January 2013

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 15 January 2013, at 5:07 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium). After Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of 4 December, 2012 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry welcomed everyone back to the Senate. She made a brief announcement that Parliamentarian George Pothering had a previous engagement at 5:45 P.M. and he would be replaced during the rest of the meeting by Joe Kelly (at-large). She then reported on the following items.

1. Board of Trustees meeting on Thursday 17 January and Friday 18 January. She sent an email earlier with the times and locations of committee meetings on Thursday; anyone planning to attend the meetings should let Clara Hodges in Academic Affairs know so she can ensure there are enough seats for everyone.
   a. Academic Affairs Committee will meet 9:00-10:45 A.M. in the Alumni Center, School of Education, Health & Human Performance
   b. Budget and Finance Committee will meet 11:00 A.M. -12:30 P.M. in the same location.

2. Flu report
   a. Student Health Services and multiple offices across campus are working to develop pro-active strategies to try to minimize the potential impact of the flu on the CofC campus.
   b. As of last Thursday, 14 cases of flu confirmed among students; probably more since Thursday.
   c. This year’s flu is expected to be comparable in severity to the H1N1 influenza of 2009/10. The last three years have been relatively mild, but this year is expected to see more serious cases and a lot more cases.
   d. As appropriate, please take this into consideration regarding attendance policies, make-up policies for work, etc.
   e. If you have a student who tells you s/he has been diagnosed with the flu, please reinforce that the student should stay home and should not attend class and risk infecting everyone else.
   f. News reports indicate a person may get the flu more than one time.
   g. Health Services says the worst cases are likely between now and the end of February/beginning of spring break.
h. If necessary, Health Service (HS) may extend their operating hours to meet the needs of the students, so please direct student to HS.

3. Nominations & Elections is soliciting nominees for Speaker of the Faculty and Faculty Secretary. This is Sarah Owens’ last year of eligibility for Faculty Secretary.

4. Nominations & Elections is soliciting nominees for at-large senate seats. Elections will take place in February.

There were no questions at this time.

**The President**

President Benson welcomed everyone back to the Senate. He said his report would be focused on a concept that he would call “New Charleston.” Within the next month he would like to get together again to discuss these items.

1. The Strategic Plan

The Strategic Plan continues to be revised to ensure that it remains closely linked to annual priorities and available resources. Since the plan’s adoption by the Board of Trustees in 2009, our Strategic Plan is a living document that will evolve as circumstances around us change. The circumstances and times are now changing.

The President briefly summarized the three values identified in the Strategic Plan: Academic Excellence; Student-Focused Community; and Power of Place, which refers to the History, Traditions, Culture and Environment of Charleston and the Lowcountry, and the opportunities they afford students for learning and faculty for scholarship.
He said we already do a very good job of incorporating Charleston’s existing assets into our academic programs — assets such as the port, historic preservation, the ecology of the Lowcountry, the tourism industry, African American history, urban planning, the arts, etc. We are doing a little better at helping to nurture and take care of Charleston’s assets. But as Charleston’s economy has expanded and evolved over the past few years, these traditional assets are no longer the only driving force behind Charleston’s economy and its quality of life. The traditional assets have been joined by new and emerging assets in several areas. He said he would discuss these momentarily.

The revised Strategic Plan — as revised this fall — calls for us to take advantage of and support both Charleston’s existing assets and its emerging assets.

2. New Charleston

As President, he said it is his job to think out 10, 20, 40, even 50 years into the future and make sure the College is on track to achieve its potential…its envisioned future. It is that type of thinking that has inspired this presentation. Charleston is no longer a Navy town. Charleston is developing a complex, modern, diverse economy.

Significant wealth has moved in over the last 30 years, particularly to the barrier islands and south of Broad.

- Retired CEOs and executives
- Second homes for celebrities, sports stars, and high-powered business leaders
- Fortune Magazine ranks Charleston as one of the best small cities in the country for retiring.

Aerospace and Manufacturing

- Since Boeing arrived in 2009, their local workforce has grown from 0 to 6,000
- Boeing is the strongest transformative positive economic force to hit Charleston since the Civil War
It is not “the #1 tourist destination in the world” designation that has us on the national map … it’s Boeing.

Even in Atlanta they talk about recruiting suppliers for Boeing-Charleston

In 2012, the Brookings Institution ranked the Charleston metro area No. 1 in the nation for growth in manufacturing jobs.

More than 100 automotive industry manufacturers such as Bosch, Daimler, and Force Protection, collectively employ over 6,500 workers.

**Technology**

Charleston is becoming known as “Silicon Harbor”

One of top 10 fastest-growing cities for software and Internet technology, according to the Charleston Regional Development Alliance (CRDA).

Charleston now has 250 small to medium-sized software firms.

From Blackbaud, to Benefit Focus, to People Matter, to two people working in a kitchen

Other firms include BiblioLabs, TwitPic, and BoomTown.

Google Data Center in Berkeley County (500-acre site near Goose Creek)

Some of the growth in technology and software companies has been fueled by the Charleston Digital Corridor, a public-private technology incubator and resource center launched by the City of Charleston in 2001.

In April, the College will host a major technology conference and expo in TD Arena called “Dig South.” The conference will explore the intersection of technology, social media, marketing, and the arts. Dig South is the brainchild of Stan Gray, Director of Strategic Communications in our Division of Marketing and Communications. Modeled on Austin’s famous South by Southwest (SXSW) conference, Dig South will be held in Charleston each April.

The College is seeking $2M from the General Assembly to develop a Digital Technology Incubator and Center. The center will focus on the commercialization of digital immersive and interactive technologies for software applications in medicine, healthcare, education, industry, entertainment, and the arts.
Hospitality and Tourism

- Nearly 1,500 new hotel rooms are being built or are in the planning stages on peninsular Charleston. (Increase of nearly 44 percent over the existing 3,281 rooms in the downtown area.)

Healthcare and Biosciences

- Charleston is home to more than 35 medical device and pharmaceutical manufacturers and more than 50 research laboratories and development companies.
- MUSC’s Strategic Plan calls for developing a Center for Medical Innovation and Entrepreneurialism.

Miscellaneous Activity

- At CofC, McAlister Development is building Campus Center Apartments.
- The renovation of Gaillard Auditorium is a public-private project to convert the auditorium into a premier concert hall with exhibition space and city offices.
- Construction on Greystar’s Elan Midtown is well underway along the block of Spring Street between King and Meeting streets. This includes boutique apartments, a hotel, retail space, and parking garage. It is the first significant mixed-use real estate development project in downtown Charleston in over 20 years.
- Upper King Street is booming with new retail shops, restaurants, nightclubs, and technology firms.
- The Evening Post, parent company of The Post and Courier, is developing plans for the redevelopment of nearly 12 acres along King and Meeting streets.
- Law firms from around the East Coast are opening offices here:
  - K & L Gates from Boston
  - Carlock Copeland from Atlanta
  - Womble Carlyle from Winston-Salem
- Charleston International Airport served 1.3 million departing passengers in the last fiscal year — an increase of nearly 200,000 over the previous year.
- Southwest Airlines began operations here in March 2011.
Jet Blue begins service to New York City and Boston on 28 February, 2013.
The airport is about to undergo a nearly $200 million renovation
The quality of Charleston’s workforce is finally being systematically addressed through the Anita Zucker-inspired Cradle to Career Program.

