Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 14 January 2013

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, 14 January 2013 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order: 5:09 PM
2. 3 December 2013 meeting minutes were approved as posted.

3. Reports
   A. The Speaker

      The Speaker reminded the Senate that the online faculty survey regarding faculty perceptions related to the mission and future direction of the College will close on January 15 and asked Senators to please encourage colleagues who have not taken the survey to do so, adding to the over 320 responses to date.

      The Speaker also reminded the Senate that nominations for Speaker of the Faculty and for Faculty Secretary are due by Friday, Jan. 17. Nominations are to be submitted to Calvin Blackwell, Chair – Nominations and Elections. The Speaker invited interested faculty to self-nominate or to nominate interested colleagues. She also reminded the Senate that she is in her third year and will not be up for election.

      The January Board of Trustees meetings will take place on Thursday, Jan. 30 and Friday, Jan. 31. The Speaker noted that the meetings are open and interested faculty can attend, but they should email Clara Hodges in Academic Affairs in advance so sufficient seating can be available.

      In October the Board approved a policy making the College campus a tobacco-free campus effective July 1, 2014. The Speaker reported that the College will be offering smoking cessation programs for interested faculty and staff, probably beginning toward the end of February.

      The Speaker stated that many of us have read the news stories over the past month or so regarding the search for the next President of the College and speculation about candidates. In light of the many stories that have been published, the Speaker added, she invited Greg Padgett, Chair of the Board of Trustees and chair of the search committee, to come to the Senate meeting and comment on the search process and respond to questions.

      After Mr. Padgett spoke and took questions, the Speaker asked if there were any questions for her regarding her report. There were none.

   B. Greg Padgett, Chair – Board of Trustees

      Mr. Padgett thanked for their service to the College of Charleston the Senate and also thanked Speaker Cherry, Dean Fran Welch, and Professor Pamela Riggs-Gelasco for their knowledgable service on the Presidential search committee.
At the outset, he noted that he would likely be repeating some of what he said at the 5 November 2013 meeting of the Senate (see minutes, 3. B.).

The College of Charleston Foundation provided support for hiring a search firm, AGB Search, to assist in finding qualified candidates. The Board, in their most recent meeting to date, approved a resolution thanking AGB Search. The original consultant, Dr. Robert Lawless, stepped down to a less-intensive role in the search due to health issues. Dr. Jamie Ferrare, Principal of AGB Search, will be leading their search efforts.

Dr. Lawless met with over 250 people. There were 41 separate meetings at the beginning of November of various campus constituencies and shareholders, who provided their feedback. Following this, the search committee met with Dr. Lawless, who shared the accumulated feedback. With that feedback in mind, an ad was developed and submitted for publication in print and online in venues, including the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, and it has been posted since the end of November. Online publications in which the ad appeared included *Inside Higher Education*, *Diverse Job Search*, *Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*, *American Conference of Academic Deans*, and *Women in Higher Education*.

Candidate applications, Mr. Padgett said, are due today (January 14) for full consideration by the committee, which meets on Friday, January 17. Applications that come in over the next few days will still be included in the process, however. A second search committee meeting will occur before the end of the month to begin narrowing down candidates in order to begin interviews in February.

The search committee has been asked to give the Board a list of no more than five candidates by February 10. The Board will decide who among this list to bring to campus later in the month. Only the names of the finalists, Mr. Padgett stressed, will be released to the public, with the Board of Trustees deciding on the finalists. The final candidate decided on by the Board will not be announced until a contract is signed.

Mr. Padgett stated that he wants to be clear that, despite media reports on the Presidential search, nothing has changed in the process since he came to the November Senate meeting. The process, he said, remains the same, as he has pointed out to media outlets and in returning phone calls regarding the search. The board, he asserted, is committed to the integrity of the process: a national search with full consideration of all applicants. The outcome of the search, he stressed, has not been foreordained. The board will strive to hire the best person for the job, no matter who that person may be.

Mr. Padgett said that the Board hopes to announce the name of the next President in March, possibly April. Search committee members, he stated, have signed confidentiality agreements in order to ensure the best candidate pool possible. The *Presidential search web page* will continue to be updated as the search progresses.

Finally, Mr. Padgett offered to take questions, stipulating that he would be happy to answer questions about the search but not about individual candidates.
Questions

Phil Jos, Senator – HSS, inquired if the first order of business for the search committee will be to determine if the pool is adequate.

Mr. Padgett replied in the affirmative, noting that the upcoming meeting will be the first in which the committee has a pool of applicants to discuss.

Jos followed up by asking if the committee is satisfied with the number of applications.

Mr. Padgett again replied in the affirmative.

Tony LeClerc, Senator – Computer Science, asked for a clarification on what Mr. Padgett said about applications that arrive after the deadline. If the “full-consideration” date has passed, will there eventually be a “no-consideration” date?

Mr. Padgett replied that the 14th of January was a date set prior to the committee setting their first meeting for consideration of the full application pool. As the committee meets in three days, he stated, applications for full consideration will need to arrive very soon. If applicants need to add an item to complete their applications, for instance, he said, they would need to do so in the morning.

Irina Gigova, Senator – HSS, thanked Mr. Padgett for alleviating concerns that the search might be compromised, and then asked if it is possible for the Board to share the size of the applicant pool.

Mr. Padgett replied that once the application process is closed, the Board should be able to provide that number.

There were no more questions.

C. The Provost (Powerpoint Slides)

John White, the Provost reported, has been appointed as Dean of the Library and has officially started. Currently, he is meeting with Addlestone staff, Deans, and others on campus. He will be invited to present a report to the Provost in late February, with some attention to the planned library renovations.

On the LCWA Dean search, the Provost reported that 40 completed applications are in, and the committee, headed by HSS Dean Hale, began a review began on January 8. The pool features candidates with diverse prior experiences. Finalists will be on campus in March or early April.

The Honors College students displaced due water damage and subsequent discovery of asbestos in their residence hall are now returning to campus. The Honors student residents will be moving into Berry Residence Hall in the fall. Renovations will take place in the summer for the first two floors of Berry to accommodate instructional and academic needs. The renovation team is meeting on January 15.

CofC – MUSC Merger talks continue. It is fair to say, the Provost asserted, that the “legislative delegation … responding to their perceived need, reinforced by the Chamber of Commerce,” may propose legislation in the coming year to merge the
College and MUSC. However, he stated, those in the know think there is a very slim possibility of such legislation getting out of the State House of Representatives. The Chair of MUSCs Board of Trustees is not in favor of a merger. The Provost encouraged Senators to peruse the white paper posted on the Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce’s website (a separate white paper from that developed by the coordinated committee with representation from both MUSC and the College). The site also states that among its key agenda items is to support legislation for the creation of a comprehensive research university in Charleston through the merger of MUSC and the College.

The Provost reiterated that the chances of legislation passing are slim, but that we should remain vigilant.

Figures for those up for tenure and promotion, by school are as follows: LCWA (5), EHHP (1), SSM (9), HSS (10), SBUS (5), and SOTA (1). By level, the figures are: promotion to Senior Instructor (1), review of Senior Instructor (4), tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (17), and promotion to Professor (9).

There were no questions.

D. Faculty Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics: Proposed FAM Class Attendance Language Change

The Speaker noted that the language proposed is for a section of the Faculty Administration Manual over which the faculty does not have direct control. Thus, the proposal is brought to the Senate not for a vote but for information, discussion, and to generate feedback.

Andrea DeMaria, Char of the committee, introduced the proposed language, indicating that the committee researched the need for a language change before moving forward and wrote a draft and distributed it for comment by faculty as part of the process leading to the proposal. The committee feels that the suggested language better protects faculty and offers clearer guidance when they have students who are absent for college-related activities.

Questions/Comments

Phil Jos, Senator – HSS, noted that faculty he has talked to about the proposal find it a very reasonable change.

Paul Young, Senator – Mathematics, pointed out that new language, in the first sentence of the third paragraph, changes the current “Instructors determine...” to “Instructors ascertain...” He asked if the language difference means anything in particular, whether “ascertain” means anything different than “determine.” What is the reason for the word change?

DeMaria responded that there is not any specific change intended in the word choice. Jordan Ragusa (Political Science), a committee member in the audience agreed that the change was inadvertent and that there is nothing intended by it. Kristen Gentile (Classics), another member of the committee, indicated that it was a “wordsmithing” change.
There were no further questions/comments.

4. **Old Business**
   None.

5. **New Business**
   None.

6. **Constituents’ Concerns**
   None.

7. **Adjournment: 5:46 PM**

   Respectfully submitted,

   J. Michael Duvall
   Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 11 March 2014

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 11 March 2014 in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order: 5:05PM
2. 4 February regular meeting minutes were approved as posted.
3. 18 February special meeting minutes were approved as posted.
4. Reports
   A. The Speaker

   The Speaker thanked Margaret Mauk from the Academic Affairs Office, who sat in for Heather Alexander.

   She also thanked everyone who volunteered for committee work next year. She reported that Calvin Blackwell, Chair of Nominations and Elections, said they received over 200 volunteers, and he hopes they will be able to fill most committees based on those submissions. If anyone did not submit a request and still wants to, the Speaker said to email Blackwell.

   The Speaker reported that the Board of Trustees will be holding their March meeting in the next week. The Academic Affairs Committee will meet on Thursday (March 20) morning at 9:15 in the EHHP Alumni Center. Among other topics scheduled for discussion, she said, is the College Reads! program. She encouraged all interested faculty to attend, adding that they should let Clara Hodges in Academic Affairs know if they plan to attend so that she can make sure there is enough seating.

   Finalists for the presidency of the College, she reminded the Senate, will be on campus Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday (3/12-14). There are two opportunities for faculty to meet with each candidate and ask questions, with the same schedule on all days: 1:30 in Alumni Hall (Randolph Hall) and a second meeting at 5:15 in the Stern Center Ballroom. The 5:15 session is open to faculty, staff, alumni, and the public. The Speaker stressed that it is important that faculty attend these events and be prepared to ask questions of each candidate. For anyone who cannot attend either event, the 5:15 session will be taped and posted to MyCharleston. Each session will provide an opportunity for Q&A and there will be feedback forms available so that everyone who attends can provide feedback about the candidates. A copy of the form ( Constituent Summary Sheet) is posted on the Presidential Search tab on the home page.

   The Speaker announced an open faculty meeting on Monday, March 17 for all faculty to meet and discuss the three candidates, the exact time and location of the meeting to be announced via email as soon as they are confirmed.

   The Speaker reported that she received an email from Jordan Hensley, Student Government Association President, regarding an anti-McConnell banner that appeared in numerous place on campus and also an online petition regarding McConnell. Both
of these, Hensely wanted to make clear, were the result of individual students and were not sanctioned or endorsed by SGA.

Finally the Speaker introduced Greg Padgett, Chair of the Board of Trustees, and Lee Mikell, Vice-Chair of the Board, for an update from the board.

B. Greg Padgett, Chair – Board of Trustees

Below are Mr. Padgett’s prepared remarks, from which he read. Text in brackets represent substantive additions to the text in Mr. Padgett’s delivery of it at the meeting.

REMARKS FOR FACULTY SENATE
Greg Padgett
March 11, 2014

Good afternoon. I’m pleased to be with you.

I am here with Lee Mikell, vice chair of the Board of Trustees, to address faculty and community concerns about some recent events at the College of Charleston. I welcome the opportunity to address those concerns, and to take your questions. Today, I’d like to briefly address concerns about the College Reads program, proposals to merge the College of Charleston and MUSC, and the College’s search for a new president.

College Reads

Let me begin by discussing the College Reads program.

In light of recent events, members of the Board of Trustees know that many faculty members are worried that the Board is attempting to interfere with your responsibilities as faculty to determine what is taught at the College of Charleston. Today, let me leave absolutely no room for doubt: The Board of Trustees has no interest in interfering with the academic freedom and responsibilities that rightly belong to the faculty. Those rights and responsibilities of the faculty have been stated in the Faculty/Administration Manual for many decades.

At no time in the history of the College Reads program has the Board acted to censor a book, prevent a book from being taught, or choose any book that will be taught. Any attempt by the Board to determine what books will be taught, or how they will be taught, would violate College policies and the College’s long-standing commitment to academic freedom.

As background, during our Board meeting last August, members of the Board of Trustees did ask for the opportunity to provide input on the College Reads selection for 2014-2015. Because of a misunderstanding, Board members were not given that opportunity to do so early in the book selection process.
I don’t think it should surprise the faculty that, if legislators are going to hold Board members personally accountable for the College Reads book selection, some Board members have expressed interest in offering their individual opinions about those selections.

Happily, we were able to devise a process for the current year that will let Board members have a chance to look at David Finkel’s *The Good Soldiers*, the book that has been recommended by the College Reads Committee for 2014-2015.

Each Board member has been mailed a copy of *The Good Soldiers* and will have a chance to send individual comments about the book to President Benson. The deadline for doing so is this Friday [3/14].

Personally, I do not plan to offer the President any comments on this book. Even if I did want to express an opinion, I understand that President Benson’s decision will be final. Like me, other Board members also appreciate that basic curricular decisions must be made by the faculty and the faculty leadership – not by the Board of Trustees, or by individual Board members. The individual Board members can advise, but we cannot and should not decide.

[Nor should we have a say in the decision. In fact, Board members will have far less influence in book selection than the non-faculty members on the College Reads! committee, who get a vote.]

Of course, faculty and Board members all know that the College Reads program has been subjected over the past month to an unusual level of scrutiny, thanks to a very public discussion of our program in the General Assembly and the media. Legislators have criticized the College’s spending on the College Reads program, and, to address that concern, I believe the Board will eventually review the finances of the program.

Next week I expect the Board of Trustees will adopt a resolution reaffirming the College of Charleston’s commitment to academic freedom. I believe that the Board’s resolution will be similar to statements previously made by President Benson, and to the resolution on academic freedom the Faculty Senate will probably approve later this evening.

Further, for the Board’s meeting during August 2014, I am now inviting the Provost and the next Speaker of the Faculty to make a joint presentation to the Board about the history of academic freedom and the reasons we have academic freedom. I hope this presentation will continue our conversation about the idea of the university, and the respective responsibilities of the faculty, staff, administration, and Board of Trustees.
I hope my words today will assure you of what I already know to be true: The Board of Trustees respects and honors the exceptional work of the College of Charleston faculty. Your academic freedom has not and will not be threatened in any way by the Board of Trustees.

Regarding some of the recent media reports, let me also state for the record that our LGBTQ faculty, staff, and students are welcome and valued members of the College of Charleston community.

Merger

Next, I’d like to talk about the legislation proposing a merger between the College of Charleston and the Medical University of South Carolina.

As a reminder, this legislation was filed just over a month ago, on February 6th. The Board of Trustees has not had a regular meeting since that time, so we have not had the opportunity to discuss this bill.

Today, I don’t want to review the details of the House bill, or the similar Senate bill that was filed more recently.

We know that many members of our business community believe the resources of a comprehensive research university are needed in Charleston.

We know that a majority of faculty at the College oppose a merger for various reasons, including deep skepticism about the willingness of the state to properly fund a merged university.

We know that students and alumni are adamantly opposed to any change in the name, the traditions, and the undergraduate focus of the College of Charleston.

As we move forward, I believe the Board will make a statement about merger. I also believe we will affirm that we as Board members want to preserve the name, the undergraduate excellence, and the unique culture of the College, while simultaneously working to meet the needs [of business], of our community, region, and state.

The College’s strategic plan, as developed in consultation with the faculty and originally approved in 2009, has always envisioned the development of more research capacity and graduate programs for the College, including a few, targeted doctoral programs.

We know that, if we plan carefully [and don't make foolish mistakes], the College can preserve its student-focused culture, while embracing the slow and steady growth of graduate programs and research activity.
In my view we should carefully consider the model provided by the College of William and Mary, which combines excellent undergraduate programs with a relative handful of strong master’s and doctoral programs. Of course, we at the College of Charleston have admired the model provided by William and Mary since I was an undergraduate in the 1970s, and that hasn’t changed.

Like many faculty, I recognize that substantial new funding will be needed to increase the College’s graduate profile. And, along with many faculty, I believe we shouldn’t create new programs at the expense of our already established and successful programs. [If we don't have the funding to create something new, we shouldn't do it.]

Perhaps the best way to explain the Board’s thinking is to look at the text of the presidential prospectus, which has been posted on the presidential search website for over four months:

“The College [of Charleston] is highly ranked and regarded as an exceptional public arts and sciences university. This outstanding reputation is based on the undergraduate programs and will need to be continued as research and graduate programs grow. ... The College’s leadership has the desire to move toward recognition as a doctorate-granting institution with high research activity and will need to significantly expand its graduate programs and support for funded research.”

The Board’s obligation is to preserve the best of the College of Charleston, even as we change and adapt with the times. We look forward to working with students, faculty, staff, the administration, and our local community to meet the needs of the times, while preserving our 244-year tradition of excellence in undergraduate education.

Presidential Search

Finally, I want to discuss the search for the 22nd president of the College of Charleston.

From the time George Benson announced his decision to step down as president, we Board members have recognized the importance of a thoughtful, open, and national search for the next president of the College.

We hired a highly regarded search firm. We named a search committee that included faculty, alumni, staff, and student representation. And, when faculty argued for the addition of more faculty to the search committee, we did so. The search process, as is customary, included the request that search committee members and Trustees sign confidentiality agreements covering our deliberations about the presidential candidates.
Unfortunately, some information about the search process has been leaked, in direct violation of those confidentiality agreements. And, predictably, those leaks have included misinformation.

Given what many of us have read in the media, I understand why people are skeptical about the presidential search process.

However, I need to say three things where this presidential search is concerned.

First, I want everyone to understand that the presidential search process has been followed, exactly as it was announced and described in November 2013.

The search committee conducted its deliberations and made recommendations to the Board of Trustees in early February. At that time, the work of the search committee was concluded, as was always our intent.

The Board then determined who would be offered the opportunity to be finalists. Those finalists have since been announced, and they will come to campus for interviews, beginning tomorrow.

If you don’t like the finalists, I can understand that. If you disagree with the decisions of the Board of Trustees, that is your right.

But, please, don’t suggest that the search process was not followed. While a few people clearly have ignored their confidentiality pledges, the search process has been followed, exactly as it was announced.

Second, I understand that faculty are curious about why some candidates have become finalists, while others have not.

In a confidential search process, those are hard questions to answer.

Here’s what I can say: Of course, the original position announcement included a series of attributes and desirable characteristics for the next president of the College. Those attributes were and are very important from the perspective of the Board.

However, some attributes have been given more weight by some Board members than others, just as faculty might disagree on the importance of different attributes when conducting a faculty search.

Further, while I know some faculty might not value candidate connections to South Carolina, it’s understandable that some Board members would consider existing community relationships as an asset.
The diversity of our three finalists should make clear that the Board of Trustees was not looking for only one kind of prospective President. Our three finalists have very different backgrounds and experiences. The advice of the faculty, students, staff, alumni, and our other campus constituencies will help the Board decide which finalist has the right attributes for this moment in the College’s development.

Third, I know that many people have heard it reported that our Trustees have been the subject of excessive or inappropriate attempts to influence their votes for the next president.

I want to report to you today that I understand the concern. I appreciate that faculty want a process in which Trustees make a decision based on their convictions, and not because their standing or their jobs are threatened.

Today, let me assure you that I have full faith in the ability of all the Board members to deliberate and decide based on principle, not based on political pressure. Our Board members certainly have been listening and will continue to listen to the ideas and opinions of the community about this search – including the ideas and opinions of faculty members. But listening to what others have to say does not mean people are being unfairly pressured or unduly influenced.

Ultimately, I believe all the Trustees share my desire to make a decision based on all the available evidence, and the best interests of the College of Charleston. I hope you will not assume that the Trustees have some malicious intent, or will make some decision out of some selfish desire for personal gain.

Speaking only for myself, I can tell you that no one in a position of authority has threatened my job, or my position as Trustee. Nor has anyone suggested that I will gain or lose personally, based on my own vote for the next President.

Of course, I cannot guarantee that everyone will be pleased with the final decision of the Board of Trustees. All three of our finalists have their strengths, and all three doubtless will have enthusiastic supporters. Some people will be disappointed in the Board’s decision, as is the case with any presidential search at a college or university.

What I can say is that the Board members, based on their own personal reflection and all the available evidence, will make the best decision they can. I ask you to give us the benefit of the doubt as we complete this critically important task for the future.

Finally, let me tell you that faculty input will be absolutely essential to us as we complete this search. Regarding our three finalists, I personally will read and carefully consider each comment submitted to the Board by faculty members.
Thank you for your time today. Lee and I are happy to answer any questions you have.

Questions & Discussion

Phil Dustan, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics, asked if the Board of Trustees is planning to make a statement to the state legislature regarding their actions related to the College Reads! program.

Padgett replied that the Board's forthcoming resolution on academic freedom will be a public statement.

Richard Nunan, Department of Philosophy, queried whether funding for the search firm for the presidential search came from College of Charleston Foundation, and on an affirmative reply from Padgett, asked if the board ever had any concerns about the propriety of Jody Encarnation's candidacy for the presidency since he is a member of the foundation's board.

Mikell replied that it was not considered. With 108 candidates in the application pool, he said, “that didn't cross my mind.”

Larry Krasnoff, Department of Philosophy, asked a hypothetical question about the deliberations leading to the selection of the three candidates for President: “Suppose one of the Trustees on the board, you or someone else, were contacted by someone from the legislature or [connected to] the legislature threatening either your position on the board or funding for our institution if you didn't vote a certain way. What do you think should be the appropriate response of a board member in that circumstance?”

Padgett in reply reiterated his faith and trust in the Board, whose members are “passionate about” and “love the institution.” There is feedback coming from all over the community, he stated, but he asserted that he does not know of any untoward pressure.

Krasnoff in replied that he asked the question as a hypothetical and repeated the question.

Padgett replied “abstain from the vote.”

Lynn Ford, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Academic Administration noted that she appeared before the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee in August and had a “long and difficult conversation” about the committee's selection, Fun Home. The minutes of that meeting reflect, she stated, that the Board asked for and she, on behalf of the committee, invited the Board’s participation on the front end of selecting the book for next year. She cited Padgett’s reference in his remarks to a misunderstanding of some sort, but asserted that, nonetheless, the invitation was issued. At the August meeting, she said, “no one spoke in support of Fun Home, no one had apparently read the book, and there was very distant engagement. They wanted
the controversy to go away, but they were not interested in engaging in the process for the purpose of which the College Reads! exists, which is to engage students with a wide variety of issues for educational purposes.”

Referring to the section of Padgett’s remarks in which he said “I don’t think it should surprise the faculty that, if legislators are going to hold Board members personally accountable for the College Reads book selection, some Board members have expressed interest in offering their individual opinions about those selections,” Ford called the claim that “legislators are going to hold Board members personally accountable” an “absurd statement,” since none of us can be held personally responsible by legislators, especially the Board of Trustees, whom Padgett himself asserted has nothing to do with the decision and stays out of curricular decisions.