All of these activities, rankings, and plans are clear signs that Charleston’s economy is booming

The President then spoke briefly about the College and its environment. For 227 years the College has focused on turning out 21 and 22-year-olds with college degrees. Overall that has been our singular mission. He said there are some graduate programs, but they are an afterthought. They always have been and unfortunately they continue to be. They are poorly funded and hardly even marketed — except for the new MBA degree.

President Benson said what the College is doing and has done for the last two to three decades is not enough to support and nurture New Charleston. We had a sense of this when we built our Strategic Plan four years ago. And the plan aimed us in the right direction. It calls for more research, more graduate programs — even two or three PhD programs. It calls for more executive education, more adult education, more online coursework, and more economic development initiatives to support existing businesses and help launch new businesses.

The plan recognized the City’s existing assets and pledged to both exploit them and take care of them. These existing assets — some of which he listed earlier — include:

- The Port
- The Lowcountry’s Marine Environment
- The cutting edge urban planning that sustains and builds Charleston
- Historic Preservation
- The Hospitality and Tourism Industry
- African American History
- Southern Jewish History
- The Arts Community
The plan calls for the College to strengthen and invest in the programs and majors that align with Charleston’s assets; thereby creating a truly unique university and an academic experience that cannot be duplicated anywhere else in the world. But the plan developed from late 2007 to the fall of 2009 and did not anticipate Boeing and the changes to follow.

He said the recently revised plan does, by recognizing both Charleston’s existing and emerging assets. The emerging assets include the following three industries:

- Aerospace
- Digital Media and Technology
- Healthcare and Biosciences

The President remarked, while the Strategic Plan was extremely well received by the Board of Trustees, and unanimously adopted, it has not been adequately funded. As a result, many of its initiatives are still in the early stages of implementation or have been delayed. Examples of the initiatives called for include:

- Executive Education — through something that was tentatively called the Charleston Institute.
- Adult Education — we are just now restarting and reenergizing the North Campus
- More graduate programs including two or three doctoral programs — Coastal Carolina is ahead of us here.
- Hiring more faculty, particularly in the fields that match up with Charleston’s assets and emerging assets (little progress)
- Applying for and receiving more research grants (some progress)
- Building a conference center at Dixie Plantation (many years away)
- Expanding online education (a little progress)

The President said these types of programs and activities are suddenly being recognized by Charleston’s business community as vital to Charleston’s future. And they are looking for our leadership— looking for us to deliver them. For example, the software industry recently asked the College to start producing 200 undergraduate computer science graduates a year. We graduated only 21 last year.
There is growing interest in executive education in the Lowcountry. The College did a feasibility study and looked closely at establishing executive programs through our own “Charleston Institute,” but could not risk the $500,000 to launch it.

The President said this is the picture of the emerging economy and a snapshot of the College in that context. The bottom line is that the College is not yet adequately investing in its Strategic Plan, which means, it is not yet investing enough in New Charleston.

The President listed other organizations that are investing in New Charleston and the growth and revenue opportunities:

• 26 for-profit and non-profit private universities have invaded Charleston: Strayer, Virginia College, Webster University, St. Leo University, ITT Technical Institute, Southern Wesleyan University, ECPI College of Technology, etc.

• Clemson has 85 acres in North Charleston that houses their Restoration Institute (wind turbine testing, The Hunley) and engineering programs. Their architectural center is about to be built on Meeting Street, essentially on our campus. Their Agricultural Research Services Center is on Savannah Highway west of the Ashley.

• University of South Carolina in Charleston:
  o Masters of Social Work at our Lowcountry Graduate Center since fall 2007.
  o Distance MBA program since 1970.
  o New MBA Program two blocks from ours
  o New Executive Education classroom and classes two blocks from our Business School
  o Store on King Street
  o Billboards on I-26
  o Joined the Charleston Regional Development Alliance (CRDA). This means their president sits on the Economic Leadership Council with the four presidents of Charleston’s public universities, the three school superintendents of metro Charleston, and members of the business community.
- The President has been told that USC is currently looking for more real estate, including, 25 acres that adjoin Trident Tech. He “can smell” USC-Charleston on the horizon.

The President said there are now 26 for-profit universities; Clemson; USC; the four publics (CofC, MUSC, Citadel, Trident Tech); and Charleston Southern—that’s 33 universities with footprints in Charleston. What does this mean for the College? He believes that if we don’t think carefully now and move quickly, we could be boxed in as these other universities step up to satisfy the demands of New Charleston. He said, for example, could we do engineering now if we wanted to? Probably not because that is already been covered by Clemson and The Citadel. Could we launch an Executive MBA Program? He thinks yes, but we need to hurry. Executive Education? USC and The Citadel are already ahead of us.

The President said we risk being boxed in and prevented from pursuing educational programs that are being demanded by our community. We could end up frozen in time unable to do much more than we’re currently doing. We could end up being marginalized by our own inaction. He said “New Charleston” wants more from the College and needs more from the College. He thinks we should deliver it, and if we don’t others will.

President Benson spoke about a very low-probability event, but one that should not be overlooked in our planning and analysis. He said MUSC was nearly merged into USC within the last decade. We must keep our eye on USC. The last thing we want it to become a branch campus. Charleston needs its own university. In general branch campuses are always underfunded; overlooked; and of inferior quality relative to the main campus.

The President outlined some possible solutions for us to invest in the College and in New Charleston and keep ourselves from being marginalized and/or absorbed.

Solutions:

Short Term:
1. Raise tuition and fees to Clemson’s level. Their fees are a lot more than ours. This would immediately generate over $30 million to invest in New Charleston.

2. Align with Clemson and do joint work with them in areas important to New Charleston. This will enhance our growth opportunities and help maintain our independence and our value to New Charleston.

Long Term:

We need to be able to raise enrollment. USC did: Added 3,600 students during the Great Recession (That’s all of Davidson and Wofford, plus 800 more students).

1. Open a branch campus (within the next 7-10 years). The best location may be Summerville since it will be the epicenter of real estate development in the Lowcountry for the next 20-plus years.

2. A Dream: Find a way to take over the Robert Mills Manor (the subsidized housing project near campus): Put together a 30-year plan to gradually buy and rebuild the residences elsewhere on the peninsula or the neck. This would open up about 2 ½ blocks south of Wentworth Street for College expansion.

Medium Term:

1. Convince the legislature to grant the College Authority Status, like the Ports Authority, or Santee Cooper, or the MUSC hospital (an authority does not receive any state funding, runs itself like a business).

2. To preserve a university devoted to Charleston it may be necessary to merge with MUSC (in the very long term, this is not one he is advocating, but you cannot overlook it).

President Benson said despite the negativity implied by some of his remarks, he thinks that the College is doing very well today. Overall, the news is terrific:
• Student applications are at an all-time high
• Fundraising is at an all-time high ($15.8 M in CY2012)
• Students studying abroad are at an all-time high. In fact, with respect to the total number of students studying abroad, among all the master’s-level institutions in the U.S., we rank 10th.
• We are among the top producers of Fulbright Scholars — tied for second nationally among master’s-level institutions. (3 Fulbright Scholars in 2012-13).
• In December 2012, the College was one of only 40 universities listed in a U.S. News national ranking of universities that offer a high quality education but spend less to do so. (Dollars spent per student per index point)
• National awareness of the College is at an all-time high
• We have joined the Colonial Athletic Association – which will offer us significantly more visibility, more academic support, better athletic competition, and enhanced revenue opportunities.
• Our alumni will be the winners – in their job searches.
• We have made great strides in professionalizing the administration of the university, including both people and processes.
• We have modernized the campus and developed a Campus Master Plan to guide future growth.
• We’ve built a strong network of supporters, friends, parents, and alumni clubs across the country.
• The quality of our students is excellent and our student body is becoming more diverse.
• And we have laid out both a Strategic Plan and a Diversity Strategic Plan that are leading the College toward supporting New Charleston and becoming a truly national university.

3. Closing/Discussion

President Benson said he recognizes that some of the ideas and concepts he has discussed might be controversial and that opinions might differ – in some cases dramatically – from what he and others believe the College is and should aspire to become. He said we can respectfully disagree
on these points. But what we can’t do is ignore what is happening all around us with respect to Charleston’s economy and the actions and plans of other South Carolina universities. The activities and trends he has mentioned will directly and profoundly impact the College.

He said that many at the Senate meeting have been at the College much longer than him. Some have seen Presidents come and go, and have sat through many pitches and presentations about the future of the College only to see these visions fade as the College reverts to the way it has operated for decades. He said he understands if Senators are skeptical about New Charleston or any new vision.

President Benson said he wants to hear and understand the Senate’s thoughts on this topic. He wonders what Senators would do if they were in his shoes. How can he ensure that the College of Charleston remains true to its roots while adapting and evolving to meet the needs of New Charleston?

The President opened the floor to questions, but said he would like to spend an hour or two with the Senate on just this topic in the very near future.

Heath Hoffman (at-large) asked if we could schedule an open forum on this topic. The President said if we do an open forum then he will have to give the speech again for background information.

Phil Dustan (at-large) said the College was founded by the Library Society. Has he had discussions with the mayor? President Benson responded yes, he has. A month ago he went through these items with him. He has done this multiple times, but the city does not build the College into its plans. The President wants more support from the city. For example, Coming and St. Philip streets will be converted to two-way – he does not think this is wise with so many students. Yet, he agrees that we need to work together.

Speaker Cherry said she wants feedback on a future meeting/discussion with the President. Should we schedule a special session of the Senate or do it during a regular meeting?
The Provost

Provost Hynd briefly reported on the following items:

**Provost Report**
The Provost said that 6 February, 8:30-9:30am will be his next Provost Report. Location TBA.

**Distance and Online Education Task Force**
The taskforce, led by Lynne Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration, and Godfrey Gibbison, Dean of the North Campus, was charged on 28 September, 2012. This Thursday 17 January, they will present their report at the Academic Affairs meeting.

**Library Dean Search Update**
Fran Welch, Dean of the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance, is the Chair of the Search Committee. The position description will be posted on 16 January. Applications will be start to be considered on 15 Feb and continue. He would love to have someone in this position by 1 July.

**Curricular Updates**
Marketing and Archeology degrees have been approved by the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). He thanked all involved in those programs.

**General Education (Gen Ed) Assessment**
On 7 January there was a Provost Workshop led by Ms. Ford and others (a follow-up from the one day workshop held last semester on 17 November, 2012). The assessment process will reexamine and certify courses. He is hopeful that departments will be careful about what courses will be submitted for Gen Ed certification. The College will be monitoring patterns of enrollment over time (next 3-5 years).

There were no questions at this time.
Faculty Welfare Committee

Simon Lewis, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, gave the following power point presentation.

Faculty Welfare Committee

Faculty morale report and recommendations
1/15/2013

Faculty morale issues

- Evidence:
  - two surveys conducted last year
  - anecdotal / informal communication
- “Great Colleges to Work For” survey
- Current areas of concern
  1. Online teaching evaluations
  2. Communication about T&P procedures
  3. Evaluation of chairs and deans

Faculty Welfare Committee, 1/15/2013
1. Online teaching evaluations

- Much reduced response rate
  - old paper-based system: ~70% responded
  - new online system: ~35% respond

- No recovery in response rate
  - had expected recovery within 3-4 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semester</th>
<th>response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data: Institutional Research
Faculty Welfare Committee, 1/15/2013

1. Online teaching evaluations

- Concerns
  - questionable validity for T&P and other reviews
  - even with some recovery, unlikely to return to original levels
  - faculty-based incentives:
    - philosophical opposition
    - generate bias
    - undue pressure on untenured faculty

Faculty Welfare Committee, 1/15/2013

Online teaching evaluations – Recommendations 1 & 2

1) Simplify student participation
   - single click from emails *
   - extend opportunity through end of finals *

2) Opt-out system
   - require students to either complete or actively opt-out of each evaluation *
   - discontinue faculty-based incentives *

* recommended by Faculty Educational Technology Committee, 2009
Faculty Welfare Committee, 1/15/2013
Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, asked if she could give some responses to the information presented thus far. She said there was a single click in the email for student evaluations. They can put it back in. She said they are happy to extend the student evaluations until the end of finals. They are happy to talk about the opt-out policy.

Provost Hynd said they have talked about the opportunity to use a mobile app – to allow students to bring it to class. Ms. Caveny-Noecker said that our current software is supposed to be able to do this. They would like to do a pilot in some classes.

Mr. Lewis said the committee considered the option of going back to paper evaluations, but they know that will not happen, but the possibility of a mobile app looks like a good alternative.

Mary Beth Heston (Art History) supports making on-line evaluations mandatory by not allowing students to access their grades: either they opt out or they complete them for their grades. She also commented that now when we print these online evaluations they are very long.
Mr. Dustan asked if the committee had considered the venue and the outcome of the evaluations. Are the students in a bar or the formality of a classroom? He thinks there is a difference in the levity. Mr. Lewis said there is no control; it is like “Rate Your Prof.Com.” He thinks we need to get the response numbers up to something reasonable. We do not have uniform measures of judging teaching performance (like we had with the paper forms).

A professor asked if we still have to leave the room if students use their own electronic devices. Mr. Lewis said we should leave the room, but there are no official guidelines. Bev Diamond, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, said that we will have to develop new procedures.

Mr. Lewis restarted the PowerPoint here: Point 2 Communication about T &P Procedures

---

**2. Communication about T&P procedures**

- *Substantial changes to T&P guidelines since 2009*
  - Faculty concerns (from 2011 survey)
    - 70% agreed: “the requirements for a successful tenure and promotion review are constantly shifting”
    - nearly 50% disagreed: “I have a clear understanding of the criteria one must meet to have a successful tenure and promotion review”
  - Changes made in 2011-12
    - took effect this year but not finalized until after packets were due

---

**Communication about T&P procedures – Recommendations**

1) Single annual period for FAM revisions
   - e.g., one month ideally over summer

2) Stable T&P requirements for each faculty member
   - e.g., evaluate each tenure candidate based on standards and process in FAM at time of their hire

---

Faculty Welfare Committee, 1/15/2013
Ms. Caveny-Noecker said as a point of clarification that she will take full responsibility for what was posted when. But, she wanted it to go on the record that the document that came to the Faculty Senate with changes, was posted to department chairs and candidates this summer. Candidates did have that language. What was posted late was a copy of the FAM with a complete set with old and new changes. Mr. Lewis said in terms of principle it does matter. It needed to be absolutely finalized and posted.