With reference to legislators’ questions about the College Reads!, Ford asked Padgett, “why isn’t each and every Board member empowered to say ‘that is not an appropriate question to ask me as a board member of a public institution of higher education’?” And, why, she asked, are we engaged in a “continuing saga” regarding the selection for next year. Finally, “why,” she asked, “do we have a bunch of position-taking without, again, engagement with the faculty, staff, and administrative committee that has worked for years on a program that does a lot of good?”

Padgett replied that as regards the “new process” for the “new book,” what the Board requested, he asserted, was to “be part of the process,” not to chose the book, but that as the committee was working, to be updated. “I think,” he said, “the decision was made and we had a board meeting but did not have the opportunity to be brought up to speed,” but he is certain there will be such an opportunity at the March meeting. He further stated that the Board has a “process worked out.”

In response, Ford stated that the general statement on academic freedom is understandable, but that what is not understandable is individual board member’s “unwillingness to take a stand against legislative intrusion in what is clearly an academic decision in clear violation of SACS-COC standards.”

Padgett reiterated that the Board will make a resolution on academic freedom. Individual board members may have opinions on individual books, but these have “no bearing,” he said, on selection of books: “this is a faculty decision.”

Scott Peeples, Senator – School of Humanities and Social Sciences, following up on Ford's questions, asked why we have still not announced and have still not paid for next year’s books if, as Padgett said, the Board of Trustees is not involved in the decision.

Padgett responded that what the Board asked for in August was that, once the selection was made, that it be brought before the Board. At the January meeting, the book wasn't brought up, but it will be at the March meeting. He added that if Trustees have “negative information” to share regarding the selection, they can share it at the March meeting.

Bob Podolsky, Department of Biology, thanked Mr. Padgett for coming to the Senate meeting and answering questions. He read a quotation from a publication by AGB Search, the firm the Board hired to consult on the presidential search, “Increasing the Odds for Successful Presidential Searches”: 

9
We have also seen boards that retreat into themselves and come up with the presidents they want, only to find their choices frustrated or rejected by important constituencies. Both types of outcomes—having to start a new search or appointing someone unwanted or likely to fail—are ones every board wants to avoid.

Podolsky posed three questions:

1. How important is it to the Board that the President have the support of the faculty?

2. What are you doing to assure that is the case, and what responsibility do you feel to make sure that it’s the case?

3. In light of the recommendation that is made by the consulting firm, what would you do with information and evidence suggesting that faculty do not support a candidate?

Padgett asserted in reply that faculty opinion is “absolutely essential,” “absolutely important,” and there will be an opportunity for faculty feedback during campus interviews. The Board will “take input” from faculty forms and it will be “incorporated into” the information that will inform the Board’s decision.

He asserted that the Board has put in place a proper search process, with thorough deliberations by the search committee and among Board members, to come to a list of well qualified finalists.

Podolsky replied, with respect, that the question was not answered: “what,” he asked, “would you do with evidence indicating that one of the candidates did not have the support of the faculty?”

Padgett stated that such information will be weighed into the decision. The Board will take in “a lot of input from a lot of constituents, but the faculty's is absolutely essential.” The Board will make the final decision based on the input.

Podolsky asked if the board would hire a candidate that did not have the support of the faculty.

Padgett asserted that the Board will take faculty opinion into consideration.

Morgan Koerner, Senator – Department of German and Slavic Studies, asked why, at the outset of the search, there was only one member of the faculty on the committee and why the faculty had to agitate for more representation.

Padgett replied that sheer numbers were a consideration. There was one representative from “each area,” but after conversation with some faculty about adding more faculty representatives, he thought adding more faculty was a good idea.

Irina Gigova, Senator – HSS, noting that her source is media reports, asked on what basis the Board added two names to the five finalists recommended by the search committee.

Padgett reiterated that the process was confidential. The search committee presented five unranked candidates to the Board, and “the Board certainly took those into
consideration, and the Board made a decision as to who they invited” to be finalists.