Mr. Lewis returned to the power point: Point 3 – Evaluation of chairs and deans

### 3. Evaluation of chairs and deans

- Faculty satisfaction with dean varies widely by School
- FAM stipulates faculty input into evaluation of chairs (annually) and deans (“periodically”)
  - has not been consistently applied across Schools
- Faculty dissatisfaction with communication with upper administration
  - especially in Schools dissatisfied with dean

Faculty Welfare Committee, 1/15/2013

### Evaluation of chairs and deans – Recommendations

1. Annual, anonymous evaluations of chairs and deans by their faculty
   - two-levels-up reporting for accountability
     - chair evaluations to provost as well as dean
     - dean evaluations to president as well as provost
   - FWC requests input into procedures and questions

2. Mechanism to ensure responsiveness
   - Academic Affairs develop a mechanism to dialogue directly with faculty in cases of dissatisfaction

Faculty Welfare Committee, 1/15/2013
Mr. Lewis said he believes that faculty opinion really does need to be taken into account.

Vince Benigni (Communication) asked about the relationship between faculty members and deans. He wondered if faculty feel qualified to evaluate deans or would it be better to give feedback to their chairs first. Mr. Lewis said that we need to investigate if faculty members are prepared to evaluate deans.

Moore Quinn (Sociology/Anthropology) asked if the FAM will be changed by these proposals. Mr. Lewis does not think so because this information is already in the FAM, but it is not happening now. Jen Wright (at-large) asked about the recommendation for T&P. Can faculty opt-in to newer versions of the FAM and not have to stick to items that they were hired at? Mr. Lewis said he believed this to be the case.

**Faculty Committee on Educational Technology**

Elizabeth Jurisich, Chair of Educational Technology, began her report by saying that her committee wants faculty input about changes. She said that the following PowerPoint presentation has live links and she encourages faculty to follow them in their free time. The version of the presentation with the live links will be posted on the Faculty Senate webpage.
Near term goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish a client advocacy program in IT</td>
<td>Huron report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom technology upgrades</td>
<td>Huron report, TechQual survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Lifecycle replacement</td>
<td>Huron report, TechQual survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless throughout campus</td>
<td>Huron report, TechQual survey, GoogleDocs survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establish a client advocacy program

Justification

- Huron Report
- CoFC is more centralized than its peers, so requires strong customer linkage.
- Create clear channels of communication, instill a customer service mentality throughout IT.
- Create a method for student input for how the student technology fee is used, esp. if the fee is increased to peer levels.

Classroom technology upgrades

Justification

- Huron Report
- Equipment inconsistent and antiquated.
- TechQual Survey
- Classroom technology was below respondents’ “minimum” level of acceptable service (question #8)
Lifecycle replacement

Justification

- Huron Report
  - Long replacement cycle leads to reduced productivity and non-central purchasing.
  - Improved replacement cycle should result in fewer off cycle purchases and reduce PC support costs.
- TechQual Survey
  - Accelerating replacement of classroom computers in particular would partly address concerns over inadequate classroom technology (Question #8).

Wireless throughout campus

- Huron Report
- TechQual Survey
  - Internet speed and reliability was below respondents’ “minimum” level of acceptable service (questions #1-3)
- Google Docs Survey
  - Dissatisfaction was greatest for wireless internet (questions #3-4).
- Upgrades underway: Projected date of completion Dec 2014.

Progress and FETC suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>FETC goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish a client advocacy program</td>
<td>Helpdesk has been requesting user feedback following closure of tickets</td>
<td>Student input in use of feed by Sept 2013. FETC exploring possible solutions (e.g., forming a software/hardware needs subcommittee.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom technology upgrades</td>
<td>Upgrades are underway</td>
<td>Ideally 4 year timeline. Current timeline is based on swing space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifecycle replacement</td>
<td>No known progress.</td>
<td>Investigate cycles of other institutions. Consider a tiered replacement system. Immediately prioritize classrooms, heavy data users, image processors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless throughout campus</td>
<td>Upgrades are underway</td>
<td>Prioritize classrooms and academic buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no questions at this time.

New Business

Senator Dr. Susan Balinsky (Dept. of Health and Human Performance) presented the following proposal and resolution. She did this on behalf of CofC Faculty and Staff: Dr. Olivia M. Thompson, Mr. Dan Dickison, and Ms. Rachael McNamara CofC Students: Ms. Lauren O'Grady (Student Senator) and Mr. Sukhpreet Singh (Student Senator); MUSC: Dr. Susan Johnson.
TOBACCO FREE CofC

I. PURPOSE
The purpose of this policy is to extend the current College of Charleston (CofC) smoking policy (adopted in 2006) to promote a tobacco-free environment for employees, students, and visitors such that the negative effects of passive smoke and tobacco use are minimized within all CofC facilities, including CofC affiliate facilities.

II. POLICY
A. Covered Individuals
The provisions of this policy shall apply to all employees (including faculty and staff), visitors, students, volunteers, contractors and vendors unless otherwise noted.

B. Use of Tobacco Products
Consistent with Act No. 188 (adopted June 7, 2012), the use of any tobacco product is prohibited “IN BUILDINGS, PORTIONS OF BUILDINGS, AND AREAS CONTIGUOUS TO THESE BUILDINGS OWNED, LEASED, OR OPERATED BY PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING THAT THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE INSTITUTION HAS DESIGNATED AS NONSMOKING.” Tobacco use is prohibited in places including, but not limited to: offices, classrooms, laboratories, elevators, stairwells, restrooms, shuttle buses, shuttle bus stops, sidewalks, parking areas, meeting rooms, hallways, lobbies, and other common areas. The use of tobacco products in CofC owned, operated or leased vehicles is also prohibited.

C. List of Tobacco Products
Tobacco products include, but are not limited to: cigarettes, cigars, pipes, chewing tobacco, e-cigarettes and other smokeless tobacco products.

D. Related Issues
Employees, students, volunteers, contractors and vendors are expected to adhere to professional standards of appearance and not have an odor of tobacco products on their clothing or person.

III. INFORMATION AND PROCEDURE
A. Faculty/Staff
1. Faculty and staff are expected to comply with the Tobacco-Free Campus Policy and assist with sharing information about the policy.
2. New employees will be informed of the Tobacco-Free Campus Policy during orientation.
3. Enforcement of the policy rests with the appropriate supervisory staff, deans, department heads and administrative officials.

4. When employees observe violations of the policy, they should politely remind the offender of the policy and request that they dispose of tobacco materials.

5. If the employee continues to violate the policy, the location and time of the violation should be reported to the appropriate supervisory staff, dean, department head or administrative official.

6. Violation patterns will be assessed and appropriate action initiated.

B. Visitors

1. Visitors will be informed of the policy and asked to comply while they are on campus.

2. Signage will be posted throughout CofC’s buildings and grounds; stating this facility is a tobacco-free campus.

3. All employees are encouraged to assist with the education of visitors regarding the policy, using policy information cards, which will be made available.

4. Employees are expected to help enforce the policy with visitors by requesting that they dispose of tobacco materials and respect CofC’s healthcare mission and tobacco-free campus.

5. If a visitor is observed repeatedly violating the policy after being advised of the policy, staff should note the location and time of the violation and contact their respective manager or the Department of Public Safety.

C. Students

1. New students will be informed of the Tobacco-Free Campus Policy during orientation.

2. Enforcement of the policy rests with the respective Dean’s office.

3. When students observe violations of the policy, they should remind their fellow students of the policy and ask them to dispose of the tobacco materials.

4. If the student continues to violate the policy, the location and time of the violation should be reported to the appropriate Dean’s office.

5. Violation patterns will be assessed and appropriate action initiated.

6. Affiliation agreements will include the Tobacco-Free Campus Policy so that students from other schools will be advised of the policy.

D. Contractors/Vendors

1. A provision will be inserted in all contracts, e.g. construction and/or maintenance, to prohibit the employees of contractors/vendors from using tobacco materials on property owned or leased by CofC.

2. Failure by the contractor/vendor or their employees to comply with the provisions of this policy could result in the termination of the contract.
IV. ENFORCEMENT
A. The monitoring and enforcement of this policy is the responsibility of ALL CoFC employees and students. Each individual should consistently and politely bring any infraction of this policy to the attention of the person or persons observed violating the policy.

B. The CoFC Department of Public Safety will assist in the enforcement of this policy by reporting violations to the appropriate manager or supervisor. Employees are also expected to assume leadership roles by adhering to the policy provisions and by reminding others who aren’t in compliance of the policy provisions.

C. CoFC will provide Tobacco-Free Campus Policy information cards to facilitate the education and enforcement of the policy.

V. RESOURCES
Tobacco-use cessation classes and seminars will be planned and implemented, as resources permit, to assist faculty, staff and students interested in ceasing to use tobacco products. Student Affairs is responsible for developing such programs for employees and students.

Resolution Presented by Senator Dr. Susan Balinsky (Dept. of Health and Human Performance) on behalf of CoFC Faculty and Staff: Dr. Olivia M. Thompson, Mr. Dan Dickison, Ms. Rachael McNamara
CoFC Students: Ms. Lauren O’Grady (Student Senator) and Mr. Sukhpreet Singh (Student Senator);
MUSC: Dr. Susan Johnson

On this 15th Day of January, 2013

Purpose: To extend the current College of Charleston smoking policy such that the College of Charleston is a tobacco-free campus.

Whereas: The negative health effects of primary and secondary (passive) tobacco-use are well documented; primary and secondary tobacco use are associated with increased incidence of infectious and chronic diseases as well as injuries.
Whereas: The College of Charleston (P.I. Dr. Olivia M. Thompson) has been awarded a Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) service grant to develop, implement, and evaluate a tobacco-free campus initiative.

Whereas: On June 7, 2012 the South Carolina Governor signed Act No. 188 into law providing that smoking specifically is not allowed “IN BUILDINGS, PORTIONS OF BUILDINGS, AND AREAS CONTIGUOUS TO THESE BUILDINGS OWNED, LEASED, OR OPERATED BY PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING THAT THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE INSTITUTION HAS DESIGNATED AS NONSMOKING.”

Whereas: On September 12, 2012 the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services announced an initiative to eliminate tobacco use on U.S. college campuses.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
That the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston encourages the administration of the College of Charleston to adopt a 100 percent Tobacco-Free Campus policy that prohibits tobacco use by all employees, visitors, students, volunteers, contractors and vendors on campus and at College of Charleston affiliate locations at all times unless otherwise noted.

The resolution was seconded.

The discussion began with the comments a Student Senator. He said that he and other Student Senators just came from their Student Senate meeting. They had 50-60 people show up to the meeting and a lively discussion ensued regarding the proposed smoking ban. In the end the Student Senate voted in favor of the ban (14 to 8). But, he asked the Faculty Senate to vote against the ban because he believed the vote was too close and does not represent all of the students’ wishes.

Mr. Dustan supports the ban. He does not appreciate all the smoke outside the buildings and all the butts that are hurting the biosphere.

Erica Arbetter (Student Body President) said the Student Senate did support the resolution after two hours of discussion. She thinks that we have to do “what is right.” She thinks that this is “black and white.” She believes that tobacco kills, and she does not think it has a place in a learning environment.

One professor made the comment that she is not a smoker, but would like to do something that is a little less difficult – perhaps a few more smoking areas. She said we should respect non-smokers and smokers.
Scott Peeples (at-large) said he wanted more clarification regarding the resolution. How is the campus defined for this purpose? Would it include sidewalks on Coming and St. Philips streets? What are the limits of campus? Can you smoke in a car? Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Policy Advisor, in the Office of the President, said there is a model policy attached to this resolution. It has not gone through a legal review yet. There still has to be some policy revision, but you can vote for or against the resolution now.

Ms. Heston wanted a point of clarification. Don’t we already have this as a law? Dr. Susan Johnson (MUSC) said on June 7, 2012 the South Carolina Governor signed Act No. 188 into law providing that smoking specifically is not allowed “In buildings, portions of buildings, and areas contiguous to these buildings owned, leased, or operated by public institutions of higher learning that the governing body of the institution has designated as nonsmoking.”

Craig Plante (Biology) had a concern about the policy regarding the odor of tobacco products: “Policy II – D. Related Issues  Employees, students, volunteers, contractors and vendors are expected to adhere to professional standards of appearance and not have an odor of tobacco products on their clothing or person." Ms. Thompson said this policy is not part of the resolution. Today, they are just trying to see if the Faculty Senate will support this resolution. She gave some statistics on how many colleges in the US and in South Carolina are either smoke-free or tobacco free: Currently there are: 1130 US college campuses either smoke-free or tobacco-free; 766 US college campuses are tobacco-free; 16 college campus in SC that are either smoke-free or tobacco-free (11 are tobacco-free); 9 college campus in SC that are working on becoming tobacco-free. Mr. Plante said if we have to adhere to the point on professional appearance then he has a problem with the resolution. Ms. Thompson said that this will all be worked out by the lawyers.

Mr. Hoffman said he is concerned about banning things. He said that the policy from 2006 did not really work. Why will this work? Ms. Thompson said that they have money for a marketing campaign. Jeff Wragg (Physics/Astronomy) said he is a non-smoker, but he thinks this is over his line of tolerance that allows adults to do “stupid things.”

A student said this resolution stems from a desire to be a healthier campus.

Jannette Finch (Library) asked why the 8 student senators opposed this. One student said we should work on the smoking areas and make them work. That was the major concern. Another student said that banning the smoking areas is a bad idea because it will make smokers go to unsafe areas outside the campus limits.

A question was asked whether the grant requires the College to adopt a tobacco free policy. Can the grant still be used if this does not pass? Ms. Thompson responded that the tobacco-free campus initiative is supported by a grant from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Healthy South Carolina Initiative. Grant money will be used to support the implementation of a tobacco-free campus policy, adopted by fall 2013 semester.
A Student Senator said it would be hypocritical to ban something that is not enforced. Without designated smoking areas there would be lots of cigarette butts on the ground. Ms. Arbetter said that the overall feeling of the Student Senate is that tobacco is deadly. We can perpetuate the problem, or we can be part of the solution. The majority vote of students shows that they want to be the solution. Another student said that she did not even know that smoking areas existed on campus. More information should be distributed about the designated smoking areas.

The Senate voted on the resolution to adopt a tobacco-free campus policy, which did not pass.

Constituents' Concerns

There were no concerns at this time.

The Senate was adjourned at 7:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 4 December 2012

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, 4 December 2012, at 5:06 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium). After Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty, called the meeting to order, the minutes of 13 November, 2012 were approved as circulated.