Lance Foxworth, Student Government Association Academic Affairs Liaison, reported that the SGA passed a resolution in support of the College Reads! program and sent it to legislators and received a reply from Representative Stephen L. Goldfinch Jr. (District 108 - Georgetown and Charleston Counties), whom Foxworth added, is married to a Trustee of the College. He read both the initial email and Goldfinch’s reply into the record:

```
Dear Representatives,

Attached, please find a copy of a resolution from the Student Government Association, the governing voice of the undergraduate students, at the College of Charleston regarding the decision to remove funding from the College of Charleston 2014-2015 budget. In our regular session on Tuesday, February 25, 2014, this resolution passed with no objections with a final vote tally of 21 yays, 0 nays, and 4 abstentions and was signed by President Hensley. This resolution calls on you to restore the funding to the College of Charleston budget immediately and respect the academic freedom of institutions of higher education within the state of South Carolina. Our curriculum should be left to the discretion of the professors and administration. At no time, was the reading in question required by all members of the campus community or forced upon any student population. Higher education is meant to challenge students to think critically which often means coming into contact with ideas and beliefs that are different than one’s own. This sparks discussion and ultimately enhances the educational experience of creating well-rounded students who can prosper in a diverse and fast-changing global economy. The college experience is designed to allow students to grow as people and academians by interacting with multiple schools of thought covering a variety of issues.

Again, we demand that the SC House restore the cuts made to the College of Charleston budget and respect the right of academic freedom of the institution.

On behalf of the students of the College of Charleston,
Vice President Chris Piedmont
```

```
Chris [SGA Vice President Chris Piedmont ],

Out of one side of your mouth you demand that we fund your school and many of your educations, yet, out of another side of your mouth, you demand we stay out of your school and your education. I have a simple solution for
you: Ask your school to go private. At that point, you can require obscene pornographic mandatory reading without any intervention from the people who fund your school now.

We answer to Constituents. Each and every house member represents 38,000 people. I have multiple families in my district that were horrified when their 17 year old daughter was REQUIRED to read this book. President Pastides testified that students would be tested on the book. If that’s not required, I don’t know what is. My constituents demanded accountability and change. Not censorship, but rationale and reason. Society, and in this case, your faculty, can, in fact, go too far. And in this case, they did. No one has, nor will they ever object to the book being in your library, but mandated reading is out of the question if you desire continued funding from me and my constituents.

Sincerely,
Representative Stephen L. Goldfinch Jr.

Foxworth closed by saying that he wanted to bring to the Senate’s attention the resolution and Goldfinch’s response. There was applause.

Wendy Cory, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, returning to the issue of leaks, asserted that the fact that there were leaks points to flaws in the process. A recent editorial, which she called “outrageous,” blamed faculty for the leaks, when there was information presented that no one on the faculty were privy to and that only Board members could have known. She agreed that it was unfortunate that leaks may have caused one candidate to drop.

Cory read from the confidentiality agreement itself, item number five: “The search committee chair or his designee will be the only person to disclose the status of any aspect of the process to the public and/or media.”

She asked if there is any way that we can get some information about how all this happened in order to bring transparency and potentially restore trust between faculty and the Board of Trustees.

Padgett stated that search committee members can verify that he stressed confidentiality and that he asked the same level of care for confidentiality of the Board of Trustees. Everything that could be in place to keep the search confidential was in place, and it is “unfortunate” that there was some leaking of information.

Cory urged Padgett, as search committee chair, to make some of the decisions public because faculty do not understand what has happened and are being blamed for leaks, for having some agenda, and it is causing serious friction between the Board and the faculty.

Padgett offered assurances that the idea that faculty are the source of leaks is not coming from the Board of Trustees, emphasizing that “we are all on the same team.”
Bob Mignone, Chair – Department of Mathematics, thanked Mr. Padgett for coming, and brought attention to a section of a resolution to be discussed later in the meeting asserting that “multiple sources indicate undue pressure on Board of Trustee members by legislators in an attempt to influence the outcome of the presidential search.” Mignone said that he doesn’t have hard evidence that this has occurred, but an actual board member, he claimed, informed him that she felt that she would not be renewed if she did not support a particular candidate. He also said that during his time at the College, a past candidate for President was being forwarded by the legislature and that when, after much resistance on the basis of his qualifications, he was not made President, the Chair of the Board lost his membership on the Board because he did not go along with what the legislature wanted.

Thus, he argued, it’s easy to conclude that such pressure might be felt now. There are good reasons for concern.

Padgett replied that he understands Mignone’s concerns. “There’s a lot of passion in this search,” he added, “because people care.” He asserted that Board members do not hold their positions as jobs but as opportunities to serve the institution. He said he “feels comfortable” that the Board’s deliberations will be grounded in “love for the institution.”

Jo Ann Ewalt, Department of Political Science and Director of the Masters in Public Administration, thanked Mr. Padgett for coming and for stating unequivocally that the Board does not make choices for the College Reads!. Given that statement, she asked, “would it not be an act of good faith” to go ahead and release the funds for the books already ordered?

Padgett reiterated that the Board has not had a chance to discuss the selection for next year’s College Reads! program. The Board will discuss this issue in the March meeting, and, he added, he expects the outcome to be good.

Andy Shedlock, Department of Biology, suggested that when the Board convenes to decide on the President that it keep in mind how “wildly out of proportion” is the level of influence or control wielded over the College to the meager 8% investment the legislature makes in the College. “So,” he queried, “if you want to go to bed with those guys, why don’t you ask for more investment in our operations?”

Speaker Cherry noted that Board only has so much control.

Pam Riggs-Gelasco, Chair – Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and also a member of the presidential search committee, thanked Mr. Padgett and Mr. Mikell for coming to the meeting and answering questions, which she noted is “extraordinarily important” at this time. She asked that the following be related to the rest of the Board. There is a resolution (and have been various resolutions) circulating among the faculty because of the “level of angst about the search” and the process. In a meeting with various faculty from across the campus, she reported, faculty bounced the idea around of approaching the Board directly with a resolution in order to have a back-and-forth about what the Board might do that might undo the need for the resolution, such as, perhaps, a guarantee by the Board that the next Provost search would have a great deal of faculty input. But in the end, the faculty at the meeting seemed to agree that nothing Mr. Padgett could say on the behalf of the Board could
be trusted. “That’s where we are,” she said, a mistrust that she noted that she and Padgett had earlier discussed was something they both wanted to avoid. The prevention of this was one reason for the expansion of faculty representation on the search committee. “I just want you to know,” she went on, that “we are at this really tragic place, where the trust in the Trustees is gone. I don’t want to speak for everybody, but I know I speak for quite a number of faculty members.”

Padgett repeated that he and the Vice-Chair came to the meeting because they care, and that he hates to see the distrust because he feels the Board does have the best outcome for the institution in mind and cares a great deal for what the faculty has to say.

Mikell added that one of the things that he enjoyed about the search was getting to “meet someone like Pam {Riggs-Gelasco}.” He stated that he has always “operated under the philosophy that the Board should be close enough to see but not to touch.” We do not often have the opportunity to interact, Board and faculty, however. He stated that when he has had the opportunity to talk with faculty on issues like the proposed merger, he has come away with the feeling that the faculty and the Board are not far apart. We need to work on better communication, he said.

Richard Nunan followed up on College Reads! funding, saying that while Padgett has said the decision is in the hands of the faculty, the money for next year’s book has been held up. He also asserted that Padgett expressed concern that Board members be able to review the selections and speak to the President in this connection as individuals. The image of holding up the money and, even if it doesn't actually happen, individual Board members consulting with the President is what we want to avoid — it has an appearance of interference, regardless of intent. He closed by thanking Mr. Padgett for taking the time to “come into the lions' den,” which Nunan said is a good sign.

Padgett asserted again that the Board is not trying to be part of the selection of the book: that’s the faculty’s decision. Referring to Nunan’s comment about appearances, Padgett said that he wants to make sure that the appearance isn’t there.

He also reiterated that the Provost has been invited to a Board meeting to have a conversation about the history of academic freedom so that the board can have a clear understanding of it. More interaction between the Board and the faculty would be helpful he said, and he closed by emphasizing again that the Board and the faculty are “on the same team.”

The Speaker thanked the Chair and Vice-Chair.

There was applause.
C. The Provost (PowerPoint presentation)

The Provost remarked that the just completed dialogue between the Senate and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board of Trustees was refreshing and important, particularly as the presidential search has taken many of us into “new territory.” He asserted that “any President coming in is going to want to have the full support of the faculty because, after all, it is the faculty, the Provost, the curriculum, the students, that [the President has] to represent to the outside world, and [with a] passion...that is heartfelt and not practiced.”

Tenure & Promotion

The Provost expressed appreciation for the care that has been and is going into the process at all levels. At this point, all parties and committees have weighed in and decisions rest with the President. [See slides for numbers. Numbers in parenthesis are the number of faculty up for 3rd year review. Notably, 16 of the 31 cases used online documentation.]

Trifecta, Hat Trick or Perfect Storm?: News Coverage

The Provost reported that the College on the same day as the Senate meeting was featured in news stories in Chronicle of Higher Education (front page), Inside Higher Education, and the Post and Courier (front page), respectively, on the proposed merger, on the state house budget penalty for the College Reads! selection of Fun Home, and on the NAACP’s statement on Glenn McConnell’s candidacy for President. Additionally, in 24 hours (at midday), there were 45 media pieces on the presidential search, with a focus on the NAACP’s statement, and 77 pieces on the budget cut.

This is “not the absolute best way to promote the College of Charleston,” the Provost said.

Concerns & Path Forward

The Provost noted, as concerns the reputation of the College, that the majority of the applications to the College come from out of state (about 7,000 from out of state, compared to 5,000 from in the state). This reflects a strong out-of-state reputation, but there may be reason for concern about this reputation considering the latest media, he asserted. He hopes that out-of-state applications do not fall because of negative publicity, but he also noted that applications may be on the decline somewhat, anyway, because of recent trends in college applications generally.

He also noted that academic freedom is a continuing concern, and he welcomed the Board of Trustee's invitation to speak on the matter in August.

As concerns accreditation, the Provost stated that we need to be aware of any impact of politics on the SACSCOC standards that we may be held to, adducing the following standards as “highly relevant” in relation to the recent press:

3.2.4 The governing board is free from undue influence from political, religious, or other external bodies and protects the institution from such influence.
3.2.6 There is a clear and appropriate distinction, in writing and practice, between the policy-making functions of the governing board and the responsibility of the administration and faculty to administer and implement policy.

3.4.10 The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty.

3.7.4 The institution ensures adequate procedures for safeguarding and protecting academic freedom.

The Provost asserted that we will need to respond in accreditation proceedings to the above and address any potential problems.

Finally, the Provost noted that the Commission on Higher Education is trying to work behind the scenes in relation to the recent legislative budget cut to try to get our lost funding restored. Richard Sutton, Executive Director – CHE, the Provost reported, is interested in making the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs a more active and proactive provost group, and he will be forming a subcommittee of state provosts to develop a statement on academic freedom that can be shared with all the provosts and presidents in the state and signed off on by those parties to be presented to the CHE. This would not merely be a response to recent events, but also a matter of best practices.

**Questions & Concerns**

Kelly Shaver asked whether it is true, as reported in the *Chronicle* and *The State*, that the next target is art courses that use live nude models.

Provost replied that he is not aware of this.

Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Vice President for Executive Administration, noted that reports he has seen are that one legislator in the House of Representatives, filed a motion to amend the state budget that would levy a one million dollar budget penalty for institutions that use live nude models in classes and require students to experience this live, nude modeling. Additionally, the same penalty would apply if students in any class are required to read “pornography,” though the motion, predictably, does not define the term. McGee said there is no reason to believe that this motion has any chance of passing, with which the Provost concurred.

Adam Mendelson, Jewish Studies, asked who stopped payment to the bookstore for *The Good Soldiers*, next year’s College Reads! selection.

The Provost responded that the payment was stopped “at the College level.”

Mendelsohn asked for more detail in the response.

The Provost replied that he did not think it would serve any good to go further in his reply.

Mike Auerbach, Dean – School of Science and Mathematics, asserted that in the Provost’s slide on concerns, that was a striking omission: faculty morale. While we cannot control the local newspaper, he said, we certainly have the same route as ordin-
ary citizens to try to publish articles, op-eds, etc., in it. There has been a continuous flow of op-eds that make anti-faculty statements. He singled out recent pieces by Wooten and Hicks, which essentially say, “faculty have no role. Shut up.” Auerbach stated, asking for a correction if he was wrong, that he hasn’t seen any response from the President’s office or elsewhere to these statements against the faculty. When will such a response occur?, he queried.

The Provost replied that he “can’t account for the past.” Turning to MUSC in relation to the question, he pointed out that, as regards the proposed merger, their board was unified against it from the start. Our board, on the other hand, has neither reached a consensus, nor formed a unified opinion. Once this is clarified, he said, there probably will be statements.

Auerbach pressed for more. Setting the merger aside, what about “the berating of faculty unjustly?” Is there any defense of faculty, he asked, forthcoming?

The Provost replied, “not that I know of but that doesn’t mean there won’t be.” He added that “the President has been very articulate in his remarks about the quality of education the students get here.”

Irina Gigova asked if the Academic Affairs office might write a letter in public defense of the faculty.

In reply, the Provost said, “it would be a good thing to do, wouldn't it?”

Marianne Verlinden, Senator – School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs, asserted that the presidential search committee confidentiality agreement is much stricter and, thus, not typical, of confidentiality agreements, mentioning a particular provision. She wondered who was involved in drafting the agreement.

The Provost replied that he had no involvement in the confidentiality agreement for the presidential search committee. He deferred to Kathryn Bender, Senior Vice President and General Counsel.

Bender said that the Office of Legal Affairs helped with the agreement's language and asked Verlinden for clarification: what provision?

Verlinden read provision one into the record:

1. I understand that this Presidential Search Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the College of Charleston Board of Trustees and that the Board of Trustees will make the final decisions regarding the determination of the finalists and the selection of the President;

Typically, Verlinden stated, it is the committee that forwards names to the Board of Trustees and has the determination of the finalists.

Bender replied that she, herself, does not know what is typical, but that Legal Affairs did work with the consulting firm on the language and the consultant said it was typical. If it is not, she said, Legal Affairs was not aware that it wasn't.
Verlinden replied that she has seen an agreement that is very similar but without the restriction on the committee implied in the provision cited.

Bender reiterated that she was not aware of any atypicality.

Podlosky followed up on Verlinden’s observations, saying that AGB Search states that it is typical for feedback to go to the search committee and for the search committee to collate it and make a recommendation to the board for how to vote. The search committee in our search has been cut out at an earlier stage than is typical, according to published principles of the consultant the Board hired. Furthermore, having only one faculty member on the search committee at the beginning was also atypical in relation to the consultant’s prior searches, none of which used just one faculty member on the search committee.

Phil Jos, Senator – HSS, in reference to the conversation at the meeting more general, commented that the faculty he represents in HSS in conversations with him have very low morale and are really upset, which is even more acutely felt by those of the faculty who have a little more information about the things going on. He asserted that “we are in a bad place and that whatever happens this next week could potentially put us in a far worse place.” The restoration of trust and the assertion of the faculty’s central place is “going to have to be kicked into a higher gear.” Furthermore, “the routine just isn’t fine. Nobody’s fine with the ordinary way of dealing with things right now.”

The Provost replied, speaking to both Jos and Auerbach, saying that he would not defend the fact that there has not been an op-ed coming out of his office defending faculty. The President, he stated, has publicly expressed his appreciation for faculty and been supportive. He agreed that “right now, this is a tough place.”

He encouraged faculty to attend the upcoming Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee meeting. Many representatives are present at this committee from a variety of offices and committees. Faculty presence alone could deliver a strong message of support, particularly while academic freedom is a hot issue. It might also help move us forward, to a place where we are communicating back and forth more regularly and, furthermore, coming to an understanding the values we hold in common. The Provost gave the time, date, and location of the meeting.

Tom Carroll, Senator – School of Education, Health, and Human Performance, expressed thanks for the Provost’s report on Tenure & Promotion, adding that, having gone through the process, himself, he was impressed with depth of review. While he was encouraged by the online process, he noted it is much the same as the paper process. He asked if the online process will develop such that electronic only evidence, such as video clips, online student projects, and so forth, can be provided.

The Provost said that he didn’t think there’s any restrictions.

He recognized Beverly Diamond, Associate Provost, who replied that when we began the online process, we made a commitment to align the online iteration with the paper-based process in order to disallow any reviewee’s advantage in one direction or another. If we do lift the restrictions on the online process, she added, there will have to be an understanding that no reviewer has to be committed to following all
links or else there will really be no restriction on what might be added to a packet. We also, she pointed out, have a restriction on when packets have to be closed, and that is difficult to maintain with external links that point to potentially changing content. We may in the future decide, she noted, as a faculty that those concerns are not so serious. She added that we can have a conversation with faculty who have gone through the electronic process as part of a larger dialogue about how we might loosen up the process in a way that makes sense and is not burdensome to reviewers.

The Provost added that the College has an aspiration that all dossiers and supporting materials will be online at some point.

Magaret Cormack, Senator – Religious Studies, asked why superior rating, the requirements for which, according to the FAM, are identical to coming up for full Professor, only comes with half the raise of the former.

Beverly Diamond responded that it is true that the criteria are the same. At the moment, though, the documentation is far less and the review process is different.

Cormack responded that this is punishing the candidate for a problem in the process, which she hopes will be changed in the future.

Penny Brunner, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness, commented on the Provost’s listing of SACS standards on his slides. She stated that it is always “a little dangerous” to look at only a few out of context of the full set of 81 standards.

There were no further questions

5. Old Business

None

6. New Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee

(1) Course Proposals and Program Changes

(a) **ASST**: Create new conversation supplement courses in Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, and Japanese

(b) **EXSC**: Create new special-topics course (EXSC 320)

(c) **URST**: Create new course (URST 360)

**Decision**

All the above items were approved by unanimous consent.

(2) New Program. New programs are voted on by the Senate.

(a) **SCIM**: New major in Supply Chain Management (with new courses, etc.)

**Questions & Concerns**
Bob Perkins, Chair – Academic Planning, noted that the committee approved the proposal.

**Decision**
Approved

B. Resolution on Academic Freedom

| Resolution on Academic Freedom  
| March 11, 2014  
| Faculty Senate Meeting College of Charleston  

The College of Charleston Faculty Senate unequivocally defends academic freedom as essential to higher education. This freedom, and the occasional controversies it can generate, is fundamental to the pursuit of truth and knowledge in all disciplines. Legislative efforts attempting to influence or limit curricular decisions at any institution are a threat to academic freedom at all academic institutions.

Speaker Cherry stated that she wanted to speak on the motion and so, she temporarily stepped down. Speaker Pro Tempore Jennifer Wright took over as Speaker.

The Speaker Pro Tem noted that this resolution was brought by Kirk Stone, Senator – Department of Communication.

Stone described the resolution as short, direct, and extremely important. The motion was seconded.

**Questions & Discussion**

Lynn Cherry explained that two weeks or so prior to the meeting Kelly Smith, Speaker of the Faculty at Clemson sent an email to all speakers at institutions across the state, encouraging institutions to band together and present a united front in response to the legislature’s withholding of budget funds from the College and USC-Upstate. Multiple institutions have either crafted their own or are copying a resolution similar to the one on the floor. At the moment, those that have passed or will consider passing a resolution include Clemson, USC, MUSC, The Citadel, Winthrop, Francis Marion University, USC-Upstate, USC-Aiken, and USC-Sumter.

The question was called by a senator and seconded, and passed.

**Decision on the resolution**
Approved unanimously

Speaker Cherry returned to her role as speaker.
C. Proposal to Modify Admission Standards for the School of Business - Academic Standards Committee, Jim Bowring - Chair

Introduction

Bowring summed up the introduction provided in the proposal and read the motion as written.

Questions and Discussion

Paul Young, Senator – Department of Mathematics, asked if the items following “in particular” in the motion are the only things that are changed by, essentially, turning back the clock on the standards via the motion. Or has anything changed since February 2006 that this would also annul?

Bowring replied that to his knowledge nothing else would be affected.

The Speaker invited Marcia Snyder, Associate Dean of the School of Business, to reply as well. She verified that nothing else has changed, and no other changes are needed.

Decision

The motion passed.

7. Constituents’ Concerns

Irina Gigova, Senator – School of Humanities and Social Sciences, proposed the following resolution for debate and approval if the Senate saw fit.

Speaker Cherry explained that consideration of the resolution would require a suspension of the rules of the Senate, since the resolution was not on the agenda distributed a week before the meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to suspend the rules and the motion carried with at least the 2/3 required majority.

The motion to consider the resolution was seconded by Hollis France, Senator – Department of Political Science.

RESOLUTION OF GRAVE CONCERN WITH THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON PRESIDENT AND UNDERMINED CONFIDENCE IN ITS OUTCOME

WHEREAS, the faculty was forced to request multiple representatives on the Presidential Search Committee, which has been standard practice in past presidential searches at the College as well as at other institutions where AGB Search was the consulting firm;

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has failed to meet a series of other principles regarding how to conduct a successful presidential search, as cited in the AAUP Presidential Search Committee Checklist and in recommendations of the consulting firm AGB Search;

[Continued on next page]
WHEREAS, multiple sources indicate undue pressure on Board of Trustee members by legislators in an attempt to influence the outcome of the presidential search;

WHEREAS, reports suggest that the Board of Trustees removed at least 2 of the 5 names recommended by the Presidential Search Committee and replaced them with the names of 2 individuals with strong connections to several Trustees and/or the South Carolina Legislature;

WHEREAS, these events create the impression of partiality and undue influence in the selection process, and make it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they led to the withdrawal of 2 of the 3 remaining shortlisted names recommended by the Presidential Search Committee, leaving only a single name in contention that was recommended by that committee;

WHEREAS, there is an overwhelming impression among faculty that the selection for president was predetermined;

WHEREAS, the president of any academic institution must have the full trust, confidence, and support of its faculty to engage effectively in a relationship of shared governance;

WHEREAS, the incoming president will already be enormously challenged to restore the faith of the faculty in a Board of Trustees that has failed to convey its position regarding a proposed merger with MUSC and failed to defend the principle of academic freedom;

WHEREAS, the incoming president will need to begin with the confidence of the faculty, staff, students, alumni, community and the Board of Trustees to effectively lead the College of Charleston, and these constituencies all will need confidence in each other;

WHEREAS, the most important responsibility of a Board of Trustees is the selection of an institution’s President, and the concerns raised above suggest a breach of this duty thus far,

THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston expresses grave concern that the Presidential search process has been compromised, undermining confidence in a president chosen through the process and in the Board of Trustees that allowed the process to be compromised.

Phil Jos explained that those who wrote the resolution wanted to offer it as a means of going on the record and entering into our minutes discussion about the presidential search, particularly in the event that discussion with Board of Trustees Greg Padgett was not conclusive or satisfactory to the Senate.

Hollis France, Senator – Political Science, stated that she continues to find whole search process troubling, nor is having to take Padgett’s word that the search was on the “up and up” satisfactory. There seems, she said, to be a lot of hiding behind confidentiality. For these reasons, she said, she supports the resolution.
Joe Carson – Senator – School of Science and Mathematics, singled out a one “whereas” clause for discussion:

WHEREAS, there is an overwhelming impression among faculty that the selection for president was predetermined;

Carson said that this has been his impression but that making such a statement without actually polling the faculty makes him nervous.

Phil Dustan, Senator – SSM, noted that he would like stronger language than “grave concern” in the “resolved” clause.

Scott Peeples, Senator – HSS, moved that the clause singled out by Carson be struck from the resolution since it is conjecture and its being struck would not weaken the resolution.

The motion was seconded.

**Discussion of the motion to amend**

Todd Grantham, Department of Philosophy, argued to keep the clause that the motion to amend would strike. Grantham reported that in a conversation with Chair Padgett when there was a push to add more faculty representation to the committee, Grantham expressed concern at that stage about the two names—McConnell and Encarnation—that were being talked about in the news at that time in connection with the search. It seemed at that time that “the fix was in.” Now, having gone through the whole search process, if the reports are to believed, McConnell and Encarnation were names added by the Board to the list of finalists. We can't know this to be the case because of the shield of confidentiality but there is “an overwhelming impression” that this is the case.

Jeff Wragg, Senator – Physics and Astronomy, stated that the Senate serves as a micro-cosm of the faculty and he is, therefore, as a representative, comfortable with keeping the clause since the Senate seems to agree with the sentiment of the clause.

Richard Nunan, Department of Philosophy, stated that he does not know if the impression at the present is overwhelming but that if McConnell is appointed, then it will be overwhelming, and this is reason enough for keeping the clause now.

Paul Young argued that, while there is no poll on what the faculty's impressions are, the clauses prior to the one proposed to be eliminated, taken together, might quite reasonably give an “overwhelming impression.”

Dan Greenberg offered that a good idea might be to add “among senators” to limit the sense of who has the “overwhelming impression.”

Dustan noted that he has not talked to a single member of his faculty that would not agree with the clause. It should be kept in place.

Bob Podolsky noted that he was among those who wrote the resolution and pointed out that the clause sends a message now, but also lays groundwork for later. On the other hand, he pointed out, it is the clause that comes closest to pointing out actual candidates by name, and those who wrote the resolution did want to avoid that.

Peeples pointed out that he would vote for the resolution regardless of the success or
failure of his motion to amend. But another reason to remove the clause is that there may be a split on the board: there may be not just one, but two candidates for whom “the fix is in.”

David Moscowitz, Senator – HSS, suggested that in deciding to vote on this amendment, Senators might want to consider that, rhetorically, if there’s any one part of the resolution that looks like over-reach to others reading it, then this could weaken the entire document.