Reports

The Speaker

Speaker Lynn Cherry reported on the following items:

1. Reminder – December graduation is Saturday 15 December, 2012 at 2:00 P.M. in the TD Arena. This is a combined ceremony for graduate and undergraduate students.

2. Final grades for all fall classes are due by noon on Friday 14 December.

3. On 17 November a one day workshop on General Education Assessment was held. Dr. Mary Allen, Professor Emeritus from California State University, facilitated the discussion. She spoke about how to assess General Education (GenEd). It was a very productive day. Speaker Cherry thanked Academic Affairs for organizing this event.

4. In response to recent stories in the Post and Courier and campus emails regarding the sexual assault of April last year, the Speaker met with Victor Wilson, Jeri Cabot, and Paul Verrecchia to discuss CofC policies and procedures regarding crimes. Speaker Cherry said it is important to remember that what has been publically reported in the news does not reflect all the facts of the case.

The Speaker gave the following summary of Federal and State legislation that guides criminal investigations and procedures at the College of Charleston.

The 2007 Department of Justice report – often cited regarding campus sexual assaults – indicates that approximately 20% of female students and approximately 6-7% of male students will be victims of an attempted or completed sexual assault during their college career. Alcohol is usually involved.

• Jessica Horton Act of 2007 (legislation specific to South Carolina)
  • In the event of any death on campus, South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SLED) is the lead agency in the investigation and the campus police assist SLED.
• In the event of sexual assault cases, the campus police are the lead agency in the investigation and SLED assists. SLED’s assistance is “call us if you need us”, not a direct involvement with the case.
• Campus police are not allowed to turn a case over to city police – crime must be handled by campus police.

• Cleary Act
  • Campus police must notify campus in a timely manner of a crime if there is an ongoing threat to the campus. For example, we get emails about someone who has been assaulted on our near campus.
  • If threat has been neutralized, no notification is required.

• “Dear Colleague Letter” – April 2011 from the Department of Civil Rights in the Department of Education – Under Title IX, sexual assault is a form of sexual harassment.

College of Charleston Procedures –

• CofC Public Safety officers are commissioned state law enforcement officers and are commissioned and sworn in by SLED, not by CofC. Public Safety officers go through the same training as other law enforcement officers.
• CofC Public Safety notifies SLED when Public Safety receives report of crime such as sexual assault. USC, Clemson and Winthrop University follow this same procedure on their campuses.
• Public Safety throughout their investigation also keeps SLED and the Solicitor’s Office informed of progress and findings in sexual assault cases.
• CofC Public Safety processes crime scene as appropriate – this involves securing a search warrant, gathering physical evidence as pertinent to the crime, etc.
• CofC Public Safety must adhere to all federal and state laws regarding collecting and processing evidence, gathering testimony and interviewing the victim as well as the accused.
• CofC Public Safety has two detectives, one male and now one female, who are trained to process crime scenes. If crime scene requires help from SLED, we call on SLED or even the city if SLED officers are not immediately available.
• Student options –
  • Students who are victims of a crime or who believe they may be a victim of a crime have a number of resources/options including:
    • Office of Victim Services (OVS)
    • Dean of Students Office – Campus Conduct cases
    • Counseling and Substance Abuse Services (CASAS)

• Students can choose whether they want to pursue a case through Campus Conduct and/or the criminal process.
  • Campus Conduct cases can move more quickly than criminal cases, and are required by the Department of Education to move quickly.
  • Campus Conduct cases and criminal cases can be investigated simultaneously, but it is not uncommon for students to limit who they ask to testify in Conduct cases because they want the testimony only for a criminal case, if the case goes to trial.
  • Even if a student does not want to pursue a Campus Conduct case, the campus can still act/investigate if there is a threat to the campus.

• CofC has multiple policies/options for responding to instances of sexual misconduct whether related to faculty, staff or students.
• When students report instances of sexual misconduct/assault to OVS or Dean of Students, they are given booklet which outlines the College’s Policy and Procedures.

• Final comments –
  • Both Victor Wilson, Executive VP for Student Affairs (9 years at CofC), and Paul Verrecchia, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs & Chief of Police (8 years at CofC), verified that in their time at the College the administration has never tried to step in and influence an investigation.
  • Victor Wilson’s decisions regarding Conduct cases and/or appeals are based on the totality of the evidence, some of which may not be publicly known.
  • At the April 2012 Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting (April 20, 2012), the Board approved new procedures for the processing of sexual assault cases. The case in the news occurred on April 23, 2012.
  • The College has, for the past several months, been reviewing practices and steps to improve the process of handling cases as well as steps to improve the overall safety on the campus.
  • The Student Sexual Misconduct Committee was formed last spring and continues to work on issues related to sexual misconduct.
    • Jeri Cabot and JoAnn Diaz – co-chairs
    • 16 members of the committee include students, faculty and staff
    • Purpose – students
• To make sure students know what constitutes sexual misconduct, the College’s policy regarding sexual misconduct, and that students are aware of where to report cases of sexual misconduct.
• To make sure faculty and staff know what constitutes sexual misconduct, the College’s policy regarding sexual misconduct, and resources available to students who are victims of sexual misconduct.
• The committee is forming sub-committees to address specific areas of concern and actions and to develop a plan for program assessment.
• Anyone who is interested in joining this committee can contact Jeri Cabot.

The Speaker opened up the floor to questions.

Phil Dustan (at-large) asked about the obligation of the faculty member to report a student’s rape to the College (if a student tells you this in confidence). Kathryn Bender (Legal Council) said that is a difficult question. There is no privilege of confidentiality between faculty and student so the faculty member should encourage the student to report it to Victim Services. She does not know if you are mandated to report. Speaker Cherry said she does not think that faculty members are “mandated reporters.” You can do so as a “John Doe” – you do not have to give your name. Ms. Bender would encourage the faculty member to walk the student over to Victim Services. Ms. Cherry said if the incident occurs off-campus then it is the responsibility of Charleston Police, and if it happens on-campus then it is Public Safety. Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Policy Advisor, in the Office of the President, said he will do the research and give the answer in writing. The sexual misconduct committee will have a website with this type of information too.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, noted that if a student alleges sexual harassment by a faculty member then there is an obligation to come forward.

Mr. Dustan wanted to know the difference between sexual harassment and bullying. Mr. McGee needs to look into this matter and will have a definite answer in writing. His recollection is that it is a subcategory. The Speaker said she will be distributing this information to everyone.
The Provost

The Provost thanked Speaker Cherry for her report.

Provost Hynd gave a brief report on the following items:

**Dean of the Library Search**

Provost Hynd spoke about the search for the new Dean of the Library. The search committee has representation from a number of constituents (see slide below with names and affiliations). He thinks that by January the committee will finalize the description of the position, advertise it, and then hopefully start the interviewing process later in the spring semester.

![Library Dean Search Committee](image)

- Fran Welch, Chair
- Janette Finch, Library, North Campus
- Harlan Greene, Senior Archivist, Special Collections
- Helen Ivy, Head, Grice Marine Resources Library
- Patricia Lessane, Director, Avery Research Center
- Sherry Gadsden, Head, Circulation
- Claire Fund, Director of Administrative Services
- Martha McTeer, Special Collections
- Rick Heltrich, Chemistry & Biochemistry
- Thomas Baster, Director of Libraries, MUSC
- John Rivers, Friends of the Library
- Burton Callicott, Reference Librarian
- David Goble, Director of Library Services, the Citadel
- H. Chapman (Chappie) McKay, Friends of the Library
Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) Search
The Provost said there is not much to report on the HSS Search. The committee now has all the feedback, application materials, and they are moving into the consideration phase. There are four well-qualified candidates.