Jos noted that in many early discussions of this resolution, there was a feeling that we’re going to have to restore trust, not just regarding the presidential search but regarding many things. The relationship with the board after the search is over is what we’re setting our sights on. The real question is, as he put it, for those Board members who might have sympathy for our view of what makes for a fair and open search, what does this resolution do? Will it help them? Embolden them? Or does it perhaps undermine their position?

Podolsky suggested that changing the clause to read “selection of candidates” might address Peeples’s objection that the clause points to one candidate.

Andy Shedlock, Senator – Biology, expressed concern that the word “predetermined” might provide a distraction for those inclined to discredit the resolution.

Bill Olejniczak, Department of History, suggested that the clause can be seized on negatively by a reporter, for instance, in a newspaper column, which could put us again on the defensive. He said he would vote in favor of the motion to amend.

Nunan asked if a motion can be made to amend the motion to amend. He suggested, if so, that the language change Podolsky recommended be added in some way to the motion.

George Pothering, Parliamentarian, said, yes, one can amend a motion to amend, but in this case, the motion is to strike a clause. He suggested that the best method in this case would be to defeat the motion and then offer a different motion to alter the statement that remains.

Marybeth Heston, Senator – Art History, proposed, alternatively, voting to delete the clause and then rewriting it.

Decision
The motion carried.

Debate on the resolution continued, with the following text representing the resolution.

RESOLUTION OF GRAVE CONCERN WITH THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON PRESIDENT AND UNDERMINED CONFIDENCE IN ITS OUTCOME

24
WHEREAS, the faculty was forced to request multiple representatives on the Presidential Search Committee, which has been standard practice in past presidential searches at the College as well as at other institutions where AGB Search was the consulting firm;

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has failed to meet a series of other principles regarding how to conduct a successful presidential search, as cited in the AAUP Presidential Search Committee Checklist and in recommendations of the consulting firm AGB Search;

WHEREAS, multiple sources indicate undue pressure on Board of Trustee members by legislators in an attempt to influence the outcome of the presidential search;

WHEREAS, reports suggest that the Board of Trustees removed at least 2 of the 5 names recommended by the Presidential Search Committee and replaced them with the names of 2 individuals with strong connections to several Trustees and/or the South Carolina Legislature;

WHEREAS, these events create the impression of partiality and undue influence in the selection process, and make it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they led to the withdrawal of 2 of the 3 remaining shortlisted names recommended by the Presidential Search Committee, leaving only a single name in contention that was recommended by that committee;

WHEREAS, the president of any academic institution must have the full trust, confidence, and support of its faculty to engage effectively in a relationship of shared governance;

WHEREAS, the incoming president will already be enormously challenged to restore the faith of the faculty in a Board of Trustees that has failed to convey its position regarding a proposed merger with MUSC and failed to defend the principle of academic freedom;

WHEREAS, the incoming president will need to begin with the confidence of the faculty, staff, students, alumni, community and the Board of Trustees to effectively lead the College of Charleston, and these constituencies all will need confidence in each other;

WHEREAS, the most important responsibility of a Board of Trustees is the selection of an institution’s President, and the concerns raised above suggest a breach of this duty thus far,

THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston expresses grave concern that the Presidential search process has been compromised, undermining confidence in a president chosen through the process and in the Board of Trustees that allowed the process to be compromised.

Jason Coy, Senator – HSS, suggested that prior to Padgett’s presentation and Q&A, the purpose of the resolution was clear. Similarly, he noted, had Padgett not come to the Senate meeting the resolution would be in order. But afterwards, what is the purpose of the resolution? It may not serve at this point.
Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, spoke against the resolution, expressing concern that the motion relies on newspaper reports that themselves may lack credibility.

Morgen Koerner, Senator – German and Slavic Studies, said that he would have preferred a no confidence resolution, but that he supports this resolution because, questions of news credibility aside, we do, in fact, have grave concern and want to put that on the record.

Susan Farrell, Senator – HSS, asked about the third whereas clause:

WHEREAS, multiple sources indicate undue pressure on Board of Trustee members by legislators in an attempt to influence the outcome of the presidential search;

What are the “multiple sources”?, she asked.

Gigova replied that Bob Mignone’s self-report of talking to a member of the Board of Trustees who feels political pressure is one source, added to which there are the press leaks to the same effect.

Farrell expressed discomfort with the second- and third-hand knowledge on which the clause relies and which the clause states as fact, and not as a perception.

Todd McNerney, Department of Theater, noted that he, too, was part of the conversation and group that wrote the resolution. It seems, he stated, that we have been reactive for much of the last two months or so. Once the decision comes on the next President, reactivity won't help, so the idea behind the resolution is to be proactive. After the fact, our complaints will just cast us as the “whiney faculty.” The process thus far has been deeply insulting. He doesn’t have the facts, he said, but every impression points to the search as predetermined. He added that he “couldn't write this as a play and [have] anyone believe it.” It’s important to make a statement because it might be difficult to be heard later.

Chris Starr, Senator – SSM, stated that he cannot support the resolution, although he empathizes. He said he did not have a better solution, but reflecting on what he would ask his own students to do—cite their sources—he cannot support the resolution.

Shedlock asserted that the Senate has to be prepared for the resolution to be easily discredited. That is likely to happen.

Margaret Cormack, while she is convinced, she said, that the hearsay about the search is correct, for the very reason that is hearsay, she can not support the resolution.

Jos asserted that this is a critical issue and it’s important to consider whether or not the document reads as is intended to be, which is not as a statement of fact. Confidentiality and a lack of transparency keep us from knowing things. "From a power perspective," he said, “the fact that we don’t have any information” shouldn't stop us. The intent was to say consistently that we do not have confidence. The fact, in the end, is that the faculty have lost confidence in the process.
We might consider changing, Jos suggested, in the wake of Padgett’s visit, the final, “resolved” clause:

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston expresses grave concern that the Presidential search process has been compromised, undermining confidence in a president chosen through the process and in the Board of Trustees that allowed the process to be compromised.

We might consider striking, he said, “and in the Board of Trustees that allowed the process to be compromised.” This phrase has a different meaning after Padgett has come and answered questions.

Grantham said he remains a little conflicted. What will be an effective move for the faculty? The faculty, he said, have a lot at stake, and it’s worth asking if we have any leverage with Board of Trustees, when in fact they can decide as they see fit, regardless of faculty opinions. So, in reply to Jos, Grantham asked the Senate, “did you find Padgett persuasive?” Grantham said, for him, the answer is “no.” We don’t have the facts, but the pattern is overwhelming. There is a small window to act, the document is not perfect, but it is the best shot, Grantham asserted, that we have. The question, he said, is “do we want to say something or not?”

The Speaker at this point notified the Senate that the room needs to be vacated in ten minutes.

Dustan asked, addressing what Jos said, if a phrase could be added to the effect of, “whereas confidentiality and lack of transparency have prevented access to the true facts and opinions of the process....” Such an addition, Dustan said, would help clarify the faculty’s position.

The Parliamentarian, in the interest of proceeding within the time constraints, at this point referred the faculty to Robert’s Rules on resolutions. When resolutions have “whereas” statements, the suggested way to proceed is to settle on the “resolved” clause first, and then keep, reject, or fine-tune the “whereas” clauses.

The Speaker said that she supported the Parliamentarian’s suggestion, given that, at this point, only six minutes remained before the Senate needed to vacate the room.

Jos moved that the final phrase in the “resolved” clause mentioned above be struck, as below:

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston expresses grave concern that the Presidential search process has been compromised, undermining confidence in a president chosen through the process and in the Board of Trustees that allowed the process to be compromised.

Additionally, Jos suggested that, after this motion is considered and, hopefully passes, the next step might be a motion to strike all the “whereas” clauses.

The motion was seconded.

The question was called by Jim Carew, Senator – Geology, was seconded, and passed.

**Decision on the motion to amend**
RESOLUTION OF GRAVE CONCERN WITH THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON PRESIDENT AND UNDERMINED CONFIDENCE IN ITS OUTCOME

WHEREAS, the faculty was forced to request multiple representatives on the Presidential Search Committee, which has been standard practice in past presidential searches at the College as well as at other institutions where AGB Search was the consulting firm;

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has failed to meet a series of other principles regarding how to conduct a successful presidential search, as cited in the AAUP Presidential Search Committee Checklist and in recommendations of the consulting firm AGB Search;

WHEREAS, multiple sources indicate undue pressure on Board of Trustee members by legislators in an attempt to influence the outcome of the presidential search;

WHEREAS, reports suggest that the Board of Trustees removed at least 2 of the 5 names recommended by the Presidential Search Committee and replaced them with the names of 2 individuals with strong connections to several Trustees and/or the South Carolina Legislature;

WHEREAS, these events create the impression of partiality and undue influence in the selection process, and make it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they led to the withdrawal of 2 of the 3 remaining shortlisted names recommended by the Presidential Search Committee, leaving only a single name in contention that was recommended by that committee;

WHEREAS, the president of any academic institution must have the full trust, confidence, and support of its faculty to engage effectively in a relationship of shared governance;

WHEREAS, the incoming president will already be enormously challenged to restore the faith of the faculty in a Board of Trustees that has failed to convey its position regarding a proposed merger with MUSC and failed to defend the principle of academic freedom;

WHEREAS, the incoming president will need to begin with the confidence of the faculty, staff, students, alumni, community and the Board of Trustees to effectively lead the College of Charleston, and these constituencies all will need confidence in each other;

WHEREAS, the most important responsibility of a Board of Trustees is the selection of an institution’s President, and the concerns raised above suggest a breach of this duty thus far;

THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston expresses grave concern that the Presidential search process has been compromised, undermining confidence in a president chosen.
The discussion returned to the resolution.

Susan Farrell moved that all the “whereas” statements be struck. She noted that she supports the resolution but some of the statements seem problematic and in the interest of time, the motion seems the best way forward.

The motion was seconded.

The question was called by Jim Carew, was seconded, and passed.

**Decision on the motion to amend**

The motion passed.

The discussion returned to the resolution as represented below.

---

**RESOLUTION OF GRAVE CONCERN WITH THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON PRESIDENT AND UNDERMINED CONFIDENCE IN ITS OUTCOME**

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston expresses grave concern that the Presidential search process has been compromised, undermining confidence in a president chosen.

---

The question was called by Irina Gigova, was seconded, and passed.

**Decision on the resolution**

The resolution above passed.

8. Adjournment: 7:30
The Faculty Senate met for a special meeting Tuesday 18 February 2014 in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order at 5:03 PM
2. New Business
   A. Resolution Regarding House Bill 4632, The “Charleston University” Bill

   Speaker Lynn Cherry introduced guests at the meeting: Dr. Tom Smith, President of the Faculty Senate, Medical University of South Carolina, and a local television news channel.

   The Speaker explained that a suggestion emerging from an open forum meeting on Monday, February 10 was that the Faculty Senate call a special meeting in order to address the pending legislation to merge the College and MUSC. The next regularly scheduled Senate meeting is not until March 11, and time was of the essence.

   The resolution, the Speaker noted, is focused specifically on the legislation in the South Carolina State House of Representatives (House Bill 4632). She also pointed out that very similar legislation had just been introduced in the SC State Senate (Senate Bill 102).

   The Speaker explained that the meeting is an open one, and all faculty and guests have speaking privileges, but that only Senators can vote, and she further stipulated, according to by-laws, that proxy voting is not allowed. Additionally, those who speak from the floor are limited to two minutes for comments or questions that add something to the discussion or offer additional arguments or counterarguments. Finally she stipulated that, in line with the by-laws, Senators and guests may speak on one issue two times at the most.

   Resolution Regarding House Bill 4632, The “Charleston University” Bill

   WHEREAS, the drafting of the “Charleston University” bill (H.4632) for the merger of College of Charleston and the Medical University of South Carolina appears not to have carefully considered and involved study of the following critical issues:
   ◦ the type of university being proposed, its mission, and its structure;
   ◦ the cost to expand existing programs and create new research capacities and administrative structures, and the source of funds;
   ◦ impacts of the change in mission and identity on student recruitment, alumni engagement, and faculty retention;
   ◦ impacts of the change in mission on student learning and educational opportunities;
impacts on resource reallocation and student enrollment for existing research universities in the state;

impacts on funding and productivity from losing designation as a PUI (primarily undergraduate institution) among granting sources;

constraints on space for further expansion on the Charleston peninsula;

implications of an altered mission for faculty whose training and expertise are in undergraduate and targeted graduate instruction; and

WHEREAS, the filing has disrupted the College of Charleston’s Presidential search process and its critically important capital campaign, and its sponsors have disregarded the recommendations (White Paper) of the Institutional Organizational Review Committee convened by faculty and administrators from both institutions;

THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston opposes the Charleston University Bill.

Resolution Introduction – Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS

Gigova noted that the resolution represents a week or so of work and the contributions people from four different schools. Nine people actively worked on it, and 18 people altogether reviewed and commented on it. The group opted for a longer resolution than MUSC’s recent resolution, which allows for some specificity in the reasons for objecting to House Bill 4632 and reinforces that, while the faculty oppose the bill, we do not necessarily oppose the expansion of the College. Finally, she asked that the Senate in the case of this resolution act as a “political, not an academic body,” focusing on the statement, rather than precision of language.

Discussion/Questions

Margaret Cormack, Senator – Religious Studies, thanked the people who worked on the resolution and encouraged the Senate to vote for it. We cannot, she asserted, resolve the future of the College in this meeting, and we should stay focused on the resolution.

Jim Carew, Senator – Geology, called the question. It was seconded, and passed on a voice vote.

Decision

The Senate approved the resolution by unanimous voice vote.

B. Resolution Concerning Collaboration with the Medical University of South Carolina and other Area Colleges

Phil Jos, Senator – HSS, introduced the following resolution from the floor. Jos noted that introducing a resolution from the floor requires a suspension of the rules of the Senate, and so it is up to the Senate to decide whether or not it would like to consider the resolution at the present meeting or at the next meeting.
Scott Peeples, Senator – HSS, made a motion to suspend the rules in order to consider the resolution. The motion was seconded, and passed on a 2/3 majority voice vote.

Resolution Concerning Collaboration with the Medical University of South Carolina and other Area Colleges

WHEREAS collaborations with the Medical University of South Carolina and other area institutions might be an important part of serving the changing needs of the Lowcountry and securing the College’s future in an increasingly competitive educational marketplace,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston:

◦ asks that the Provost reconvene the Institutional Organizational Review Committee to address concerns about H. 4632 (the “Charleston University Bill”) and examine alternative forms of collaboration.

◦ asks that the College administration continue a dialogue with other institutions, the business community, faculty, and area legislators regarding ways to enhance the College’s service to the region while ensuring that such initiatives do not compromise the educational quality of our current undergraduate and graduate programs.

◦ asks that the College administration solicit faculty perspectives on any new more detailed proposals under discussion.

Introduction of the Resolution

Jos read the resolution, which was on projected on the screens as well. The rationale, he explained, is that, whatever happens with the current House bill, legislators, Board of Trustee members, and leaders will continue to move on these matters, and the main purpose of the resolution is to very strongly indicate that we want to be a part of those discussions and that, furthermore, we expect to be a part of them. The resolution is presented toward the goal of having the locus of discussion shift to the schools, where we have some expertise. The second rationale is that, while there is consensus to reject House Bill 4632, we should signal our willingness to think about other kinds of collaborations and to not simply be seen as an obstacle to these discussions. Jos further asserted that that levels of funding for our current mission are insufficient and that this is not likely to change. But if there are opportunities that might secure our financial future and that allow us to continue our focus on an undergraduate mission, we want to signal our willingness to continue collaboration discussions. The resolution also captures the more nuanced views that faculty have on potential collaborations between CofC and MUSC.

The resolution was seconded.

Discussion/Questions
Kelly Shaver, Senator – Management and Entrepreneurship, asked about the Institutional Organizational Review Committee referred to in the first bullet point of the resolution. What is the relative size of faculty on the committee? Is it six from each institution?

The Speaker replied in the affirmative, but noted that the committee included administrators as well.

The Provost added that there are two Board of Trustees members from each institution on the committee. But, he asserted that this committee might not be the right venue to pursue, given the intent of the resolution. There might be another structure that would work better for the purposes of the resolution, or perhaps a new structure might be formed. He added that his conversations with the Provost of MUSC would seem to indicate that he would also welcome the kind of dialogue asked for in the resolution.

David Moscowitz, Senator – HSS, asked about the intended meaning of “alternative” in first bullet point. Does it mean options other than merger? Does it semantically rule out a merger?

Jos said that “merger” itself has become rather ambiguous. In the legislation, the merger would seem to be produce a primarily science research institution and not one focusing on the other aspects of the College. The intent of “alternative” was to signal “all available” options.

Larry Krasnoff, Department of Philosophy, replied to Provost Hynd’s point about the possible inappropriateness of the Institutional Organizational Review Committee to the goals of the resolution, pointing out that the resolution asks to reconvene the committee, but it doesn’t foreclose on working with other existing committees or forming new structures. Therefore, the language as is should be fine.

Darryl Phillips, Senator – Classics, asked the Senate to keep in mind Gigova’s suggestion for the first resolution: that we think of this resolution, too, as a political statement. Jos’s resolution says that we are in the conversation. We have discovered in recent months, he asserted, that the legislature suddenly has a new-found interest in higher education in South Carolina, and we might consider this, perhaps, as a good thing. The resolution signals our interest and, so, he said, he supports it as written, since the faculty are the people with the expertise to be leading the discussion.

**Decision**

The resolution was approved by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Constituent Concerns**

Jim Deavor, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, asked that the minutes reflect that votes on both resolutions were unanimous.

Gigova asked if the resolutions would be forwarded to the President, the Board of Trustees, and the legislature.
The Speaker said that the resolutions will be sent to the Board of Trustees, and other offices, and that she will look into how we can forward them to the legislature.

4. Adjournment: 5:27PM
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 4 Feb 2014

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 4 February 2014 in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order at 5:03 PM
2. 14 January 2014 Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.
3. Reports
   A. The Speaker

   The Speaker noted that the Provost reported that on Friday, January 31, the Board of Trustees approved a Distinguished Adjunct Faculty Teaching Award. This award will be given for the first time this spring with the other Distinguished Faculty Awards. She encouraged senators to consider nominating outstanding adjunct faculty members in their departments. Information about all the Distinguished Faculty Awards was sent out via email.

   The Speaker made a special appeal for faculty to volunteer for college service: “if we want and believe in the idea of shared governance, it is critical that faculty step and run or volunteer for service.” She pointed out that it is not unusual for there to be only one or two, and sometimes no one at all nominated for elected offices – Speaker of the Faculty, Faculty Secretary, and at-large Senators. Friday, February 7, she noted, is the deadline for nominations for at-large school senators.

   Additionally, she pointed out, for the past two years there have not been enough faculty volunteers to fill all the committee positions. We need faculty participation on faculty committees and we need a diversity of faculty: not just junior faculty, but senior faculty as well. She noted that, while we are all busy and have multiple responsibilities, faculty committees are responsible for much of the work that takes place on this campus and they provide a voice and sense of direction regarding the type of institution we are and want to be. “As senators, many of you are committed to serving the College; it is important to talk with your colleagues and to encourage them to also participate and serve in the Senate and on College committees. If faculty do not volunteer, we lose the opportunity we have to try to make a difference.”

   B. The Provost (PowerPoint presentation)

   Merit & Market Raises – The Provost reported that 456 faculty received merit raises, another 263 received a market adjustment, all totaling about 2.3 million dollars. He stated that the next step in the process is to see if these raises have had an impact on our faculty salaries in comparison to peer-group institutions and to see how much
we have closed the gap. About 85% of the faculty received merit and market adjustments. This initiative, he noted, arose from the Faculty Senate, in concert with the Office of Academic Affairs.

CofC-MUSC Update - A month ago, the Provost reported, there was solid support for the introduction of a bill this year to merge the College and MUSC. There seemed to be support for at least introducing the bill in the House and, perhaps, a little support to carry those discussions forward; however, the enthusiasm for introducing such a bill, the Provost stated, has diminished somewhat. As it stands now, he said, it looks like a special committee may be formed to look into a merger. There are still individuals, however, who want to put in bill to merge the two institutions, but he characterized enthusiasm for it as “low.” MUSC’s interim President made a statement in his president’s report that MUSC was not opposed to working with CofC, but MUSC was very concerned about its brandmark, its esteemed history, and that they are in the middle of a presidential search, and merger discussions are very distracting at this time. MUSC’s interim President, nonetheless, supports working with CofC to explore how collaborations under some arrangement could contribute to the Charleston area economy.

The Provost stated that he does not believe we are moving at “light speed” toward a merger, but that we may be moving toward more discussions of structured collaborations of some sort.

Presidential Search – The Board of Trustees is moving forward with the Presidential search with a plan of getting three to five names for candidates to visit on campus. The Board is slated to meet on February 11 to get recommendations from the search committee.

Faculty Coordinator for E-learning and Distance Education – The Provost announced that Professor Doug Ferguson in the Department of Communication has agreed to coordinate e-learning and distance education for the College.

Mandatory training in sexual harassment and discrimination – The Provost announced that faculty and staff can expect email shortly from the President’s office detailing required training.

There were no questions.

C. Gia Quesada and Karen Smail – General Education Assessment

Quesada made the presentation. See the PowerPoint slides: amplifications of or additions to information in the slide deck are below.

Faculty were trained in workshops in developing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and subsequently identified 16 SLOs in seven different areas.
Objectives were aligned to curriculum through the process of re-certifying (old) general education courses. General education courses were reduced by 70% last year, but with some new courses added, we are currently at a 68% reduction from the prior numbers.

Quesada stipulated that we still do not have a very clear definition of general education.

Assessment Reading Groups (ARGs) were composed of 30 faculty members. Meetings of ARGs began with workshops for working with rubrics, calibrating scoring, etc. Quesada characterized the meeting as being a learning experience in which some flaws in the process were identified. The results from this first round of assessment, she said, may not be reliable because the ARGs found that the signature assignment descriptions were not aligned with the rubric that the faculty created.

ARG representatives will now go back to departments to help faculty with providing better directions to students, which will produce more reliable data.

Rubrics, SLOs, training videos, and other materials used in the assessment process can be found in OAKS under the student tab. All faculty have access. Results will be reported there as well.

We will use results to develop action plans for improvement.

20% of ARGs will be going to conferences and training in assessment. We are building capacity and developing an assessment culture.

Quesada asked Amy Kolek, Department of Psychology and member of the Social Science ARG, to speak a bit about the process. Kolek described it as a surprisingly smooth process, especially given the number of artifacts to assess. Additionally, she found the process to be valuable simply for bringing together faculty from different disciplines in the social sciences and learning from each other about similar goals for student learning.

Quesada noted that the process, to some extent, is about forgetting about one’s individual general education course in order to focus on the general education program as a whole.

Questions/Discussion

Bob Mignone, Chair – General Education Committee, congratulated Gia Quesada, Karen Smail, and Shawn Morrison on their work, noting that in his long service at the College, he has seldom seen such a high the level of dedication and competence. This comment was followed by applause.
There were no further comments or discussion.

D. Darryl Phillips and Hollis France - Campus Climate Survey Committee (PowerPoint presentation & Faculty Senate Report - PDF)

Please see the PowerPoint slides and fuller PDF format report at the links above.

Questions/Discussion

Shawn Morrison asked for a clarification as to who will be surveyed.

Phillips replied that the survey will go out to everyone in the campus community, anyone attending or working at the College, part- or full-time. The more participants in the survey, the better; the wider the participation, the better, too. The committee is especially concerned, noted Phillips, to get students to complete the survey, and he asked that faculty take a few minutes in each class to advertise it.

David Moscowitz, Senator - HSS, asked how long the survey will take to complete.

France and Phillips replied that the survey should take 15 to 30 minutes.

Jannette Finch, Senator – Library, asked if the survey would be pushed to mobile devices as well.

France replied that she would assume so, but for clarification, Phillips asked Jim Posey, Associate Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning, to field the question.

Posey replied that right now, the survey is not being set up for mobile devices.

Finch asked if it could be, and Phillips replied that the committee can recommend that.

Lance Foxworth, a student representative from the Student Government Association (SGA) attending the meeting, suggested that the committee make a presentation to the SGA. Phillips and France agreed that it would be a good idea.

Irina Gigova, Senator – HSS, asked if the survey can be saved in progress in order for users to come back to it should they be short on time.

Phillips said that the survey has to be completed in one sitting for anonymity purposes. Saving it in progress would mean saving an IP address as well, which can be traced.
Margaret Cormack, Senator – Religious Studies, asked if there is any way that the questions could be seen in advance to allow those who take the survey to consider them before beginning. This might reduce the time needed to complete it.

Phillips replied that the committee will explore that.

Kirk Stone, Senator – Communication, asked for an example or two of the questions that might be asked.

France said that one question is along the lines of, “have you ever thought about resigning from the College of Charleston?,” which goes to workplace environment.

Phillips emphasized that there are a range of questions dealing with concerns like tenure and promotion processes for faculty, comfort level in classrooms or problems in living spaces for students. The survey is quite comprehensive, and includes opportunity for fee responses, since the interest is in collecting information.

Marvin Gonzalez, Senator – School of Business, asked whether the data gathered will be made available.

Phillips replied that the intention is that reports based on the survey get widely circulated. The raw data, however, will not be distributed, but will be owned by the College and will be in the office of the Associate Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning. The reporting out process, he added, however, will be at the discretion of the new President.

E. Bob Podolsky - Recent Online Faculty Survey (PowerPoint presentation | Executive Summary | Responses | Faculty Survey Comments)

See the PowerPoint slides, Executive Summary, Responses, and Faculty Survey Comments at the links above. Below are amplifications on or additions to information in these sources.