December Commencement
Provost Hynd encouraged everyone to attend commencement on 15 December at 2:00pm. It is a celebratory event for students and parents.

Colonial Athletic Association
The Provost passed out a handout (this information is also posted on the Faculty Senate website: http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2012-2013/dec-2012/colonial-athletic-association) This handout is an abbreviated copy of an email that he sent to the BOT. As a member of the Colonial Athletic Association, the College of Charleston will be admitted into the Colonial Academic Alliance. The Colonial Athletic Alliance provides a number of programs that fold directly into CofC’s strategic plan with regard to being an outstanding student-centered academic institution with a national reputation for excellence. The quick link to the Colonial Academic Alliance website is: http://colonialacademicalliance.org/

The Alliance has established the following five strategic priorities.

1. Communities of Practice
2. Sharing Academic Resources and Courses
3. Continuing/enhancing Collaboration in Global Education/Study Abroad
4. Continuing/enhancing Collaboration in Undergraduate Research
5. Developing an Alliance Infrastructure Supporting Strategic Initiatives

The Provost noted that since 2002, more than 700 faculty and staff have participated in conferences/research/reviews, and more than 1,000 students have presented research at the Colonial Academic Alliance conference.

Provost Hynd concluded his report by saying that he will be giving a more formal Provost Report early next year.

He then opened the floor to questions.

Vince Benigni (Communication) said he is very excited about our affiliation with the Colonial Athletic Association. He would like to host an event here on campus. This is a good fit for us especially because we will be involved with top-tiered schools.
Jen Wright (at-large) asked when we will become an official member of the Colonial Athletic Association. Mr. McGee said on 1 July, 2013.

Joe Kelly (at-large) wanted to know if there was a consortium for tuition for children of faculty and staff among these schools. The Provost said he did not think so.

Paul Young (Mathematics) asked about corporate logos on the website. Are we entering in relationship with these corporate entities? Mr. McGee said that this is the website for the sports.com webpage, but it is not on the Colonial Academic Alliance pages. He said there are some arrangements with some corporate sponsors, but that was the same with our other sports’ associations.

Speaker Cherry said she would like to switch the order of the next two reports. There were no objections.

**Budget Committee**

Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Budget Committee, gave the following Power point presentation. In general she said her report would focus on what her committee has been doing this year and what they will be doing during the rest of the Academic year.
BUDGET PLANNING PROCESS

- In 2011, our 2009 Strategic Plan was revised
- Tactics (several for each Strategy) were rank ordered
- An Annual Action Plan was developed to carry out high-priority tactics
- Increases in 2012-2013 Budget were directly tied to Annual Action Plan

SNAPSHOT OF 2012-13 BUDGET

- Total: about $220 M
- $10.8 M Increase over 2011-12 Operating Budget
- This came from increased tuition & fees; no increase in state funding
OF THIS 10.8 M, OVER 4 M IS ALREADY SPOKEN FOR.

- 3.3 M goes to mandated new spending
- 1. M goes to inflationary required spending
- Remainder: around $6.4 M for increased spending

ABOUT $6.4 M FOR INCREASED FUNDING OF STRATEGIC ACTION ITEMS

- Merit-Based raises (1.8 M)
- Economic Development Initiative (400K)
- North Area Programs (300K)
- Diversity Strategic Plan (300K)
- Critical Faculty/Staff lines (600K)
- IT (2.9 M)
EACH OF THESE INCREASES WAS TIED TO ANNUAL ACTION PLAN.

- Only highly ranked tactics are likely to receive increased spending.
- Other tactics may get funded if money materializes from other sources (grants, donors)

THIS YEAR’S BUDGET PLANNING PROCESS

- Our committee studied last year’s budget & suggested revisions to Strategic Plan
- President also taking input from Ac Planning, Pres Advisory, and Staff Advisory
- Provost’s Academic Council will discuss budget requests in early Jan
- Annual Action Plan should be discussed at January 17 BOT meeting
- We continue to work with Brian McGee & others as next budget is developed
- Reps attend Planning & Priorities Committee meetings and BOT meetings
- We are educating ourselves and other faculty in order to participate constructively in budget planning process
- A few examples follow . . .

**MANDATED NEW SPENDING FOR 2012-13?**

- The state mandated a 3% raise for all state employees.
- State does not actually pay for the salaries of all College employees; for many positions, the College generates the salaries via tuition & fees.
- For these positions, C of C must come up with the mandated 3% increase.
**STUDENT FEES?**

- An increase for some science lab fees is now being proposed
- Other SC universities charge higher lab fees and program fees
- Committee will continue to explore this topic

**BOND INDEBTEDNESS?**

- A faculty member asked if College debt should be a concern
- Our total indebtedness will be around $188M at end of FY2013
- Reported in annual budget
- Bond payments built into fees

- State of Texas in 2011, average was $20,519 per student. UT Austin= 22,000 per student. [Link](http://www.texas transparency.org/yourmoney/ed_debt/University_Debt_Table.php)

- C of C: 17K per student [?| by end of FY 2013

---

**Other Budget-Related Matters for Budget Committee to Pursue?**

- Send queries to a member of the Budget Committee
- Julia Eichelberger, Tim Johnson, Marion Doig, Marianne Verlinden, Jane Clary, Linda Jones, Tom Heeney
Ms. Eichelberger opened the floor to questions.

Mr. Kelly thanked Ms. Eichelberger for her report. He asked Godfrey Gibbison, Dean of the North Campus, about the $300,000 for the North Campus. Is this because of the expectation that the North Campus will be generating more revenue? Bev Diamond, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, said that the budget from last year did not add any revenue, but by year two or three they project a modest budget revenue.

Dan Greenberg (guest) asked about lab fees. Has the committee reached out to other schools to find out about fees? The Provost said she met with Steve Osborn, Executive Vice President for Business Affairs, and he is aware about the lab fees that will be “coming down the pipe.” Ms. Eichelberger would encourage Mr. Greenberg to look into this for his school (School of Humanities and Social Sciences).

Bill Olejniczak (History) asked about the Annual Action Plan and critical faculty spending. Are these lines new? Ms. Eichelberger said yes, they were new lines. Ms. Diamond said that the lines from a few years ago were lost because of budget problems/cuts, but then they have since gotten some of them back.

**Distance and Online Education Task Force**

Lynne Ford and Godfrey Gibbison, Co-Chairs of the Distance and Online Education Task Force, presented the following Power point presentation. Ms. Ford started the presentation by explaining that this morning they had a campus forum where they had the opportunity to speak about definitions.
Distance and Online Education Task Force

Preliminary Recommendations and Questions for Discussion
December 2012

Task Force Membership

Lancie Affonso       Deborah Jeter
David Desplaces     Joe Kelly
Beverly Diamond     Monica Lavin
Jo Ann Ewalt         Amy McCandless
Jannette Finch      Renee McCauley
Lynne Ford           Rene Mueller
Godfrey Gibbison     Bob Perkins
Beth Goodier         Michael Phillips
Zach Hartje          Robin Zemp
What is it?

- Distance learning takes place when space, time or both separate the teacher and the learner. Instruction is conducted primarily online (Internet) or through videoconferencing.