Podolsky noted that he, for the purposes of reporting to the Senate, represents an ad hoc committee of the Chairs of the standing faculty committees. The ad hoc committee was originally convened in October as a way of increasing communication and coordination of duties across the standing committees, but the committee also took on other charges of their own, notably an effort to increase the faculty representation on the Presidential search committee, and now the effort represented in the report. The survey grew out of a concern that faculty attitudes may not actually be known on key areas of concern: potential changes to the mission of the College and value of the current mission, the model of institution the College of Charleston should follow, and future leadership of the College.

The survey, he noted, is far from perfect, but this is a compromise that needed to be made in order to execute it in a fairly short timeframe.
Podolsky noted that Speaker Cherry presented the findings of the survey to the Board of Trustees, and stated that free-form comments gathered in the survey needed to be redacted before being presented to the public, to eliminate identifying information and commentary that “might be seen as less professional.” Since these will be made public, it's important that the comments reflect faculty opinion in a dignified way.

Podolsky stipulated that in the Executive Summary reporting of the results, “agree” or “strongly agree” responses were grouped together under the heading “Agree”; similarly, “disagree” and “strongly disagree” responses were grouped together under the heading “Disagree.” “Neutral” and “I don't know” answers were left off, for the purposes of reporting.

The Executive Summary also includes an index column that indicates the degree of agreement or disagreement. A negative value shows that people disagree more than they agree. A positive value indicates that people agree more than they disagree.

In the report's section 2, “greatness” in question b is taken from speeches made by President Benson.

Podolsky, in concluding his report on the survey findings, commented that what might be done with the results of the survey is up to the faculty. The ad hoc committee has no charge regarding that. The data might serve a number of purposes, not the least of which, is to back positions the faculty might take on the important concerns addressed in the survey. These data provide a fuller perspective on faculty attitudes.

Questions/Discussion

Kelly Shaver, Senator – Management and Entrepreneurship, addressed a question to Speaker Cherry: did she get any particular vibe from the Board of Trustees when they received the results?

The Speaker replied that some of the results were presented to the Presidential search committee by Pam Riggs-Gelasco at a meeting on Jan. 24, and the board members on that committee were the first to get some of the information. The Speaker presented the survey data and the executive summary to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board at their meeting on Thursday, Jan. 30, and then she presented the information to the full Board of Trustees at their meeting on the following day.

The Speaker reported that after her presentation to the Academic Affairs committee, a member of that committee who is also a member of the Presidential search committee spoke to her and said that the Board needs to do a better job communicating to the faculty. He also, speaking for himself, said he does not believe that the Board thinks we should change the College's mission. Better communication between the Board and the faculty, the member said, would help the faculty understand in what directions the board wants to go. Whether and how that will happen, the Speaker
said, she does not know.

At her presentation to the full board on Friday, Jan. 31, she said she noticed several board members nodding their heads as they looked at the information and heard her presentation of it. The Speaker said that her sense is that the Board is looking at this information, though she doesn't know what conclusions they might draw. She noted that she informed the board of the comments still to be redacted and provided and that several board members expressed interest in reading them. She expects that the board will find the comments insightful.

Irina Gigova, Senator – HSS, expressed thanks to the committee for their work. There was applause.

4. Old Business
   None

5. New Business
   A. Faculty Curriculum Committee, Chair - Dan Greenberg

   Speaker Cherry reminded the Senate that, as was discussed in the December Senate meeting, we intend to be efficient in dealing with business such as the Curriculum Committee's. The Speaker noted that no emails were received by her or Mike Duvall, Faculty Secretary, asking that individual items of the Curriculum Committee's business be discussed and voted on separately, and she asked if anyone at the meeting wished to separate items under (1) for individual discussion and voting. There were no responses.

   (1) Course Proposals and Program Changes
       (a) SOCY/ANTH, ARCH (all documents)
           Change prerequisites for ANTH 381 (Internship)
           Change prerequisites and credit hour range for ANTH 490 (Independent Study)
           Change credit hours and description for ANTH 493 (Field School in Archaeology)
           Change credit hour range for SOCY 490 (Independent Study)
           Change SOCY, ANTH, and ARCH programs accordingly
       (b) Asian Studies (documents)
           Create new independent-study courses for CHNS, JPNS, and ARBC
       (c) ENGL (all documents)
Create ENGL 371 (Multi-Ethnic Literature)
Create ENGL 315 (Black Women Writers)
Deactivate ENGL 400 (Seminar)
Change description (ENGL 499, 190, 290, 350, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 370, 390, 395, 399, 404)
Change program
(d) FREN (all documents)
   Deactivate courses (FREN 150, Intensive Elementary French; FREN 350, Intensive Conversation and Composition)
   Change prerequisites (FREN 341, Phonetics and Advanced Language Study)
(e) HEAL (all documents)
   Change prerequisites for HEAL 325 (Health Promotion)
   Change prerequisites for HEAL 325L (Field Experience in Health Promotion)
   Change prerequisites for HEAL 403 (Health Internship)
(f) HONS (documents)
   Create two new courses (HONS 203, Financial Accounting; HONS 204, Managerial Accounting)
(g) MATH (documents)
   Change prerequisites for MATH 203 and MATH 250
(h) PHYS (all documents)
   Create new course (PHYS 272, Methods of Applied Physics); add as prerequisite
(i) PSYC (all documents)
   Add new courses (PSYC 385, Cognitive Neuroscience, and PSYC 391, Foundations of Psychotherapy); change major accordingly; change minor
(j) RUSS (all documents)
   Add new course (RUSS 398, Independent Study); change minor accordingly
(k) ARTM (all documents)
   Change program to replace 9 hours of SOTA courses with list of options
   Change name and description for ARTM 200 (Introduction to Arts Management to Contemporary Issues in Arts Management)
Change name and description for ARTM 210 (Advanced Arts Management to Principles and Practices in Arts Management)

Change credit hours and prerequisites for ARTM 360

Change prerequisites for ARTM 370

Change credit hours for ARTM 380 (Independent Study in Arts Management)

Change minor (add ARTM 401 as alternative to ARTM 400, add ARTM 390 as alternative to BLAW 205)

Add C- prerequisite (students must have C- in ARTM 200 and 310 to continue)

(I) CHEM (all documents)

Broad reworking of CHEM (BA, BS, CHEM with Secondary Education cognate), Biochemistry, CHEM minor, Marine Biology

a. Renumber and rename courses
   CHEM 511 (Adv. Inorganic Chemistry) to CHEM 311 (Inorganic Chemistry)
   CHEM 512L (Adv. Inorganic Chem Lab) to CHEM 312L (Inorganic Chem Lab)
   CHEM 522/522L (Enviro. Chemistry/Lab) to 422/422L (Enviro. Chemistry/Lab)

b. Renumber courses
   CHEM 583 (Special Topics) to CHEM 483 (Special Topics)
   CHEM 531 (Advanced Organic Chemistry) to CHEM 431 (Advanced Organic Chemistry)
   CHEM 541 (Advanced Physical Chemistry) to CHEM 441 (Advanced Physical Chemistry)

c. Renumber courses and change credit hours
   CHEM 221/221L (Quantitative Analysis, 4/1 credits) to 220/220L (3/2 credits)
   CHEM 521/521L (Instrumental Analysis, 4/0 credits) to 421/421L (3/1 credits)

d. Change name, prerequisite, and descriptions
   CHEM 341/341L (Physical Chem. I to Thermodynamics, Statistical Thermodynamics, & Kinetics)
e. Change prerequisite
   CHEM 354 (change CHEM 351 from prerequisite to co-requisite)

f. Deactivate courses
   CHEM 528, Nuclear and Radiochemistry
   CHEM 526, Introduction to Nuclear and Radiochemistry

g. Create new course
   MATH 229, Vector Calculus with Chemical Applications

h. Change programs
   CHEM, B.S.
   CHEM, B.A.
   Biochemistry, B. S.
   Marine Biology, B.S.
   CHEM minor
   CHEM B.A. with secondary education cognate

(m) GEOG minor (documents)
   Add existing course (POLI 331, Geography of Native Lands/Indian Law) to minor

(n) PPLW concentration (documents)
   Add existing course (POLI 320, Constitutional Law) as alternative to POLI 321 (Civil Liberties)

(o) EXSC (documents)
   Add CHEM 101/101L and 102/102L as alternatives

**Decision**
All the above items were approved by unanimous consent.

(2) New or Deleted Programs.
   (a) Create URST minor (documents)

**Questions/Discussion**
None

**Decision**
Approved
(b) Create ARTM music-industry concentration

Questions/Discussion
None

Decision
Approved

(3) Announcement
Greenberg advised Senators to ask their constituents to submit proposals as soon as they are ready (no need to wait for the deadline) and to ask them to communicate with him in advance about any large proposals forthcoming for the purposes of scheduling committee meetings. Finally, he invited anyone contemplating changes to the curriculum to discuss them with him: this kind of conversation can be very productive and save missteps and time.

6. Constituents’ Concerns

Hao Chen Liu, Senator - Economics and Finance, inquired and expressed concern about language in future new hire letters going out that stipulates that new hires might be required to teach classes on different campuses in future.

The Provost replied that teaching on other campuses is noted as a possibility in the new hire letters. He then invited Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker to further comment.

Caveny-Noecker explained that the language reads “something like, ‘The College of Charleston has multiple campuses, and faculty may be required/expected to teach at campuses other than the main campus.’” The letter was sent out to all the chairs and deans for comment. The objective is, she explained, to have an expectation not just of new faculty, but of all faculty that when there is a need for instruction at other campuses, chairs and deans can be positioned to ask faculty to do so. The Provost felt the need to inform faculty as we are hiring them of this possibility, Caveny-Noecker remarked.

Emily Skinner, Senator – Health and Human Performance, informed the Senate, as a member of the Faculty Welfare Committee, that the committee had seen the letter and made some recommendations about wording.

Caveny-Noecker noted that she has been in touch with the committee’s chair and that they are in conversation about the letter.

7. Adjournment: 6:21
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 3 December 2013

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, 3 December 2013 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order: 5:08 PM
2. 5 November 2013 Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.

3. Reports

   A. The Speaker

   The Speaker reported receiving a constituent concern email after November’s meeting regarding the status of the MBAD 500 course in the Master of Business Administration, which the senate did not delete at the October meeting (see 1 October minutes, 4. a.). According to Penny McKeever, Associate Director of Graduate Programs, all of the MBA students are registered for the course in the spring and corrections have been made to the School of Business website.

   The next Faculty Senate meeting will be on Tuesday, Jan. 14. Agenda items for that meeting are due by Thursday, Jan. 2. The Speaker advised those serving on committees to make sure their committee chairs know of the deadline.

   The ad for the President position has now been posted in The Chronicle of Higher Education. The ad has also been sent to other venues, all of which are online, to attract as wide and diverse a pool of candidates as possible. These additional venues include: Inside Higher Ed, Diverse Jobs Search, The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education, American Conference of Academic Deans, and Women in Higher Education.

   The deadline for applications is January 14, 2014. The search committee will review applications and hopes to make recommendations to the Board for “airport interviews” of candidates by the end of January and then to conduct the airport interviews in early- to mid-February. After the interviews are concluded, the committee will recommend to the Board the candidates to be invited for full interviews, with the hope that all interviews will be concluded before spring break. According to what she has heard from the Chair of the Board of Trustees, the Speaker reported that there will not be any on campus candidate visits during spring break week.

   The College has posted a Presidential Search webpage on the College’s website. Information including the position ad and prospectus/search profile are available on the College’s website, as well as on the AGB Search website (http://agbsearch.com/searches/president-college-charleston). The College page will be updated periodically.

   The Speaker noted that the December commencement ceremony will be next Saturday, December 14, at 2:00 in TD Arena. All faculty are encouraged to attend and should assemble in regalia by 1:30. The ceremony will be approximately 90 minutes, and there will be a reception immediately following.
B. The Provost

See the Provost’s Powerpoint slides

The Provost apologized for the 15 letter-sized flyers that were posted on campus promoting student course evaluations that many at the College found very offensive. He reported attending a public meeting organized by the Black Student Union soon after to discuss the matter. The Provost called this an error in oversight in his office, and assured the Senate that his office has taken corrective actions to make sure it never happens again. He said that his office apologizes and will continue to do so.

The Provost noted that the College is moving forward on a number of diversity issues and programs to promote diversity. He noted the success of SPECTRA and the summer project program. Additionally, this year, the African American freshman retention went up from 77% to 87%.

The online student evaluation response rate, the Provost noted, is currently at 35%, which is an improvement over past years at this same time. Some incentives will be offered to students, and it is possible that there may be faculty incentives as well. A committee is working on improving the response rate, and the President also remains very attentive to the issue. The Provost noted that we are interested not only in increasing the response rate, but also in “increasing the meaningfulness of the data that is gathered.”

On Deans searches, the Provost reported that, after three on-campus candidate interviews, the final input from library dean search committee is expected soon. For the Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs position a deadline has been posted. There is a relatively short timeline for the process, review of applications begins on January 8, with the goal of having a new Dean on board in the summer.

The Provost noted that earlier in the day, there was a campus-wide meeting on the planned renovations of the Rita Liddy Hollings Science Center and the planned demolition and reconstruction of the Physician’s Memorial Auditorium. These efforts grow out of the campus master plan from a few years back. That plan, among other things, revealed that the College is over a quarter of a million square feet short of needed instructional space. The plan has two phases. A slide included in the Provost’s Powerpoint slides (#3), shows a campus map and lists eight projects in phase one of the campus plan. Items with an asterisk are likely to be completed in the next three-to-four years, and some items are already scratched off the list (item 5, for instance, a 350-bed residence hall, the need for which has been satisfied by the new facility planned by private developer Anthony McAllister).

The Science Center renovation will cause disruption for two years. The Physician’s Memorial rebuild will include two additional stories to accommodate faculty and departmental offices. The Provost describe the project as “massive.” Additionally, a planned Jewish Studies expansion will provide much needed instructional space.
The Provost asked for patience during the renovation/expansions. Disruptions will occur, including the need to move some faculty office off campus. The Provost promised continued updates during the process.

Questions

The Speaker, noting that video cameras were present at the meeting he reported on, asked if a video recording of the meeting would be available on the Academic Affairs website. The Provost said it would and that as soon as the video and slides have been posted, he will notify the campus through email.

C. Vince Benigni, Faculty Athletics Representative - NBC Learn Initiative

Benigni reported that the presidents of the Colonial Athletic Association (CAA) last year voted to buy into NBC Learn, a video library and repository of shared materials that, as a result, the College, too, will be able to access soon. The materials will be useful to students doing research and faculty developing lectures and teaching materials.

In the near future, more information will be forthcoming to the campus community about NBC Learn.

Lynn Ford noted that NBC Learn would be available through the library’s website in the same fashion as other databases. Information on NBC Learn should come out in time for faculty to make use of it in course planning for the spring.

Benigni also reminded the Senate that the CAA sponsors an annual undergraduate research conference and that offices of the President and the Provost have offered to sponsor up to 10 students to go. Trisha Folds Bennett, Dean of the Honors College, will be responsible for selecting the projects that will be funded for the conference.

Questions

None

4. Old Business: Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual

A. Motion to Exclude Faculty Faculty Members Currently under Post-Tenure Review from the Post-Tenure Review Committee. Change to By-laws Article V, Section 3, B 15 a 5

Paul Young introduced both motions and noted that, as originally posted on the Senate website prior to the meeting, the motions were not correct, but that the motions as displayed on the screen were correct.

Discussion

None

Decision

The motion passed.
B. **Motion** to Exclude Faculty Members Currently under Promotion Review from the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review. Change to By-laws Article V, Section 3, B 7 a 5

**Discussion**

None

**Decision**

The motion passed.

5. **New Business**

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee

(1) Course Proposals

Dan Greenburg, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, noted that, as stated in the meeting agenda, all course proposal items would be voted on as a group, unless a Senator would like to discuss and vote on any of the items separately.

(a) Change prerequisites

   - **ASTR 210** - Black Holes in the Universe
   - **ASTR 311** - Stellar Astronomy and Astrophysics
   - **ASTR 312** - Galactic and Extragalactic Astronomy
   - **ASTR 377** - Experimental Astronomy

Change credit hours

   - **Change URST 401** - Independent Study, to variable-credit (1-3 hours)

(b) Change course prefix

   - **Move MGMT 445** - Seminar in Entrepreneurship, to ENTR 445 - Seminar in Entrepreneurship

(c) Change course number and/or prerequisites

   - **Renumber URST 201** - Introduction to Urban Studies, to URST 101
   - **Renumber BIOL 396/PHYS 296** - Biophysical Modeling of Excitable Cells, to BIOL 396/PHYS 396; change prerequisites
   - **Renumber ASTR 206** - Planetary Astronomy, to ASTR 306; change prerequisites

(d) New course proposals

   - **THTR 288** - Selected Topics in Theatre: Literature and Criticism
   - **THTR 488** - Selected Topics in Theatre II: Literature and Criticism
**HONS 121 and 122** - Colloquium in Ancient/Medieval/Early Modern Western Civilization, History Component & Humanities Component, respectively (to replace HONS 120D - Honors Colloquium in Western Civilization)

**HONS 131 and 132** - Colloquium in Western Civilization: The Modern Self in Art, Thought, and Action History Component & Humanities Component, respectively (to replace HONS 130D - Honors Colloquium in Western Civilization)

**ASTR 231** - Introduction to Astrophysics

**AAST 290** - Special Topics

**AAST 305** - Visiting Artist Practicum

**AAST 315** - Black Women Writers

**HTMT 310** - Current Topics in Hospitality and Tourism Management

(e) Course deactivations

**MGMT 319** - Creation of New Business Enterprise (replaced by already-existing ENTR 320)

**Discussion**

None

**Decision**

All the motions above passed.

(2) Program Changes

(a) **Change ASTR BA major, ASTR BS major, PHYS major, ASTR minor** to incorporate above changes

(b) **Change AAST major** to incorporate above changes

(c) **CRLS: Add POLI 310** - Urban Applications of Geographic Information Systems (GIS), to minor

(d) **POLI: Add POLI 102** - Contemporary Political Issues, to list of electives in major

**Discussion**

None

**Decision**

All the motions above passed.

(3) **Motion** to change the method by which curricular proposals are approved by the Senate

**Introduction**
Greenburg noted, that, for the most part, there is not much discussion in Senate meetings on the business of the curriculum committee. Additionally, as meeting agendas grow longer with the progress of the year, an increasing amount of time is dedicated to the Curriculum Committee Chair's standing before the Senate to present motions that will not garner any discussion. This seems inefficient. Curriculum Committee proposals, Greenburg stated, have already been vetted at a number of levels before they reach the Senate floor. The present motion answers a desire felt by many to focus the Senate’s attention on the most critical issues, while still allowing senate to retain control over curriculum. In essence, the motion states that the “big stuff” (new programs, changes to programs, policy, and the like) will always receive a Senate vote. Most of the other curricular proposals would be handled using a consent agenda, in which all items would be approved without vote, unless a Senator felt that an item needed separate discussion or the committee thought that a particular proposal merited further discussion in the Senate.

Greenburg noted that, though he has submitted a motion, a conversation prior to the meeting with the Parliamentarian, George Pothering, suggested other possible actions, and he asked the Parliamentarian to speak to that.

The Parliamentarian specified a couple options. Reading aloud the duties of the Curriculum Committee as established by the by-laws [Art. 5, Sect. 3 B 8 (b) 1], he noted that the by-laws do not specify how the committee is to forward its recommendations to the Senate. Thus, this could be left up to the committee.

On the other hand, he said, if the Senate wished to adopt something along the lines of the proposal at hand, the by-laws lend support in their specifying that “the Faculty Senate may establish and instruct such committees, standing and ad hoc, as may be necessary for the performance of its functions...” (Art. 4, Sect. 1 D).

Along these lines, the Senate could make a change to the by-laws themselves, in which case the typical procedure for doing so (review by the by-laws committee, etc.) would be necessary. But a change to the by-laws is not absolutely necessary, as the Senate can simply decide how it is going to do business in this context.

These options aside, the Parliamentarian observed, the Speaker, under Roberts Rules, could in theory conduct the entire Senate meeting under a consent agenda because she has the ability to move items through unanimous consent. An objection to unanimous consent could be used by a Senator to allow specifics to be pulled out and discussed.

So, the Parliamentarian observed, we have mechanisms already in place to move curricular (or any other) items in the way the proposal details, but if the Senate would like to formalize the procedure, then the motion on the floor can be debated.

**Discussion**
The Speaker asked that discussion be broken down into two aspects and discussed in turn: 1. the recommendation that the Curriculum Committee present their recommendations on a consent agenda, 2. whether or not the Senate wants to adopt the motion or discussion of other options for the method of proceeding with Curriculum Committee recommendations.

Paul Young, Senator - Mathematics, asked about section D. 1. of the motion, which reads

“In most cases, proposals to create or terminate programs are submitted as a bundle: for instance, proposals for new programs often involve new courses. These proposals will be voted on as a bundle, unless:

1. a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote...

Young asked when it might be that a Senator would isolate a specific proposal.

The Speaker replied that the Speaker could simply say, “With no objection, the items on the consent agenda will be approved,” and if, at that point, a Senator raised a concern and said she or he would like to discuss a particular course proposal, for instance, she or he could ask that the particular item be removed from the consent agenda and discussed separately.

Young followed up, asking if a guest would have the same privilege to pull an item out of the consent agenda.

The Speaker noted that a Senator would have to ask for the item to be removed from the consent agenda. A guest could ask a Senator to represent his or her concern by requesting that the item be discussed separately.

The Parliamentarian suggested that if a Senator knew ahead of time that she or he were going to want further discussion and debate on the Senate floor, by notifying the Speaker in advance, that Senator could have an item put on the regular order of business for a formal vote.

Greenburg added that curriculum committee agendas are sent out in advance, and a Senator or any concerned party can raise issues with the committee itself, that venue being the best for doing so, but this still wouldn’t preclude action on the Senate floor.

Heath Hoffman, Chair - Sociology and Anthropology, expressed support for the motion and appreciation for the effort behind the motion.

Darryl Phillips, Senator - Classics, observed that it only took about one minute to vote on the proposals brought by the Curriculum Committee at the present meeting, and if we structure items on the agenda as a group or package to approve, we can streamline the process and still maintain the Senate’s formal vote without undue loss of time. The motion, he argued, does not offer much time
savings, and if that is the case, he stated, he would be hesitant to go to a system that requires objecting to unanimous consent. With a grouped list, the Speaker could call for discussion, which would allow concerns to be expressed about particular items without a Senator having to formally object.

Irina Gigvoa, Senator - Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS), responded to Phillips, noting that Curriculum Committee items have not always been presented in a packaged way, and adopting the motion would allow procedures to be formalized.

Greenburg also replied to Phillips that the Curriculum Committee’s list at the present meeting was fairly short, but that the lists grow longer as the year moves on. Additionally, he argued, formal votes can easily become *pro forma* votes, and the motion would help focus discussion by encouraging Senators to consider carefully which items need further discussion.

Jon Hakkila, Chair - Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs, noted that his committee, its work being similar to that of the Curriculum Committee, also supports the proposal.

Brenton LeMesurier, Senator - Science and Mathematics (SSM), argued that, because we already have all the procedural tools to do what the motion suggests, we don’t require a formal motion for a specific committee’s work.

Phillips noted that, while he agrees with streamlining, we do not need a formal motion to streamline. Going back to Gigova’s point, he suggested that committees could draw up procedures that would ensure continuity. Similarly, procedures could be drawn up for the Speaker to hand on to future Speakers to ensure efficient operations. He asserted that juggling the agenda with the existing powers and rights that already exist for the Speaker and committee chairs can produce greater efficiency, and since this is possible, we should avoid, he asserted, the negatives of the consent agenda idea, which, among other things, would disallow knowledgable, interested visitors from weighing in on issues without having to get a Senator to make a formal objection to a consent agenda.

The Speaker, at this point, noted that there is, in principle, general agreement on the idea of streamlining processes and asked that the Senate begin to discuss means of streamlining.

Phil Jos, Senator - HSS, recognizing that his point did not conform to the change in discussion the Speaker just asked for, noted that, in discussions of this proposal with constituents and other concerned parties, two issues emerged: 1. praise for the committee bringing the motion for efforts to separate important work of the Senate from the less important, and 2., while this motion could help lessen the load of the Senate, we also need to attend to the significant work burdens and process challenges of moving curricular proposals at the departmental and unit levels.
The Speaker, replying to Jos, suggested that his second issue might be taken up directly with Greenburg and the Curriculum Committee.

The Speaker then asked the Parliamentarian for a recommendation: should the motion, at this point, be brought to a vote?

The Parliamentarian, in reply, said that the he thinks the key question is whether the process the motion describes should be in the form of a motion or not. One of the things that might happen if it is a motion and is approved is that further motions might be necessary later to make changes if problems crop up. But, if instead of a motion voted on by the Senate, the ideas in the motion were adopted as procedure by the committee and passed on to future committees (say, via a web page), it could have the same effect as a motion and be more easily adjusted as needed.

Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Vice President for Executive Administration, suggested that, since the two curriculum committees have endorsed the procedure, the Speaker could, within her powers, adopt the procedure it outlines and evaluate it over time. Any changes needed, he agreed, in this scenario, would be far easier to implement, than if it were adopted as a special rule of order.

Greenburg stated that he is perfectly happy to precede as outlined by McGee, with the Speaker adopting the consent agenda procedure, and he added that the point of bringing the motion to the Senate was to have discussion on the procedure.

Bob Mignone, Chair-General Education Committee, noted that when he served as Speaker, Curriculum Committee items were often bundled, which is up to the person presenting it or up to the person running the meeting, but there is, he asserted, one clearly defined right of the individual member of the body to divide the question, and that, if he is right, he said, division does not require a second. This right of division would serve to allow individual Senators, he argued, to separate items for further discussion.

[The Parliamentarian subsequently, having consulted Roberts Rules, pointed out that division does, in fact, require a second and a vote.]

Jos asked “does it make sense for the Senate to direct the committee and the Speaker to do what they are already willing to do?”

Kelly Shaver, Senator-Management and Entrepreneurship, stated that he gets nervous about formalizing streamlining because if the body gets accustomed to “sailing through” things, raising an objection will be like “yanking the emergency break on the train,” which may not sit well with a body that has an expectation of sailing through. He asked that the Senate not make the procedure any more formal than it already is.
Greenburg commented that there might already be a lot of “sailing through,” as it is, and though one might have to “pull the emergency break,” that might also be the appropriate role of the Senate.

Greenburg further stated that he is willing to withdraw the motion and defer to the Speaker in her powers.

The Parliamentarian added that the approach to matters of the Curriculum Committee (bundling, etc.) is, from what has been said by prior Speakers in the discussion, wholly up to the committee chair and the Speaker.

Hakkila asked if procedures need to be formalized within the committees.

Greenburg replied that his committee officially passed the motion, and that Hakkila’s committee might do the same.

Greenburg withdrew the motion. The Speaker then stated that beginning in the Spring she can present items on a consent agenda and if there are objections, individual items can be separated for individual discussions and votes. The procedure can be evaluated as we move forward and changed as needed.

Phillips, noted that in his review of the full edition of Robert’s Rules, “consent agenda” does not appear, and he wants to ensure that we do not use a procedure that does not exist in the rules. The agenda would still be, he pointed out, an agenda of items coming up for a vote. At the Speaker’s discretion, items can be moved for adoption by unanimous consent.

The Parliamentarian concurred with Phillips that “consent agenda” does not appear in Roberts Rules, and that the Speaker may move items for adoption by unanimous consent. What the procedure being debated would amount to, he asserted, would be unanimous consent applied to a selection of items: “consent agenda” is just our own terminology for this.

Discussion ended at this point.

B. Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee

1 Combined 5-Year BS/MS in Computer Science

Introduction

Renée MaCauley, Graduate Program Director - Computer Science, took questions.

Discussion

Catherine Thomas, Senator - English, noted that the sample program of study in the proposal does not seem to include courses that satisfy History and First Year Experience requirements.
McCauley replied that advising would help determine which First Year Experience classes students should take. As to the History requirement, it does seem to be missing, an error which will be corrected.

Shaver pointed out some inaccuracies in acronyms used in the proposal.

**Decision**

The motion passed.

(2) Discussion of Graduate Programs

Hakkila noted that the graduate committee has been very interested in many of the discussions that have taken place and continue to take place regarding merger and becoming a comprehensive university because they impact the potential growth and expansion of graduate education at the College. In discussing these issues, Hakkila noted, several of the faculty concerned with graduate education have come to the conclusion that, as important as graduate education is to the College at present and to the future of the institution, the faculty and college as a whole have never really had a discussion about graduate education (by comparison, we have had major discussions about general education three times, Hakkila pointed out, in his time at the College). The consensus of those on the Graduate Council, Graduate Curriculum Committee, and graduate program administration is that we lack clarity on many issues concerning graduate education at the College, including:

- What people feel are good programs to have.
- Why departments wish to have graduate programs (the reasons appear to be numerous).
- How graduate programs and undergraduate programs interact.

Thus, the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs will sponsor a series of graduate education discussion groups on campus (tentatively scheduled during the week of January 22, 2014). The purpose would be to entertain a variety of opinions and exchange ideas and generally to have a deeper discussion about graduate education than we have had before. Groups will be composed of a variety of people from different backgrounds. What is discussed in the groups will be gathered and given back to the community, the purpose of which is not to make decisions, per se, but to see where we currently are with graduate education and where we might go.

The Speaker asked Senators to take this information back to their constituents.

C. General Education Committee: Motion to Approve For General Education Status

(1) Humanities
DANC 150 - Dance Appreciation
THTR 288 - Selected Topics in Theatre Literature and Criticism
THTR 488 - Selected Topics in Theatre II; Literature and Criticism

(2) Social Science
INTL 120 - Economics of Globalization

Introduction
Bob Mignone, Chair of the General Education Committee, offered a package of the above four courses, and asked the Speaker to ask for unanimous consent to adopt them.

Discussion
None.

Decision
The courses were adopted under unanimous consent.

D. Faculty Welfare Committee (Motions presented for discussion only before being automatically referred to the By-Laws Committee)

(1) Motion to add adjunct faculty members to three faculty committees
(2) Motion to add three adjunct faculty members to the Faculty Senate

Introduction
The Speaker noted that these motions are presented for information and discussion at the meeting. They will go to the by-laws committee for further review.

Todd McNerney, Chair of the committee, noted that the general topic of adjunct representation emerged from a survey done two years ago. A subcommittee within the committee has been working on it for the better part of two years. He noted that Simon Lewis, Department of English and member of the committee, and adjuncts present at the meeting might help to answer questions, as well as Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker.

Discussion
Jason Coy, Senator - HSS, expressed support for the first, but expressed concerns about the second motion (to add three adjunct faculty members to the Faculty Senate), since the Senate may, at times, be dealing with promotion or personnel issues affecting adjunct instructors directly.

McNerney replied that he cannot speak to whether this particular issue came up in the committee’s discussions but that in his time as a Senator, he cannot recall a time when the Senate engaged with tenure and promotion issues, aside from discussing language in the FAM.
Coy replied that this is what he had in mind and that there was also a notable discussion between the President’s office and the Senate regarding tenure and promotion.

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM, asked how we would you set the “tenure” for adjuncts on committees, since they are hired on a semester to semester basis.

McNerney stated that the committee thought that there are some comparisons to be made between semester-to-semester adjuncts and non-adjunct instructors who serve on committees but may have to leave due to changing jobs or for other reasons. Also, the committee took into consideration that some adjuncts have been at the College for a long term (some far longer than even some of our tenured faculty), and that these would be the most likely to volunteer and get elected. The committee has not set any time limits, nor are there service length requirements (ex. 3 years) in the by-laws for any of the committees.

Darryl Phillips, Senator - Classics, expressed support for the general idea of the motions, but offered his reservations about how elections might work. The College, he pointed out, did away with College-wide elections for Senators, in part, based on the rationale that faculty might not know each other enough to make an informed decision. He suggested that this might be even more the case with adjunct faculty. So, he asked if it might work to have the nominations and elections committee solicit adjuncts to serve and assign them to committees. This might address the potentially very low turn out and low information voting that could occur with adjunct elections.

Additionally, speaking in favor of the general idea of the motions, Phillips noted that Coy’s objection might be addressed by the fact that the Senate has untenured faculty members who are involved in discussions about tenure and promotion. Phillips closed by stating that having adjunct faculty members on the Senate would likely enrich the Senate.

Beth Lloyd, Senator - Teacher Education, wondered if Visiting Professors might also be included in the Senate and on select committees, since many departments have visiting professors.

The Speaker replied by noting that adjunct and visiting faculty are different kinds of faculty and that the motions under discussion cover only adjunct faculty.

McNerney added that the Welfare committee has discussed the uniqueness of visiting appointments, in that some visiting faculty may be employed as such for a very long time, suggesting the inaccuracy, in those cases, of the nomenclature.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, asked if, in the case of the second motion, it makes sense to have one adjunct per school, instead of having only three from across the College. Having one adjunct representative per school might address the knowledge issue to some extent.
Caveny-Noecker, not speaking for or against Smith’s idea, asserted that it raises a logistical issue in that adjuncts are not treated as having a departmental “home” and it is possible that some adjuncts might have multiple “homes.” This might create some problems in generating election rosters.

Melissa Thomas, an adjunct, noted that adjuncts who helped with motion felt that they “didn’t want to push their luck,” and arrived at the number of three as a good compromise and starting point, taking into account the multiple “homes” individual adjuncts might have.

Hollis France, Senator - Political Science, suggested that one idea might be to have the three adjunct positions represent particular schools on a rotating basis.

Brian McGee, on behalf of President offered thanks to the Welfare committee for their important work, further stating that the President has sent multiple messages to the Senate asking for recognition of the importance of adjunct faculty colleagues, who do about 35% of the teaching but have no representation on committees (it is the only large employee group on campus without representation).

He also added that in the Staff Advisory Committee to the President (SACP), there is one seat available for a temporary employee. Recognizing the issues also previously raised in this discussion, SACP’s system allows the elected Chair to appoint a temporary employee to that slot. While there are many virtues to democratic processes, a simpler option along these lines might also be available.

Young asked what might happen if an adjunct holding a committee position in the fall semester were to not have a teaching appointment in following spring? Would she or she continue serving in the spring?

McNerney replied that the person would be replaced, similar to when a faculty member steps down mid-term.

In response to a question by Bob Mignone about the difficulty of selecting adjuncts for Senate appointments, McNerney clarified that the proposal to have three adjuncts representing all adjuncts at the College arose as a means of addressing the complication of potential adjunct multiple-membership in different schools. Among the difficulties in this scenario might be voting rights: does an adjunct teaching in three different schools, for instance, vote three times?

Smith expressed concern that adjuncts teaching in departments that use relatively few adjuncts might have very small chances for election. And, conversely, adjuncts from departments who use more adjuncts might be more likely to be elected. A school-based model of representation might alleviate this and ensure that all schools are represented.

Joey Van Arnhem, Library, noted that many staff members at the College serve as adjuncts as well and might offer a vital and energizing force, but they are on and off as faculty members.
Melissa Thomas asserted that we may be presupposing more interest among adjuncts in Senate and committee positions than there currently is. She suggested that we start with the motion as written and that, if we discover greater interest among adjuncts and/or that more representation is needed, we can make adjustments.

Jos asked those who worked on the motion or adjuncts who are present if they regard election or appointment as a better place to start.

Simon Lewis, member of the Welfare committee, spoke in favor of election as a key democratic principle, whereas appointment raises issues of representation.

Tony Leclerc, Senator - Computer Science, asked, in reference to the second proposal, if it is correct that to serve as a Senator tenure-track faculty have to have been at the College for three years [the Speaker affirmed this], and if so, if this raises an issue when considering adjuncts for membership in the Senate.

McNerney stated that, to his recollection, there was some discussion about a minimum amount of time at the College as a requirement for Senate service for adjuncts, but the committee did not add that to the motion. Personally, he added, it might be a good idea to consider that. He noted that adjuncts are compensated at a relatively low rate and are compensated for teaching only, not for service on departmental committees or service to the College. For an adjunct to get elected, he asserted, or to even nominate her- or himself, one would expect that person to have been around for a while. Yet it is possible that a person with little time in service could be elected, though unlikely: perhaps for that reason a minimum number of time employe at the College might need to be added.

Leclerc added, in reply, that the motion as written might allow adjuncts easier access to representation than is allowed some junior, tenure-track faculty members.

There was no further discussion.

The Speaker noted that the by-laws committee will bring these motions in some form back to the Senate in the spring, but, considering their meeting schedule, that will not be in January.

E. Resolution that Invited Guests and Committee Representatives Formally Addressing the Faculty Senate Provide Text of Comments One Week Prior to Faculty Senate Meeting, presented by Irina Gigova

Introduction

Irina Gigova explained that the resolution emerged from the work of an ad hoc group that has been thinking about ways in which to streamline the way that the Senate works and especially about how to promote more constructive discussion. The resolution asks that guests present to the Senate in advance reports or other information and to use their time on the Senate floor primarily for Q & A.
The motion was seconded by Jen Wright.

**Discussion**

LeMesurier said he agreed with the idea of the resolution but argued that the one week deadline for reports to be submitted should be changed to two business days.

France asked, since the resolution only mentions “text,” if the diversity of presentation formats had been taken into consideration in the drafting of the resolution.

Gigova replied that whatever form the report or information to be discussed is in, the idea would be to provide it in advance. Using Benigni’s presentation earlier in the evening as an example, Gigova stated that she would have appreciated an opportunity to review the website he discussed in advance of the meeting in order to think about it and potentially formulate questions or comments. The purpose of the resolution is to stimulate discussion. She also agreed that two business days in advance would be fine.

Jos stated that he supports the idea of posting materials two business days in advance to accommodate quick-moving issues.

LeMesurier offered a motion to amend the motion to replace the two occurrences of “one week” in the motion with “two business days,” and the motion was seconded by Shaver.

**Discussion on the amendment to the motion**

Dustan asked if the resolution could read “normally one week.”

The Speaker asked for clarification from Dustan. Since there was a amendment on the floor (to change “one week” to “two business days”), she asked if Dustan meant to speak against it, and he replied “yes.”

Meg Cormac, Senator - Religious Studies, spoke against the amendment because, she said, she would like to read materials over the weekend.

Phillips asserted that we have an agenda deadline for the Senate and that we ought to stick with that.

**Decision on the amendment to the resolution.**

A voice vote was inconclusive, so there was a division of the house. Nine voted in favor of the amendment to the resolution and more than nine voted against: the amendment to the resolution failed.

**Continued discussion of the original resolution**

Coy asserted that he agrees with the spirit of the resolution, but he expressed a concern that it might have a chilling effect on the information the Senate actually gets from the upper administration. Some remarks made on the floor of the Senate are more candid than they might if materials are distributed ahead of time, which might
also mean their winding up in the Post and Courier. Coy asked if “invited guests” in the resolution would include the Provost, for instance.

Gigova replied in the affirmative, but she asserted that the resolution allows room for sensitive information or information that cannot be shared in advance to be presented at the Senate meeting. If time limit becomes a problem, the Speaker always has the right to extend time as needed. She also reiterated that the purpose is not to preclude, but to open discussion.

Hoffman pointed out that Senate meetings are open, public meetings.

Greenburg spoke in favor of the resolution in the interest of giving Senators time to review materials before the meeting. Replying to Phillip’s argument that the Senate deadline agenda should be the time for reports or materials to be provided, Greenburg asserted that two weeks might be too long, since a lot could change between the distribution of materials and the day of presentation.

Leclerc asked, in the spirit of trying to understand the problem that the resolution is addressing, how submitting reports a week ahead of time would shorten the amount of time the Senate meeting takes.

Gigova replied that it limits the time for presentation and lengthens the time for discussion.

Leclerc asked “how?”

Senators, Gigova explained, would read reports in advance, rather than being delivered the information in the actual meeting. And guests, rather than delivering an entire report on the floor, would be offering highlights and any new information that has come to light, expecting that Senators will have read the report in advance.

Leclerc stated that the actual report is not shortened by the resolution, and Gigova replied by saying that while the reports from the floor at the present Senate meeting were relatively short, at times reports have run as long as a half hour. The resolution would shorten reports of that length delivered on the floor of the Senate in favor of having the information provided in advance.

Leclerc followed up by asking what sort of feedback might be provided to a guest who has submitted material in advance.

The Speaker at this point noted that the by-laws already specify that reports are to be limited to no longer than five minutes, though we do not always enforce that rule.

Leclerc asked, if that limitation is already there, “what’s the problem?”

Gigova replied that the difference is that the resolution asks that reports be submitted in advance, so that Senators and guests come to the meeting already having read the report and with questions possibly already formulated.
Mary Beth Heston, Senator - Art History, emphasized two advantages brought by the resolution. Senators can be better prepared, and it also allows more questions and discussion.

LeMesurier argued that we might start by enforcing the five minute time limit and asking those who have more to say than can be done in five minutes to submit a report ahead of time.

Shaver stated that he would like reporters from the Post and Courier to come to the meetings rather than just picking items up off the web.

McGee offered what he prefaced as “a couple of fairly unpopular points, given the tone and tenor of the discussion.” Article IV, Section 1 E. of the by-laws, he noted, specifies that the “Faculty Senate shall hear reports from and have the opportunity to question the President of the College and the Provost,” further stipulating that the first report will be early in the first semester, the second report, late in the second semester. It also states that “any written reports provided to the Faculty Senate by the President or the Provost shall be distributed by the Faculty Senate Secretariat to all faculty members.” McGee argued that, as the President and Provost are compelled to present reports by the by-laws, it is hard to construe them as guest invited to appear and give reports.

The by-laws also, he argued, do not require a report but only state that, if provided, reports re to be distributed.

Any President, McGee asserted, would make presentations of complex material in which facts might be changing rapidly and right up to the moment of the report on the Senate floor. A two-to-four minute time span would not meet the needs of such a presentation. It is, thus, inherently problematic to impose that limitation on a President, Provost, or invited guest on an important and time-sensitive topic.

McGee further asserted that one could argue that this is discourteous, since senators are not required by the resolution to have written remarks prepared a week in advance, yet invited guests are required to do so. He added that he does not think that the discourtesy of requiring advance written remarks of some members of the community but not others is “particularly fair” or “conducive to free and spirited and open debate or sends the right message about egalitarian and shared governance.” He concluded by stating that while he appreciates, whenever possible, the goal of providing information in advance, he does not support the spirit of the resolution.

Hoffman replied that the spirit of the resolution lies in having the President and Provost respect that the Senate is “not just a repository for information, not just ears,” to which he added that he cannot recall a presentation that the President has made to the Senate that included pressing, time-sensitive information. He characterized them, rather, as “canned speeches given to other bodies.” Also, he asserted that, even if the President and Provost are not “invited guests,” this does not mean that they cannot provide written texts ahead of time.
Hoffman then called attention to the section of the resolution that points out that the time limit can be extended by the Speaker as needed, and that the President and Provost’s reports might fall under that provision. Senators, he also noted, do not have to submit texts ahead of time, unless they are doing something like forwarding a resolution. Senators do not do anything like standing up giving speeches. The resolution asks that guest provide a report in advance to give Senators time to digest the information versus being told what could have simply been read in advance, providing the opportunity for a meaningful discussion.

Gigova interjected that a good example of the principle of the resolution was Larry Krasnoff’s report from the November meeting (see Minutes, 5. C.). While she felt he may have spoken a little too long, the provision ahead of time of a detailed Powerpoint slide deck with information and key questions worked well to stimulate meaningful conversation.

Phillips asserted that, while he supports the spirit of the resolution, he is not in favor of the resolution itself. By-laws, he observed, already address setting of agendas and time limits, and the resolution is similar to the Curriculum Committee’s motion from earlier in the meeting in that it seeks to establish operating procedure through motion, rather than through the by-laws. We, thus, do not require the resolution to achieve the ends of the resolution, which will, in turn, require the leadership of the Speaker and adherence to the by-laws.

Jen Wright observed that the resolution addresses less a “quantity issue” than it does a “quality issue,” whether or not we are using our time effectively. She stated that having a person present 30 minutes worth of material and then to have that be followed by very few questions, is also disrespectful of the presenter’s time. It would, thus, be worth the President and Provost’s time to provide materials in advance that would facilitate a lively and meaningful discussion so that however much time is put into the process, it is “good” time that maximizes the benefit to all of us.

The Provost suggested that it is important to think about what is meant by “report” or “speech.” He noted that the Powerpoint format he uses for his topical reports allows him to expand or clarify as needed, depending on the audience. However, he stated, if he were required to provide text more along the lines of a speech he would be likely to be much more circumspect. He noted that the Senate meeting is an open environment, but “the more we put things in digital format,” the more committed we might become to be “circumscribed and restricted in our conversations.”

Jos, referring to McGee’s comments, argued that the analogy between what Senators do as a matter of regular course and what a guest delivering a report might do is, as Hoffman pointed out, not the most telling. But there is an analogy when it comes to Senators giving committee reports or formal reports to fellow Senators. With that in mind, he asked the Speaker and Speakers past in the room what our “compliance rate” is in terms of submission of written reports.
The Speaker noted that in the past, we have not asked of committee chairs reporting to the Senate that they submit anything written in advance. The Speaker noted, however, that in November, she asked Larry Krasnoff to put together his Powerpoint slides in advance (see Minutes, 5. C.). In a related matter, committee chairs, the Speaker noted, are required to submit annual reports at the end of the year. Over the last two years, all committee chairs have submitted reports, and these have been posted online.

McGee pointed out that reports are labor intensive, which is worth considering when thinking about what the resolution would require. He added that given the amount of work that might go into a report, a future President, should she or he choose to be bound by the resolution’s requirement, having gone to significant labor, would probably distribute the report to the entire campus and not just the Senate. Also, he claimed, there might be a chilling effect on the kind of and extensiveness of the information provided in such a report.

Dustan called the question. It was seconded and affirmed by vote.

**Decision on the resolution**

A voice vote was inconclusive, so there was a division of the house. 11 voted for the resolution and more than 11 against: the resolution failed.

F. Motion for the approval of degree candidates for the December graduation ceremony made by Provost Hynd.

The motion was presented by the Provost and passed.

6. **Constituents’ Concerns**

LeMesurier stated that some faculty are still confused about general education assessment and that it would be nice if a brief memo went out explaining it.

The Speaker asked Lynn Ford, if between the two of them (the Speaker and Ford) they can see that a memo goes out. Ford replied that, yes, yet another memo can be sent.

7. **Adjournment – 7:09**

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary
The Faculty Senate meets Tuesday November 5 2013 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order: 5:03PM by Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty
2. 1 October 2013 minutes were approved as circulated.
3. Reports
   A. The Speaker

   The Speaker offered an update regarding Heath Hoffman’s idea of “re-envisioning the senate,” the purpose or goal of which is to create opportunities for Senate to be more pro-active and to take up and lead discussions for the campus. Groups of faculty have met three times, and notes/summaries of the discussions are posted on a blog. Anyone interested in contributing to the blog can contact Hoffman (Hoffman-nH@cofc.edu).

   Two resolutions from this group will be presented to the Senate in December, one focusing on the expectations of reports presented by guests and committee chairs, the other proposing a change in the way curricular matters at both the undergraduate and graduate level are presented. The former will ask that reports for the Senate be submitted in advance, to allow the bulk of time to be spent on questions and discussion. The latter will allow curricular matters to be handled more efficiently and, again, open more opportunity for discussion on other issues.

   The Speaker pointed out that current meeting of the Senate is already enacting the principle of the first of these resolutions: committee reports have been submitted in advance, as has information regarding Larry Krasnoff’s discussion on the Charleston School of Law (CSOL) on the agenda for the current meeting (PowerPoint slides). The Speaker stressed that Krasnoff’s discussion is not intended to produce any action, per se, but for the Senate to be proactive in thinking through the issues associated with any future discussions of the fate of CSOL in relation to CofC. The Speaker noted that we will try this general approach to reporting and modify it as needed once we have a better sense of how it is working.

   A tobacco-free campus policy was passed by the Board of Trustees (BoT) in October and was recently distributed via email. The Speaker explained that a couple changes were made to an earlier form of the policy: 1) the BoT struck a provision that would allow designated smoking areas on campus during a transitional period, and 2) the BoT amended the effective date of the policy to July 2014, instead of January 2015. The President and the Board are looking into ways that smoking cessation programs might be made available before the policy goes into effect.
The Speaker reminded the Senators that there are two open forums scheduled for faculty to give feedback to Bob Lawless, the search consultant from AGB, who is helping the College locate candidates for the Presidency: Wed. 11/6, 11:00 - 12:00 and 5:15 - 6:15 in Alumni Hall Randolph Hall. The Speaker encouraged faculty to come to the meetings.

On the Presidential search, the Speaker reiterated the content of a recent email message to the campus from BoT Chair, Greg Padgett: there are now three faculty member representatives on the search committee. The Speaker thanked Greg Padgett for the change, upon which the Senate broke out in applause. The Speaker closed her report by welcoming Greg Padgett to the podium.

B. Greg Padgett, Chair - Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston

Padgett thanked the Speaker and the Provost for their service to the College and expressed appreciation to the Senate and, on behalf of the board, to the faculty of the College for the work they do. He also expressed appreciation to President Benson for his service and for allowing the time for the search to happen this academic year.

Padgett stressed that the BoT wants the search process to be thoughtful and deliberate. He asserted that every applicant for the position will go through the same nomination and application process, with all applications sent directly to Bob Lawless and AGB. All College stakeholders are included in the process, he also stated.

Padgett roughed out a timeline:

End of November - Ad published in the Chronicle of Higher Education
January - Nominations and applications will be due.
February - Committee’s candidate interviews will be held
February or March - finalists determined and invited to campus

Padgett noted that the finalists will be determined by the BoT and stressed that only the names of the finalists will be released to the public. The final candidate selected by the BoT will not be announced until there is a signed contract. The committee will maintain confidentiality as a means of insuring the very best pool of applicants.

Padgett promised to keep everyone up to date on the process as it unfolds.

Questions

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if, in addition to the job ad, there will be a prospectus for the job. Padgett replied that there will be one, written soon and made available soon after the ad goes out. To Shaver’s follow-up, “who will write it?,” he replied that, as search committee chair, he will be in charge of it, but that he will take input from outside.

There were no more questions.

C. The Provost

Merit & Market Raises - the Provost noted that, following the recommendations of the Faculty Compensation Committee, guidance has been sent to the deans, who will
in turn, work with department heads to make pay raises available from the 1% mar-
ket adjustment pool and the 1.8% merit pool.

CofC-MUSC Update - CofC and MUSC continue to have discussions about collabora-
tion on programs, notably in Computer Science, Physics, Biology, and Business, and
are beginning to separately develop requests for funding related to those and other
areas of potential collaboration. He stated that it is “fair to say that we are moving
toward a collaborative model” and what that might entail will be clearer as we pro-
gress in developing the programs.

Addlestone Library (AL) Renovations - the AL will be undergoing significant renova-
tions next semester as a result CofC’s partnering with the South Carolina Historical
Society and serving to house many of their historical documents in Southern history.
The renovations to house these documents will add 200 seats for students, including
140 general seats, with more power outlets added. The entire current book collec-
tion will move to compact (moveable) shelving on the second floor. The special col-
collections area will expand, and a high tech lecture room will be added to the third
floor.

To accomplish the renovations, during spring break 2014, the journals will be re-
moved and boxed for temporary storage until the beginning of the fall 2014
semester. From early May to mid August, the second and third floor will be closed.
Books will be removed and stored to clear space for the work to be done. As with the
journals, these will return at the beginning of fall 2014. By fall semester the entire
library will be open and ready for use.

Faculty who anticipate a need for certain print journals may contact Sherry Gadsden
by February 15 to have those titles set aside. The same is true for books (including
reference books) that faculty need or feel they might need during the transition peri-
iod: faculty need to contact Gadsden, but in this case, by April 15. Inter-library loan
will not be affected.

Questions

Mary Beth Heston, Senator - Art History, asked if the reading area on the third floor
of AL will still be there after the renovation.

The Provost replied that, based on his recollection of the plans, yes, it will.

Calvin Blackwell expressed concern that the current compact shelving does not al-
ways work and asked that any new compact shelving be upgraded from the current
or that the shelving be better maintained.

The Provost said that he would rely the message, and noted that Claire Fund has said
that she is happy with the firm that is coming in to install the compact shelving.

Moore Quinn, Senator - Anthropology and Sociology asked how departmental lib-
rary liaisons’ duties (ordering books, databases, etc.) might be affected by the renov-
ations.

The Provost replied that he couldn’t answer that but that he would make sure to
carry the concern back to Claire Fund.
Hollis France, Senator - Political Science, asked how students will be affected by the renovation.

The Provost reiterated that the first floor would remain open, though there will be some noise.

David Moscowitz, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (HHS), asked if there has been any discussion about allocating space for faculty research carrels.

The Provost stated that he cannot answer that question with a yes or a no, but that the small rooms already dedicated to faculty use will still be available.

There were no more questions.

D. Devon Hanahan, Chair - Faculty Compensation Committee
Report on the Committee's Proposal for Distribution of Salary Adjustment Funds for 2013-2014

Proposal | Table: School Differentials from CUPA-HR Data, 30 September 2013 | Powerpoint

Hanahan thanked the committee for all the hard work, going back to last year's resolution at the April 2013 meeting of the Senate. She also mentioned the importance of the faculty feedback that the committee gets via email, which they read aloud at each meeting, and, if they can't answer the questions or address the concerns, they pass them on to those they think can. She also stated that the committee exists to advocate for faculty and serve as a liaison to the Provost's office.