- The TF discussion and recommendations include synchronous and asynchronous course delivery as well as hybrid and fully online models.

The structure of today’s conversation

- Why do it?

- What must be in place prior to expanding online education?

- How should distance and online education grow at the College?
Why Do it?

- Experience with the online learning environment is essential to preparing students to be lifelong learners, regardless of major, and to engage effectively in the modern workforce, regardless of occupation. There is student interest in and demand for online education.

- Expansion of online education will improve the quality of and enhance what we value in traditional face-to-face teaching and learning.

Why Do it?

- Online learning promotes the core value of a highly personalized education in that it requires students to be highly engaged with the material and with the instructor through regular communication and feedback.
Why Do it?

- Online courses and programs offer faculty opportunities to develop new pedagogies and skills, to revisit and revise courses, and provide increased flexibility in when and where they teach. There is faculty interest in and demand for online education.
- Greater access to courses and programs online extends the impact of the College's high-quality education and affords the College the opportunity to reach non-traditional, non-residential, likely a more diverse student population.

For Discussion...

The Task Force recommends moving forward deliberately and with energy to expand online education at the College once the necessary infrastructure and resources are in place.
What must be in place prior to expanding online education?

- Infrastructure
- Quality Assurance and Local Control
- Compliance Policies
- Ownership Policy
- Faculty Development
- Student Support Services and Online Orientation
- Assessment
- Library Services

For Discussion...

*Phased growth and development.*

- **Stage one** is a building phase in which the IT infrastructure, policies, and administrative and student/faculty supports are brought up to “best practices” standards. The TF recommends employing Huron to address the exact nature of our Infrastructure needs with relevant costs attached.

- **Stage two** includes the development of selected online graduate programs and a more robust and strategic development of online courses at the undergraduate level.
• New positions Required: DE director, curriculum design specialist, and an academic administrator (responsible for OAKS, Kaltura Video, and Echo 360, etc.).

• Ownership: TF conceives ownership of course and material as belonging to the faculty member with limited use by the institution. The faculty member may not offer the course at another institution in the same semester he/she is teaching it here; the College retains the right for one year to offer the course if faculty member leaves. Faculty may teach the course elsewhere during the summer if the College declines to offer the course. The College counsel will develop a formal policy.
Ms. Ford then opened the floor to comments and discussion regarding the previous slides.

Hollis France (Political Science) wanted to know what happens when a faculty member leaves the College. Can the College still use the course? Who owns the course? Ms. Ford said that CofC will retain the right for up to a year to offer the course. Mr. Gibbison said if it’s a summer course for an adjunct, they are a free agent and can take it anywhere.

Justin Wyatt (Chemistry & Biochemistry) wanted to know if after a year, there are intellectual property issues. Mr. Gibbison said they are still discussing recuperating the College’s investment. Ms. Diamond said that the position of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is that the faculty member retains copy write of his or her material. But in this case, they are recognizing the upfront costs and there needs to be a period of time to recuperate the funding.

Discussion ensued regarding teaching courses at other institutions. Would a professor always have to consult the university before teaching an online class at another university? What if the professor had already been teaching a class elsewhere? Mr. Kelly wanted to know if there is a current policy for competing and teaching at other colleges in the summer now. Ms. Wright asked what would happen if someone was already teaching an online course elsewhere. Ms. Ford said they will talk later about this later in the PowerPoint.

Ms. Ford then started the PowerPoint again. She also referred to the information on the handout regarding the Distance and Online Education Task Force. See: http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/archives/2012-2013/dec-2012/distance-online-education-task-force
Ms. Ford then opened the floor to more discussion.

Jaap Hillenius (at-large) asked about evaluating transfer courses. Ms. Ford said we cannot consider mode of delivery (online versus classroom). Mr. Hillenius said they do not consider online...
biology labs as the same. Ms. Diamond said they are not allowed to distinguish mode of delivery when considering transfer credit of a course.

Ms. Ford then returned to the last slide regarding faculty work load.

Mike Duvall (English) asked if enrollment should depend on the kind of instruction involved. Ms. Ford said “if appropriate.” Mr. Dustan asked what would happen if there is an extreme demand for a course. Ms. Ford said we do not have the resources at the CofC for this. We do not have to move in that direction (it’s not in the taskforce model). Ms. Eichelberger said an online course would provide flexibility in many ways such as reaching students who can’t live here. It also would allow us to work with students who have conflicts due to scheduling. But, it would not allow us to teach an infinite number of students. She said she likes the limit.

Ms. Wright wanted to know about the enrollment process for students outside of the College. Mr. Gibbison said the same processes that they use now would apply. Mr. Duvall asked about low enrollment numbers. Ms. Diamond said a course could still run with around 6 to 8 students. Mr. Gibbison said that students come to expect these courses to be offered if you start to offer them. Once the door is opened, you are making a commitment to offering these online courses.
Ms. Ford said that tomorrow (December 5) at 1:00PM in RSS 235 there is one more open forum to discuss these matters.

New Business

Dan Greenberg, Co-Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, introduced the following proposals.

Faculty Curriculum Committee
December 2012 Meeting
List of Proposals Approved by the Committee
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Web Site)

I. Course Proposals: All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deactivated) will be voted on as a single group, unless a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote. Senators are asked to contact the Faculty Speaker or the Faculty Secretary in advance, if they wish to separate a proposal from the group. Of course, this action can also be done on the floor of the Senate.

Teacher Education Cross-list EDFS 428 and EDFS 741

Psychology, Neuroscience Deactivate PSYC 317, PSYC 336, and PSYC 396 (and remove from list of possible electives)

Mr. Greenberg said that the proposal from Teacher Education was not ready for approval yet, so he took it off the agenda.

The Senate voted on the proposal from Psychology/Neuroscience to deactivate three courses, was approved without discussion.
Brooke Van Horn, Chair of the Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs, introduced the following proposals.

Faculty Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs
Proposals for Faculty Senate December 4 Meeting
(All curricular proposals along with supporting documents are posted on the Faculty Senate Web Site)

Proposals to Change a Graduate Course:

MS in Computer and Information Sciences –

- **CSIS 612** Advanced Computer Architecture – Prerequisite Change and Description Edit
- **CSIS 614** Advanced Operating Systems – Prerequisite Change
- **CSIS 618** Programming Languages – Title Change and Description Edit
- **CSIS 632** Data Communications and Networking – Description Edit
- **CSIS 638** Advanced Topics in Database Systems – Description Edit
- **CSIS 657** Embedded Systems Design – Prerequisite Change
- **CSIS 674** Introduction to Computer Graphics – Description Edit

The Senate voted on the proposals from MS in Computer and Information Sciences, which were approved without discussion.
Speaker Cherry (without objection) added the following item to the agenda.

**Motion for the approval of degree candidates for the December graduation ceremony**

The Provost proposed the following resolution: “Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Trustees that candidates certified by the Registrar’s Office as having completed all requirements be awarded degrees at graduation.”

The Senate voted on the approval of degree candidates for December graduation which was approved without discussion.

**Constituents' Concerns**

Mr. Dustan said he was recently in Jack’s Restaurant on George Street and saw a plaque on the wall for his 30 years of service in 2002. He said Jack has been serving countless burgers to the committee and it is time to renew. Speaker Cherry said she will talk to Mr. Dustan about getting this on the January agenda.

The Senate was adjourned at 6:58 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah E. Owens

Faculty Secretary