The resolution approved by the Senate in April 2013 to align faculty salaries with CUPA-HR (College and University Professionals Association for Human Resources) data was presented to the BoT Academic Affairs committee. Influenced by the resolution, the BoT approved a 1% market and a 1% merit increase. The Welfare Committee was then tasked with coming up with a plan for distributing the 1% market increase funds. They also became aware at this time of an $840,000 college budget surplus.

The committee proposed that the pool be distributed in a way that took into account how far in the negative departments within the schools differed from CUPA-HR salary means at peer schools. The committee also asked that the budget surplus be added into the 1% market adjustment pool. The surplus was added to the pool for raises, but in the merit pool.

Hanahan added that the merit and market increases will appear in faculty's January 15th paychecks.

There were no questions.

E. Mark Hurd, Chair - Faculty Committee on Educational Technology (FETC)
Report on Status of Online Course Evaluations and Current Work of FETC
Powerpoint Slides
See the Powerpoint slides for the history of online course evaluations, issues and concerns, advantages and disadvantages. The slides also indicate efforts currently being made to improve the response rate, and other possible means, as well. In addition, the slides include a table comparing our practices with those of other institutions.

Questions

Devon Hanahan asked if it would be possible to not have to print evaluations for review binders.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, noted that there have been requests to use just the summary page, but there is some important data not on that particular page. She agreed that there should be more conversation about alternatives to printing a large volume of material for review binders.

Jon Hakkila, Astronomy and Physics, asked if we could introduce more incentives and better advertise them since students seem to respond well to them.

Hurd agreed, suggesting that giving priority registration might be a good way to incentivize doing the evaluations.

Caveny-Noecker noted that Academic Affairs is looking into incentives more and advertising, too.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, noted that a challenge related to students using the evaluation app is that students, while they will do the quantitative evaluation, they are less likely to give qualitative feedback.

Hurd agreed, adding that students might be more willing on tablets than on smartphones to enter more qualitative information. He suggested that faculty could advertise that on a particular day, students could bring laptops to class and be given time to do the evaluation.

Smith followed up by saying that even when students use laptops, they may be less inclined to give more than brief feedback, simply due to the fact that they are doing the evaluation electronically—the “Twitter mindset,” he called it.

Morgan Koerner, Senator - German & Slavic Studies, suggested that faculty could add a date on their syllabuses for students to do evaluations in class on their laptops, tablets, or smartphones.

Hurd noted that some faculty may not allow such devices in their classes and, thus, be uncomfortable with such a suggestion.

Koerner countered that it would just be on one day and, thus, not be much of a problem.

Joe Carson, Department of Physics and Astronomy, reported that about 15% of his students, when asked if they could bring a laptop or electronic device to class to do the evaluations, reported that they could not—a sizable number.

Hurd replied that 15% is a high number, but the tradeoff in that scenario would be capturing data from 85% of the students.
Carson countered that there’s a potential social cost to that 15% of the group who are barred from participating simply because they do not possess a laptop, tablet, or laptop.

Darryl Phillips, Senator - Classics CLAS expressed great concern about potential insensitivity to economic disparity in our students. Since students may feel they are put on the spot by a requirement that they bring devices to class, Phillips suggested that the committee could develop guidelines to maintain sensitivity to economic inequality in our students.

Bob Podolsky, Biology, asked if the committee’s research turned up institutions that require that students do evaluations in order to get their grades.

Hurd replied that some schools do just that, but these are mainly professional schools. Discussions with the Provost’s office, he noted, indicated that we are not going to go to such a requirement. There are arguments against it as a potential violation of student rights, unduly punitive, and so forth.

Kathy Boyd, Registrar, stated that it is important to realize that there is no way to put grades out early as an incentive or withhold them until evaluations are complete once they have been entered into the system. These things could only be done at the level of instructor.

Jen Wright, Senator - HSS, argued that allowing students who complete evaluations earlier access to their grades, as some schools do, would be a strong incentive to increase response rates.

Boyd, in reply, noted that there is a very short period of time between when grades are due and when they are reported to students.

Kelly Shaver argued that having evaluations open through the final exam period would be a good idea, especially for classes such as one of his, in which most of the bulk of the work comes due at the end of the semester.

Jason Overby, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), strongly seconded Shaver’s point, adding that he has gotten feedback from students to the effect that once they had time to do an evaluation for his class—during the finals—the evaluations were closed.

Hurd noted that he had a similar experience.

Burton Callicott, Senator - Library, suggested that an anonymous survey or quiz in OAKS could be administered in order for instructors to get feedback directly from their students.

Beverly Diamond, Associate Provost, in reply to Callicott, cautioned that such means of getting feedback at the level of the instructor might cause response rates on the school-wide evaluations to go down.

Podolsky raised a concern regarding faculty offering incentives for students in their classes to complete the evaluations: such practices could conceivably drive down rates of response in non-incentivized classes.
Hurd replied that one way to incentivize evaluation that would not have this kind of effect would be to grant class extra credit only if the student has completed all course evaluations, with proof being a printout of screenshot of some sort.

Caveny-Noecker noted that Academic Affairs encourages the use of modest incentives that do not potentially dis-incentivize evaluations of other classes.

4. Old Business: Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual

Motion to More Clearly Define Faculty Eligibility for Committee Work, Change to By-laws Article V, Section 1, K [brought by Committee on Nominations and Elections to the 1 October 2013 Meeting, see minutes, 5 d. (1)]

Introduction

Paul Young represented the committee and took questions.

Discussion

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, expressed concern that the motion could be read to be foreclosing on adjunct service on committees.

Young noted that the purpose is to clarify the FAM’s language. The clarification brings the language of the FAM into alignment with current practice with regard to the composition of committees. Additionally, the language here would not preclude adjunct service on committees, since the composition of committees can be altered by later revisions of the FAM. Finally, the Faculty Welfare Committee is currently looking into just that issue.

Todd McNerney, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, confirmed that the committee intends to bring motions to the December meeting.

Decision

Motion passed.

5. New Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee

(1) 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.

   a) Change prerequisites

      COMM 301
      COMM 410
      ARTM 420

   b) Change course title
PSYC 410

c) New course proposals
   AAST 330, Black Images in the Media
   AAST 366, Race-Ethnic Relations
   AAST: Change Program (add new courses to the major)
   DANC 150, Dance Appreciation
   ARTM 230, History of the Recording Industry
   ARTM 390, Legal Aspects of Entertainment Law
   ARTM 401: Music Industry internship
   ARTM: Change Program (add new courses to the major)

   Discussion
   None

   Decision
   All proposals passed.

(2) Program Terminations:
   a) Italian minor (Italian Studies minor remains)

   Discussion
   None

   Decision
   The proposal passed.

   b) French Studies minor

   Discussion
   None

   Decision
   The proposal passed.

B. Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee

(1) Change credit/contact hours
   EVSS 631

(2) Change title and description
   EVSS 633
   EVSS 642

   Discussion
None

**Decision**

All proposals passed.

E. Larry Krasnoff, Director, **Pre-Law Program**

Discussion on the Idea of the College’s acquiring the Charleston School of Law (CSOL) | **Powerpoint Slides**

See the Powerpoint slides for background on CSOL, comparisons to other law schools, potential impacts of the proposed sale of CSOL to Infilaw, and questions we ought to consider in any proposed absorption of CSOL into CofC.

Krasnoff noted the importance of the Senate discussing issues regarding CSOL at this point, rather than later. What happens regarding CSOL is somewhat out of our control, but the Senate would have to be involved in numerous matters regarding the CSOL were it integrated into CofC, such as approving a JD degree.

The sale of CSOL to Infilaw has not gone through yet, there are still significant issues to be resolved: accreditation, etc. One of the three directors of CSOL is not happy with the proposed sale to Infilaw, and this has been the source of some of the proposals floating around right now.

Comparison to other regional law schools reveals that CSOL is “not really” a good law school. The tables in the Powerpoint slides reveal this, as do employment numbers. For instance, one estimate says that only around 50% of CSOL graduates have “lawyer” jobs.

Regarding the questions in the Powerpoint presentation

1. **Can Infilaw receive state approval to run CSOL?**

   This may or may not happen. While there is some support for it, clearly one of the directors is against it, added to which Infilaw has a bad reputation, particularly in online venues dealing with ranking and evaluating law schools.

2. **How much would it cost us to buy CSOL from the directors or Infilaw?**

   There has been one meeting in which the idea of CofC buying CSOL was discussed. [Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Vice President for Executive Administration, characterized this meeting as an “exploratory conversation”].

   This question is a “moving target,” since the question has not been answered as to whether or not a sale to Infilaw or CofC would be approved by the state. Also, matters of the financial model that might obtain are murky. On the matter of what tuition could be charged, Brian McGee noted at this point, that is not necessarily limited by law: it is a political decision. Still, Krasnoff, asserted, charging a higher tuition for law school than other programs might put us out on a limb, University of Virginia being the only other public school that he knows of that does this. Kelly Shaver then added that the MBA program is allowed to charge a higher tuition. Krasnoff agreed that, given this information, perhaps a law school at CofC could charge higher tuition, but it is still not the norm in the world of
public law schools (which are connected to an idea of public mission), even if it is a norm in MBA programs (to which Shaver agreed).

3. Could we receive state approval to run CSOL?

   It is not obvious that CofC would be approved to run CSOL. The University of South Carolina does not want another law school in the state.

4. How much could we realistically charge in tuition? Would a law school be viable at that level of tuition?

   See #2 above.

5. Does having a law school fit with our public and academic missions?

   It may be, as Krasnoff asserted has been said by some, that taking on CSOL fits our academic mission better than a merger with MUSC might. Do we feel, he further asked, that we need to rescue CSOL? Certainly this would be the perception in some camps.

   Could we make CSOL’s programs consistent with our conception of academic quality?

   Krasnoff asserted that we would probably not be happy with CSOL's status and performance at their current levels, particularly if we are invested in rescuing CSOL from “the basement.” So, how, he asked, would we improve the academic quality of CSOL and integrate it into our own academic mission and structures? We would have to make decisions about promotion and tenure procedures regarding law school faculty, and there are a couple possible models. We would have to think about what level of publishing we might expect from the faculty and the other range of questions that are raised along the lines of tenure and promotion.

Questions

Phil Jos, Senator - HSS asked if absorbing CSOL would take a massive infusion of money and how much of the total cost of running a law school is tuition-based.

Krasnoff replied that until recent years, many law schools have been profit centers. Many law schools opened to make money, yet that may not be working; applications have fallen off and law schools are struggling. Washington University of St. Louis, for instance, in the last two years has had to ask for a subsidy from WU in order to run their program, which had not happened before.

One thing to consider, too, Krasnoff, noted is that in the case of CSOL it would not only be the cost of running the school to keep in mind but also the payment made for the school itself, lump sum, or time, or however the arrangement would be made.

Sue Balinsky, Senator - Health & Human Performance, asked what might be the benefits and drawbacks of the CSOL becoming a USC branch.

Krasnoff said that given USC’s general desire to be the only law school in the state, a satellite might be better than any of the other alternatives, from their perspective,
since it would reduce competition. Of course, there is, also, the general quality concern of satellite campuses: would USC be prepared to fund it to the level of quality of the main campus law school.

George Pothering asked if Clemson has come up in these discussions.

Krasnoff said he was not sure and asked McGee.

Brian McGee stated that a significant context to consider is that the Dean of University of South Carolina Law School, according to one media account, is opposed to having any other school having a law school in the state, but that if there’s no other option, he would consider taking on CSOL as a branch campus of USC.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, asked if in an absorption of CSOL, certain law specialities might be possible, taking advantage of CofC areas of faculty specialization.

Krasnoff replied that such collaboration could be possible, but that opportunities for specialization in law schools are somewhat constrained. General and specialized law degrees also need to be tied to employment and confidence that a degree can result in employment. The academic interest, say, in preservation law, would need to be attended by some demand for preservation lawyers.

Darryl Philips, Senator - Classics, expressed a more optimistic read of the Krasnoff’s comparison of law schools. We ought to consider not only the LSAT quantitative scores, Phillips argued, but also the percentile scores, since the achievement gap does not look as stark from viewpoint of those scores. Looking at all the evidence for academic standards, he asserted, is important.

He also suggested that, if some collaboration is not already ongoing between CofC and CSOL, there are opportunities for it with our students in programs like the Masters in Environmental Science, Masters in Public Administration, and Masters in History. There may be some real positives, in other words, in CofC’s acquiring CSOL, to which our name could add some value.

To Phillips first point, Krasnoff replied Phillips is right to say that we should consider all the evidence, but that when a student scores at the lower level on the LSAT, he feels advisors ought to steer them away from law school schools, and yet the schools at the bottom, and on the “edge of fraud,” are accepting students with these scores. on the lower end of his comparison may be accepting students who

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, asked if in the the ten years since CSOL has been around there has been improvement in scores.

Kransnoff replied that the scores have gone up, but since accreditation, scores haven’t gone up, but he also noted that this may be due to the market. Applications are down. But other information that might go to the question of quality is not readily available, such as faculty hiring, scholarships, offered, etc. We need to know more about these things if we are serious about acquiring CSOL.

Gigova noted that reviewing the CSOL website, she noted that they use many adjunct instructors.
Krasnoff replied that, to some extent, this is not unusual at law schools, since they often use the expertise of practitioners, and there’s an advantage to students in working with faculty who are actually practicing attorneys. But high quality law schools also invest in academic faculty. Krasnoff noted, that in this regard, CSOL has actually gotten a little better about hiring academic faculty, too.

Kelly Shaver, Senator asked if it useful to consider first-time-out bar exam passing as a quality metric.

Krasnoff replied that bar-passing as a measure can be artificially manipulated by schools. In high-end schools, there is no preparatory coursework for the bar exam, and students still do well, but some schools dedicate a disproportionate amount of time to teaching the bar exam and supplant other coursework as an effect.

Shaver followed up by noting that bar passage is essential, of course, for employment as an attorney.

Paul Young, Senator - Mathematics, asked, aside from the name, what else CofC would offer that would improve CSOL.

Krasnoff suggested that the integration into academic culture and collaboration might factor be attractive to CSOL, though there are obvious questions to be asked about physical plant and other resources as well.

Tom Carroll, Senator - School of Education, Health and Human Performance, asked about how many student CofC contribution to USC and CSOL, which may be a kind of a “safety school.”

Krasnoff noted that, while current numbers won’t be available until spring, CSOL is the place that more of our students go than any other. Last year 43 students applied to CSOL, 33 were accepted, and 12 went. There is a perception that CSOL is a “little bit of a safety school.” Numbers have been as high as 20 or more attending CSOL. Last year numbers going to USC and CSOL were roughly even.

Krasnoff asked the Provost if any other meetings with CSOL or other parties are scheduled.

The Provost mentioned that, while he cannot speak on the subject right now, there is interest in continued meetings.

The Provost noted that we are the largest feeder school to MUSC.

Krasnoff added that this is true of CSOL, as well, and it is also true that CofC students make up the largest percentage of the CSOL student body.

The Provost adduced the example of William and Mary, an aspirational peer institution, for its combined tradition of liberal arts with a few specialized PhD programs and a law school, all as a state-supported institution. While we have a lot of unknowns, he said, this comparison is one to keep in mind as we consider options for bringing together not only CofC and CSOL, but also whatever collaborations might emerge with MUSC.
6. Constituents’ Concerns
   None
7. Adjournment: 7:08
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 1 October 2013

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 1 October 2013, at 5:00 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium)

1. Call to Order: 5:03 PM by Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty

2. 10 September minutes were approved as circulated.

3. Reports (The Speaker, President Benson, and Provost George Hynd)
   A. The Speaker

      The Speaker recognized Susan Morrison, who substituted as Parliamentarian for George Pothering, who could not be at the meeting.

      The Speaker had no update regarding plans for search for new President, though she expressed hope that she will have an opportunity in two weeks, when the Board of Trustee meets on campus, to speak with Chair Greg Padgett. She will report on any news on the search at the November meeting.

      The Speaker noted that Heath Hoffman and a group of faculty have met to follow up on the discussion Hoffman initiated at the prior Senate meeting (see the 10 September minutes, 3E; also see the blog Hoffman set up to facilitate ongoing discussions). The group is developing ideas and will meet again on Tuesday 10/8. The Speaker encouraged other faculty interested in joining the conversation to contact Hoffman.

      The Board of Trustees will meet Thursday, October 17 - Friday, October 18th. Clara Hodges sent out an email announcement of the meeting and an agenda. The Speaker encouraged anyone interested in attending any of the meetings to let Clara know so she can make sure there are sufficient chairs available. Committee meetings are on Thursday, the full Board meeting is on Friday morning.

      Following up on conversations last year with the Faculty Welfare Committee and President Benson on creating opportunities for adjunct faculty to have a voice or representation in faculty governance, the Speaker held an adjunct faculty forum the week prior to the October Senate meeting. All adjuncts were invited. 25-28 attended, with another five or six attending electronically. A number of ideas and concerns were expressed, and the adjuncts seemed very appreciative of the effort to provide a forum for them. A second forum will be held in November.

      The Welfare Committee may be bringing motions soon to the Senate concerning adjunct representation on particular committees, an idea the adjunct faculty were very excited to hear. On a different note, the Speaker mentioned one long-time adjunct’s sobering observation that, while individual regular faculty often appreciate and support adjuncts, he felt that adjuncts are still seen as second-class citizens, and the Speaker suggested that we might want to keep that perception in mind as we move forward.

   Questions: none.
B. The President

See the President’s written report. The following represents the elaborations and extensions the President made on the written text of the speech during his delivery for the Senate.

To the "New Charleston Update" section of the written text, supporting his statement that "the best solution to meeting the current and long-term needs of Charleston's economy is to establish a comprehensive research university in Charleston," the President added that the Mayor is "beyond 100% supportive of this," and that the Mayor "has made this one of his goals for the end of his administration, to make this happen." Also, the metro Chamber of Commerce, the President stated, are "major players in this game right now, doing studies, doing needs analysis: what does the community need?, what types of degrees?, what types of PhDs?, what types of undergraduate degrees? The metro Chamber," he emphasized, "is all over this idea."

In the same section, President Benson said of "Option 1" ("The legislature could designate the College as South Carolina’s fourth research university") that he does "not necessarily think it’s the best option."

To his discussion of "Option 2" ("Legislation could be enacted to merge the College and MUSC"), he added that "there is a very high probability that something like this will occur, whether we like it or not."

Regarding "Option 3" ("We could significantly increase the collaboration between the College and MUSC, including joint PhD programs and other PhD programs outside the field of medicine that are important to New Charleston"), the President stressed that at present, we could, with special approval, collaboratively offer PhDs with MUSC, but only in the medical field. Even though, as the written report text notes, with this option "we would undoubtedly not achieve all the synergies that a merger would create," the President added that such a plan "could go a long way toward" providing assets we need "by simply a significant collaboration between the two institutions." He noted that this option also has a "fair probability" of happening. He said that he believes either this option or option 2 "will happen."

In discussing "Option 4" ("The state could build a full-blown branch campus of Clemson or USC in Charleston and, potentially, require that new institution collaborate with the College and MUSC"), the President added to his assertion that Charleston needs its own research university, rather than a branch campus:

We want the faculty living here, we want the faculty working here, we want the faculty in our churches and our synagogues, we want the faculty's kids going to our schools, we want all of that happening here, and we want the best faculty we can possibly get.

The need for a comprehensive research university in Charleston, the President stated, is "no longer a question. This is a done deal." He went on to say, "we may not end up having it, but the need is completely recognized by 99% of the people that I come in contact with and, beyond that, around the state. Our community leaders are
all for it, our business community’s totally for it, our donors are for it, and the list goes on and on and on. The question now is 'how do you do it?' That’s what we’re wrestling with.

In addition, the President specified that the Trustees also support the idea.

The President bolstered his observation in the written report "that research universities can easily lose their passion for great teaching," by saying that this outcome is an "unbelievable" and "very steep" slippery slope, but that it is, nonetheless, possible to have a research focus and a focus on undergraduate education.

The President stressed that "there has got to be new money" for any collaboration or merger to work.

Having outlined the significant challenges to higher education in the state, yet noting the tremendous potential we have, and bringing to a close this section of his report, the President asserted that "we are at a tipping point. There need to be some investments in higher education: we have been waiting a long time in South Carolina for this to happen."

Under the heading of "Faculty and Staff Salary Increases," the President’s written report specifies that "in the budget approved by the Board of Trustees last June, $800,000 was allocated to support what we believed at the time would be a state-mandated salary increase for all employees." In the report as delivered, the President asked for verification of that figure from Brian McGee, who replied that the actual number was $837,000.

The President stated that he hopes that any salary increases will appear in January paychecks.

Rounding out a narrative of the College’s ultimately failed plans to raise faculty salaries and hire new faculty through tuition increases, the President noted that the tuition increases we have had over the past few years, "3%, 0%, 3.2%," and such, "don’t even cover inflation."

Questions and Answers

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, expressed concern that a shift toward becoming a research university might "very likely" "destroy what we are right now," since there is apparently no money forthcoming. She stated that many faculty appear to not be happy about the idea of becoming a research university: many, in fact, came to work at the college precisely for the kind of place it is now. She asked what happens to faculty already here who are not interested in this research university model.

The President answered by saying "the ball is rolling," but it could be stopped by lack of money. There may be increased collaboration with MUSC, which might be the best alternative from the standpoint outlined in Gigova’s question. In that model, there would be "heavy duty" research done in a set of our departments, but it wouldn’t be across the board. MUSC wants to match up, for instance, with
Computer Science, Chemistry, Public Health, and Physics at CofC, to name a few programs. The President said that he liked that model, but only until "New Charleston" came along, Boeing arrived, and "this economy caught fire." "We are on the radar screen," the President further said, with the Research Triangle, Silicon Valley, Austin, and although they are far ahead of us, there's an excitement, "probably not seen around here in a couple of hundred years." "It's the type of thing," he said, "that wants to be fed, and the business community is all over this idea of some sort of a research collaboration or a research university."

The President expressed grave concern that Clemson or USC might come into the area and marginalize the College. The result would be a loss of donors and support from businesses. He asserted that if we are to keep pace with the transformation of Charleston, we too will have to transform to an Arts & Sciences university, which would require a good deal of money. One area that money would go to is to offer competitive faculty salaries. Even staying precisely as we are, he cautioned, would require more money to recruit and retain faculty.

Phil Dustan, Senator - School of Science and Math, pointed out that the institutions that we collaborate with have particular missions (he adduced examples: MUSC, the Citadel, NOAA, and DNR) and problems to solve. Our mission, he said, is "curiosity driven and is innovative and, in some respects, that makes us very, very precious and very valuable." He expressed fear that in melding with other institutions, we might become more like them, rather than the other way around.

Dustan asserted that funding from a significant donor might be superior option to funding from the state. The state, he says, has a "plantation mentality," in which it is good to have uneducated people who will work for low wages. Dustan admitted his charge was "kind of harsh."

The President, however, replied, "it's not far off," given the history of the state as recently as the 1950s. He stated that the cultural history of the state is detrimental to higher education, and that the structural issues he outlined in his report also contribute a great deal to the problem: especially the constitutional weakness of the governor and the relative strength of the legislature. A board of regents, he asserted, also, would be superior to a CHE.

Kirk Stone, Senator - Department of Communication, asked the President what his thoughts might be on possibly being replaced by a public figure such as Chip Limehouse or Jenny Sanford.

The President asserted that we need a solid academic, and if this institution moves toward a research university model, then the President ought to be someone who has a research university background and who understands PhD programs and the slippery slope with regard to undergraduate program strength that he mentioned above.
Dan Greenberg, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee asked, given the abysmal market for law school graduates and the declining enrollments in lower-tier law schools, if the President could say more about the appeal of any kind of merger with the Charleston School of Law (CSL).

The President noted that in response to the challenges of New Charleston, professional schools, such as the CSL, and graduate programs could form part of the research university wrapped around a core, which would be the College of Charleston. Also, there’s an appeal in the homegrown nature of CSL, which seems more of a natural to join in with the College, than to be run by a for-profit chain.

There were no more questions.

C. The Provost

See the Provost's Powerpoint slides.

The Provost noted that the African American Studies program proposal was placed on the consent agenda for the upcoming meeting of the CHE. He described the program as a "signature accomplishment."

The Lowcountry Graduate Center now has a new Director, Nancy Muller, who will start in November.

The search for a new Dean of the Libraries yielded 51 applications (there were only 25 in the last search). 12 applicants were interviewed via Skype, and the committee is now looking further into five of those candidates.

The search for a new Dean of the School of Languages, Cultures & World Affairs is being chaired by HHS Dean Jerry Hale. The other committee members are listed in a separate Powerpoint slide.

Questions: none.

4. Old Business

a. Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee

Motion to delete MBAD 500 from program requirements and to add MBAD 520 to program requirements for Master of Business Administration

Introduction

The Speaker reminded the Senate that the motion was a holdover from the September meeting.

Jon Hakkila, Chair - Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee, noted that the main concern in discussion over the motion in September was for the place of ethics in the curriculum (see September’s minutes, 3c(1)). He asked Jim Kindley, Director MBA Program, to speak on the motion.
Kindley noted that he has been teaching at the College for the last two years and has served as Director of the MBA program for one year. He apologized for not being in attendance at the September meeting, explaining that he was unaware that the curriculum motion was being brought before the Senate. He expressed his appreciation for the faculty’s concern over the motion and the attention shared by all, including the MBA program, to having the best programs possible. He explained the reasons for the proposed changes to the program.

- Talks with students in MBAD 500 revealed that they thought the content covered in that course was not worthy of a full semester’s treatment.

- Charleston School of Law students pursuing the dual degree program (MBA & JD) are, under the current program, required to take MBAD 500, which is a law course, and this did not make sense given the agreement governing the program.

- CHE has limited the MBA to only 36 hours. 27 hours are in required courses, with nine in an area of focus, which he emphasized, is "not very much."

- The MBA faculty committee determined that the charter of MBA program, which has a global orientation, was more effectively met by requiring MBAD 520, with its emphasis on global commerce, and shifting MBAD 500 to a possible elective. The decision was made after considerable debate and discussion. They also looked into the core curricula in aspirational peer schools, including William and Mary, Vanderbilt, and Kellogg, and the proposed change would make CofC’s program more closely parallel in the core to these schools.

- The committee took the proposed changes to the MBA faculty "in total, along with the department chairs, all of whom approved" the proposal, Kindley said.

- In January of last year, the proposal came before the full faculty of the School of Business at a faculty meeting and was approved by the full faculty, and Kindley noted, "we have the notes to those meetings," if needed.

The concern over the ethics issue, Kindley affirmed, is legitimate, and we would all agree that ethics "stands in the forefront of the school's and the College's charter." Furthermore, he stressed that faculty emphasize ethics as appropriate in the classroom. In addition, every syllabus is required to contain the honor code. "Ethical issues have not been pushed out in any possible way," he asserted.

Kindley also pointed out that the MBA program, though this is not in the course catalog, has a preterm program that is two and a half week's long and in which corporate governance, corporate social responsibility, and ethical issues are discussed. A panel of outside people come in for two to three full days of addressing these issues, which were at the core of the course being replaced in the proposal. The preterm program "sets the right tone for the year for what the faculty do with that issue."
Finally, Kindley expressed hope that he could allay any concerns that the MBA program is not addressing ethics.

Discussion

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if MBAD 500 has been eliminated from the core for the current cohort of students.

Kindley responded "yes."

Shaver followed up with, "before we have approved it?"

Kindley replied that he thought it had been approved, and he did not realize that the proposal had not gotten to the full Senate last year.

Marvin Gonzalez, Senator - School of Business, stated that he does not remember the proposal being approved at a faculty meeting.

Kindley replied that he checked the meeting notes, which verify that it was approved in a January faculty meeting with no objections.

Shaver asserted that minutes are not kept in School of Business meetings, stating that in his time at the College (since 2005), he has never seen minutes of a School of Business meeting.

Kindley replied that "they aren't published, but they are kept."

Shaver replied by saying, "if they aren't published, how is anyone supposed to know what happens?"

Kindley: "were you at that meeting?"

Shaver: "No, but I shouldn’t have to be. I would have voted against it then, but that’s not the issue." Shaver went on to say that deliberative bodies holding public meetings need to provide a public record of their decisions in the form of minutes.

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM, pointed out that the honor code that Kindley noted is published on course syllabi, does not specifically regard ethics in business, and thus is not germane to the discussion. "Why," he asked, "are you removing the only course in the course in the curriculum, as I understand it, that deals with ethics in business?"

Kindley expressed regret that the program cannot offer more courses, but, he reiterated, the full MBA faculty felt that the global commerce course (520) was more important than the law course (500), and the MBA faculty are committed to covering ethics as appropriate in the classroom. This is important, Kindley asserted, and feedback from students, he noted, has pointed that out. In addition, Kindley stated that in his own classes ethics in context is important, as it is in faculty with whom he converses.

Kindley also asserted that, while it may not be present in catalog course descriptions, ethics is often mentioned in course syllabi.
Dustan followed up by stating that ethical problems in international business are a frequent topic of concern, and that "it seems" to him "that it doesn't matter what the students think," but that that ethics should be among the highest order concerns when it comes to international business.

Kindley clarified that he did not say that students thought that ethics were not a concern. The MBA faculty are committed, he noted, to addressing ethics in every possible way: through speakers' presentations, through panels, and within the framework of their courses, for example. "We feel like," he noted "it is woven into every class."

Andrew Shedlock, Senator - Department of Biology asked "does faculty approve the minutes of the previous faculty meetings?"

Kindley indicated "no."

Jen Wright, Senator - HSS, asked if there was an active effort to compensate for the loss of the ethics course (500) in other courses in the core, making sure that what was lost would picked up elsewhere. She said that might allay her concerns.

Kindley noted that MBAD 500 is not an "ethics course" but a "law course" in which ethics is discussed. The concern over ethics, he asserted, is brought to students in a number of ways, reiterating the importance of the preterm program and the treatment of ethics, as appropriate, in classes and their syllabi.

Tom Heeny, American Association of University Professors, asked what implications dropping the course might have for the MBA program's external accreditor, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business.

Kindley replied that the committee felt that the proposal more closely aligned the core with the program’s charter.

Heeny followed up by saying that Kindley’s reply connects to the state-level CHE, asking again how the proposed change would situate the MBA program in relation to the national accreditor, ACASB.

Kindley replied that this concern is handled in the program’s "assessment work."

Dan Greenberg, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, asked if the legal content of the course to be dropped from the core is covered elsewhere in the curriculum or programming.

Kindley responded that students spend a day in orientation talking about corporate governance and legal issues in a general sense. Additionally, MBAD 520, within its focus on global commerce course does cover legal issues, though not in great depth.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, noted that he was at the faculty meeting at which the proposal was approved. He also noted that ethics is discussed in the areas of focus in the MBA in relation to specific industries. He pointed out that the School of Business has five learning
objectives, and that the question of concern for accreditation is how the new class (MBAD 520) meets (or doesn't) these objectives.

Kindley noted that the MBA faculty committee and full faculty found the new course to be consistent with the learning objectives for the purposes of accreditation.

Todd McNerney, Chair - Department of Theatre and Dance, asked if MBAD 520 was not part of one of the concentrations, and if so, what might replace 520 in its concentration.

Kindley replied that another marketing course would replace 520 in its area of focus.

Kelly Shaver reported that he searched MBA program syllabi for four words: ethics, ethical, law, legal. He stressed that does not claim to know, however, what people actually discuss in their classes. The results of the search are:

- 502 - Accounting Issues for the Business Manager: "ethics" listed briefly, no reference to "law" or "legal."
- 504 - Managing and Leading in Organizations: there is a discussion of ethics, but nothing about "law."
- 505 - Creativity and Innovation: none of the words appear.
- 525 - Marketing Management: "ethics" appears briefly, but not "law."
- 590 - Integrated Capstone: "ethics" appears, but not "law."

Kindley responded by noting that the syllabi for next spring have not been published, and so he wondered how Shaver would have copies.

Shaver replied that the syllabi he looked at are available on the web on the MBA program site.

Tom Caroll, Senator - Education, Health, and Human Performance, asked Kindley if he could distinguish, briefly, between 518 - Global Economy and 520 - Global Enterprise.

Kindley described 518 as a macroeconomics course, whereas 520 covers global trade, supply chain, and so forth.

Phil Dustan expressed feeling in a bit of quandary in that he has not heard enough about the proposal to render a judgment, but at the same time, he wondered how much more information he could get from any other source, such as the committee that brought the motion.
Jon Hakkila, Chair - Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee, asserted that, having just joined the committee this year, he knows as much as Dustan does.

Dustan replied by saying that his gut feeling is to vote against the motion and to let the committee bring another motion forward that addresses the issues.

The Speaker clarified that if the motion were voted down, then the MBA program could bring a new motion to the Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee who could then vet that motion.

Moore Quinn, Senator - Department of Sociology and Anthropology, called the question, which was seconded and passed.

**Decision**

A voice vote was inconclusive, and members voted again by raise of hand.

The motion failed on a vote of 20 (against) - 13 (for).

A question was raised by Wayne Smith, Senator - Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, who asked what should be done regarding the current MBA students, since the change has already been implemented.

The Speaker stated that this is probably something that has to be worked out between the MBA program and the Deans of the Graduate School and the School of Business.

5. **New Business**

   a. Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee

      (1) Program Proposal: Master of Science in Child Life

         **CHE Proposal**

         **Estimated Costs by Year**

         **New Enrollment Table**

         Course Proposals:

         **CHLI 601** Introduction to Child Life
         **CHLI 603** Death and Dying
         **CHLI 604** Program Development and Practicum in Child Life
         **CHLI 605** Psychosocial Aspects of Illness, Trauma, and Hospitalization
         **CHLI 606** Family Issues
         **CHLI 611** Working with Children with Special Needs/Developmental Disabilities
         **CHLI 701** Child Life Internship

         **Introduction**
Jon Hakkila, Chair - Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Committee, asked Susan Simonian, Professor in the Department of Psychology to introduce the motion.

Simonian reported that the program has been in the works for a number of years and that there has been an ongoing collaboration with MUSC in Child Life for years. Child Life is a growing field, now moving beyond the context of children's hospitals, a traditional stronghold of child life programs, to include outpatient facilities and interdisciplinary healthcare centers. With the recognition of the importance of Child Life specialization in various contexts, the market for those holding an MS in Child Life is growing. The National Childlife Council, among other institutions, has stipulated that entry into the field should require a Masters level education. The field is interdisciplinary, and at the College we are uniquely suited to deliver an MS program, and the relationships with MUSC are in place to deliver the practical aspects of the program. The curriculum addresses established needs in the field and also looks toward future needs, such as training in working with children with disabilities. The program is very strong and may be a leader in the field in the near future.

The Speaker recommended discussion of and voting on the course proposals before considering the program proposal itself.

**Discussion of Course Proposals**

None.

**Decision**

All course proposals passed.

**Discussion of the Program Proposal**

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM, asked how much the program will cost and what the source of the funding will be.

Fran Welch, Dean - Education, Health, and Human Performance, replied that Associate Provost Beverly Diamond developed the budget in consultation with the business office and that the budget with be primarily tuition driven. The program should pay for itself, but a fair amount of money has been raised as well, and that fund raising effort will continue.

Dustan followed up by asking whether the program has all its faculty, library resources, and so forth.

Beverly Diamond replied that while some courses will be covered by existing faculty, some will require new faculty over time. Something like 1.33 faculty will be required to staff new courses. The fractional faculty will be teaching in other programs on campus. The budget included in the proposal estimates $142,000 in recurring expenses; the tuition brought in by the 20 students will be on the order of $176,000. There will be a request for new faculty, but tuition will easily cover the expense. Both Dean Welch and Dean Jerry Hale (HSS) have indicated that the MS in Child Life is at the top of their priority list.
Moore Quinn, Senator - Department of Sociology and Anthropology, asked where the program’s students will come from: here or elsewhere?

Simonian replied that as they wait for the program’s approval, they will collect data from our students through interest surveys on campus. Our students have been going to MS Child Life programs elsewhere, so they expect campus interest to be there. Once the program is established, they expect to draw from outside populations.

Jason Coy, Senator - HSS at large, asked if the budget numbers in the proposal account for recruiting fellowships or funding.

Diamond replied that the budget includes around $6,400 for one graduate assistant, but that fund raising will cover assistantships and scholarships.

Coy clarified that he was inquiring also about tuition abatements.

Diamond replied, that yes, they did factor abatements into the proposed budget.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if there has been any talk in the planning group about what might happen in the case of a merger with MUSC.

Simonian replied that the MS in Child Life is an example of a cooperative program with MUSC. Child Life in MUSC is in a service division of the school, not an academic division, which makes the cooperative model so appealing.

Jen Wright, HSS at large, asked if there has been any thought about ensuring that a potential hire for the program has a Psychology PhD so that the clinical background is there.

Simonian asserted that Psychology is represented in the coursework, but under the aegis of Child Life, since the Psychology department has no graduate courses. Faculty from Psychology might be able to teach in the program.

The Speaker asked that the discussion on hiring be discontinued at the moment, since the proposal’s approval or disapproval would not likely be affected by it.

**Decision**

The motion was approved.

---

(2) Masters of Teaching, Learning and Advocacy (MTLA)

Program Changes - add existing courses to requirements of electives, delete courses from requirements or electives, add new emphasis.

Course Proposals:
- [EDFS 705](#) Reflective Practice and Professional Development
- [MTLA 604](#) Identifying and Sustaining Effective Learning Communities
- MTLA XXX Literacies, Identities, and Pop Culture Texts (Literacy Strand):
  - Proposal, Syllabus
Hakkila introduced the motions and asked Christine Finnan, Director - Masters of Teaching, Learning and Advocacy, to speak on them.

Finnan noted that the MTLA has been in place since 2009. Given the rising popularity of the program, and the desire for particular concentrations, the program is morphing to provide, beyond the core courses, a strand on Diverse Learners and one on New Literacies. The latter they expect to grow in popularity due to the states new emphasis on literacies. Another strand with significant interest at present is in Math and Science. This context allowed the program to examine current offerings and locate redundancies or other problems. Hence, EDFS 705 and MTLA 604 are being proposed to be dropped from the curriculum.

MTLA XXXX is a new course proposed for the New Literacies strand.

**Discussion**
None

**Decision**
The motion was approved.

(3) **Master of Public Administration: New Course**

**PUBA 617** Urban Transportation: Problems and Prospects

**Introduction**
Hakkila introduced the motion and asked Phil Jos, Professor - Political Science, to speak on it.

Jos noted that the course has been offered for some time, and this proposal would make it official. Students from both the Masters in Public Administration and Masters in Environmental Science are likely to be interested in the class.

**Discussion**
Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if permission from the instructor would allow entry for undergraduates majoring in the global transportation program in the School of Business.

Jos replied that he thinks so, specifying that, while he doesn’t know what would be the specific GPA requirements, they do have a policy allowing select undergraduates in graduate courses, and he is sure that the MPA director would be amenable to that.

**Decision**
The motion was approved.

**b. General Education Committee**

(1) **Motion** to Replace Humanities Categories with Approval Criteria
**Introduction**

Bob Mignone, Chair of the General Education Committee, asserted that the humanities categories (around a dozen: literature, etc.) are a vestige of the old system and that the approval criteria are a better means of governing what is appropriate to count as a humanities general education course. For instance, a course might fit the approval criteria but not one of the categories.

**Discussion**

None.

**Decision**

The motion was approved.

---

(2) **Motion** to Approve Courses for General Education Status in Humanities

- **DANC 290 - Special Topics in Dance**
- **DANC 330 - History of Non-Western Dance**
- **DANC 331 - History of Western Dance**

**Introduction**

Mignone noted that the Dance courses on the approval list are re-certified courses.

**Discussion**

None.

**Decision**

The motion was approved.

---

(c) Faculty Curriculum Committee

**Course Proposals:** new Courses in **Psychology:** PSYC 374, Sins of Memory; PSYC 461, Advanced Personality Psychology with Lab (add to major accordingly).

**Discussion**

None.

**Decision**

The motions were approved.

---

(1) **Program Change in Urban Studies:** Add Existing Course (POLI 333) to Major

**Discussion**

None.

**Decision**

The motions were approved.
(2) Announcement: New Deadline for Prerequisite Changes

Dan Greenberg, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, explained that a new deadline has been set (12-16-2013) for any changes to appear in the 2014-15 catalog, and he advised Senators to let their departments know.

Discussion

None.

d. Committee on Nominations and Elections

The Speaker, having consulted with Calvin Blackwell, Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, prior to the meeting, sought and received unanimous consent to group motions 2 and 3 (below) and to discuss and vote on those motions first and then address motion 1 (below).

Discussion proceeded in this fashion, but early in the first part of the discussion, Darryl Phillips, Senator - Department of Classics, raised a procedural point that these motions will have to go to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual, and so the Senate will have another chance to discuss them prior to voting. Later, Brain McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Vice President for Executive Administration, reiterated Phillips’s point, adding that in the case of motions for By-Laws changes, the motion is automatically referred to the By-Laws committee. Accordingly, that was the disposition of all three motions: the By-Laws committee will now review the motions. The record below is focused on substantive discussion on the motions in the original agenda order.

(1) Motion to More Clearly Define Faculty Eligibility for Committee Work, Change to By-laws Article V, Section 1, K

Introduction

Blackwell noted that this motion is a little more contentious. A common question he gets as chair of the committee is from adjuncts or visiting professors who wish to serve on college committees. His answer, he said, has been in the negative, but it turns out that the FAM, while it stipulates that faculty serve on committees, does not actually define what is meant by "faculty." Early in the FAM, there is a definition of "regular faculty," but this is not a term used later in the FAM when it nails down who can serve on committees. Last year, he said, he asked the Chair of By-Laws and the Speaker, who both said to not allow adjuncts to serve on committees, and as this was also past practice, he followed it. The motion would clarify the situation, and should the Senate not pass the motion, he asserted, he will interpret faculty "this year in the broadest manner, which means [he] would allow adjuncts and visiting professors going forward to serve on these committees," except Tenure and Promotion, which requires that members are tenured.

Discussion
Brenton LeMesurier, Senator - School of Science and Math, noted, for consideration by the By-Laws committee, that he "would find it more readable if you actually put the words 'regular faculty' into each of the appropriate places so I don't have to read three pages before to know what a paragraph means."

Moore Quinn, Senator - Department of Sociology and Anthropology, asked if we have available what the definition of "regular faculty" is.

Blackwell replied in the affirmative, explaining that "regular faculty" are everyone who are tenure-track or a tenured professor, plus instructors, but not counting full time administrators (President and Provost, for example).

Quinn asked if adjunct faculty would be included under that definition.

Blackwell replied that they would not.

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, inquired how many adjuncts or visiting professors are asking to be on committees.

Blackwell replied that he can remember two adjuncts making a request last spring and one or two visiting professors doing the same.

David Moscowitz, Senator - HSS, asked, if this motion were to pass, would a committee that wanted to have an adjunct or visiting professor not be able to ask for one?

Blackwell replied that the committee slates are put together by his committee, then there's an opportunity for faculty to add to that through nomination and election, if needed. He added that, to his mind, there's no way for a committee to add to itself, other than going through a By-Laws change. There's nothing stopping committee members from inviting anyone to their meetings.

Marianne Verlinden, Senator - School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs, suggested that it would be a good idea to have adjuncts on some committees and expressed concern that the motion might prevent that from happening.

Emily Skinner, Senator - School of Education, Health and Human Performance, stated that on the Faculty Welfare Committee, of which she is a member, they are currently working on motion regarding having adjuncts serve on particular committees, a motion which should be finished soon. She asked if her understanding of the motion under consideration at the moment is correct: does it just define what "regular faculty" is.

Blackwell noted that this motion would, in effect, say "for the remainder of this section, which is like, 40 pages of the FAM, where it says 'faculty,' we mean 'regular faculty,' and 'regular faculty' means this..." So, if this motion were to pass and Welfare wanted to move that adjuncts could serve on a particular committee, the Welfare motion would need to say something like, "but for this committee, adjuncts can serve." And this would be committee by committee, and the motion under discussion at present would not preclude the foregoing.

Blackwell asked a procedural question: because his committee did not bring the motion to the Senate as necessary "the best" solution to the problem, but mainly
to clarify the situation, he asked if it is possible to change it once it comes back from By-Laws, without having to return it to By-Laws.

The Speaker replied that, based on a case from last year, motions brought to the Senate by the By-Laws committee can be debated and voted on.

(2) **Motion** to Exclude Faculty Members Currently under Review from the Post-Tenure Review Committee, Change to By-laws Article V, Section 3, B 15 a 5 &

(3) **Motion** to Exclude Faculty Members Currently under Review from the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion and Third-Year Review, Change to By-laws Article V, Section 3, B 7 a 5

**Introduction**

Blackwell explained that these two changes are primarily "housekeeping" in nature, formalizing past practice of the committee. Blackwell stated that, as the Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, he is uncomfortable telling faculty that they cannot do things not explicitly enjoined by the FAM.

**Discussion**

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM at large, asked if this could this be simplified into one statement: if you are going up for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review, you are not allowed to serve on these committees?

Blackwell replied by asking where such a statement might go in the FAM, which is uncertain. He pointed out that these motions are designed to follow the structure of the FAM, which defines what committees do one at a time and the rules governing those committees.

6. **Constituents’ Concerns**

For the good of the order and the irony, Phil Jos observed that after the September meeting’s "hour and a half" or so of "self-flagellation," the very next day we were on the front page of the *Post and Courier* in a story on the September meeting’s Resolution that the Board of Trustees Conduct a National Search for the next President of the College and subsequent (see 10 September minutes, 3D).

7. **Adjournment:** 7:12 PM.
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, 10 September 2013

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 10 September 2013, at 5:00 P.M. in the Beatty Center 115 (Wells Fargo Auditorium)

1. Call to Order: 5:07PM by Lynn Cherry, Speaker of the Faculty

2. 2 & 9 April 2013 Minutes were approved as circulated.

3. Reports (The Speaker, Brian McGee (in lieu of President Benson), and Provost George Hynd)

   A. The Speaker

      The speaker welcomed all new senators, welcomed back all returning senators, and introduced the senate officers: Mike Duvall (Faculty Secretary), Heather Alexander (Faculty Secretariat), and George Pothering (Parliamentarian). She also reminded faculty of the rules for speaking:

      - It is an open meeting, so anyone can speak. However, only senators can vote.
      - Speakers should identify themselves and their affiliations before speaking.
      - Speakers should speak up so everyone can hear.
      - Robert’s Rules of Order limit the number of times a person can speak on the same topic/issue to two times, though the Speaker can allow latitude as needed, so long as precedence is given to those who have not spoken.

      Mike and Heather will be trying a different way of producing the agenda with the goal of going paperless (or at least an agenda that uses less paper).

      The speaker asked that senators please provide feedback on the tobacco-free campus policy recently circulated by the President and to encourage colleagues, staff, and students to do so as well. The deadline is Saturday, Sept. 28.

      On the Presidential search, the Speaker reported that she spoke with Greg Padgett, Chair of the Board of Trustees, on Friday (September 6), who indicated that there will be a process for the search, the Board will be seeking the service of a consultant, and that the Chair is hoping to finalize this decision soon. The search will be a national search. There are no targeted individuals: all interested parties will have to apply and go through the search process. Faculty will be included in the process, although the Chair has not yet made decisions regarding the specific composition of the search committee.

      The speaker also noted a change to the evening’s meeting agenda. In lieu of the President making his report, Brian McGee will present a report on the results of the Great Colleges to Work For survey done last year. The President will speak at the October meeting.
B. Brian McGee, Chief of Staff and Senior Vice President for Executive Administration

Before starting the presentation on the Great Colleges to Work For survey, McGee noted that we have had a successful submission of our fifth-year interim report to our regional accreditor, SACSCOC, and he thanked many in the room who made contributions to the effort.

He also explained that very few members of the senior staff, regrettably, were able to make it to the annual welcome back picnic due to obligations representing the College elsewhere and, in the case of the President, illness.

Finally, he offered to address questions anyone might have about the tobacco-free policy after his presentation.

Great Colleges to Work For: 2013 Results (Presentation Slides)

Note: please see the presentation slides accompanying the report at the meeting, See below for moments at which McGee offered significant context, amplification, or remarks that go beyond the slides’ content.

McGee pointed out that the College of Charleston is not listed in the Chronicle of Higher Education's report on the Great Colleges to Work For (GCTWF) because, like the majority of colleges surveyed, we are not recognized as a "great college to work for" in any one of the survey's 12 categories.

The survey, however, also provides information that the College itself can use to make improvements.

The survey group (227 institutions) amounts to about 20% of four-year colleges and universities in the US, a number that is somewhat down from prior samples, perhaps owing to attrition from institutions unhappy with not appearing in the lists of great colleges to work for.

Sam Houston State University’s web site provides an example of how some colleges use the survey to promote themselves, but also how a college might solicit positive survey feedback and thus potentially sully the results. We ran a clean survey in this regard by asking faculty and staff to respond to the survey without prompting for how they should respond.

The President and the Provost, acting on a Faculty Senate resolution, agreed not only to participate in the survey, but to pay for additional services (about $7,000), including access to all the data generated for our own analysis. We had a slightly above average response rate to our survey in comparison to other institutions participating.
The College did not score as "high achieving" in any of the survey categories. We tend to score in the average or slightly below average range in multiple comparison groups. Some school sample sizes at the College may have been a little too small. The adjunct faculty response rate was "really, really terrible," and it's an open question how to improve that for the next round of the survey.

Scores reported on the first 2013 Survey Results slide (Strengths) are the addition of "strongly agree" and "agree" scores. In the "Job Satisfaction/Support" category, "job satisfaction" labels an intrinsic quality ("I love the work I do," etc.). The "support" element actually pulled the category score down. There was less satisfaction with support, relative to the reported intrinsic benefits of the job. Also, the 'Professional Development" score, while strong, referred to "opportunities" but not to resources, which, had that been the focus of the prompt, might have generated perhaps lower numbers.

In the weaknesses slide, "senior leadership" is defined as the President and those who report to the President, yet open-ended comments in the survey indicate that, for some respondents, "senior leadership" includes the Board of Trustees, and for some of the respondents, it included Deans and Associate Provosts and others who do not report to the President.

The slides labeled "2013 Comment Results" convey the result of McGee's content analysis of responses to the two open-ended questions in the survey.

All the data from the survey are available to anyone who wishes to review them and/or do further analysis on them. A flash drive with the data will be given to the Speaker and another to Ashleigh Parr, Chair of the Staff Advisory Committee to the President.

As context for the next steps, salary and benefits, during 2012-13, the College had 4.5% to use for faculty raises. and considering AAUP salary data from spring 2012 to spring 2013, some positive shifts are evident in faculty salaries, especially at the Associate and full Professor ranks. Also, last year and the year before, step increments for promotions were increased, and this year the President has approved a third increase in the promotion increments.

The President hopes a staff recognition program somewhat analogous to the faculty recognition program can be put into place in the near future. The President also intends to push for benefit enhancements.

At the presentation's conclusion, there were no questions.

C. The Provost (Presentation Slides)
Note: please see the presentation slides accompanying the report at the meeting. See below for moments when the Provost offered significant context, amplification, or remarks that go beyond the slides’ content.

The Provost noted that, since there was a recent forum on the ongoing conversations on collaboration/merger between MUSC and CofC, his presentation will not speak to that issue.

Academic programs listed on the third slide have been approved or are in the pipeline to be approved.

Exercise Science, at a little over two years in, has around 250 students enrolled, and the programs in health education and health promotion are attracting many students.

Archaeology is successful.

African American Studies is soon to be approved and will be only the third such program in a state institution in South Carolina.

Bachelors of Professional Studies is to be officially launched soon.

The School of Business will be breaking apart their bachelors degree in Business Administration and carving out two majors: Finance and Economics. They have also developed a 2+1+1 relationship, in which Law students at the Charleston School of Law take two years of Legal Studies, then enroll in an accelerated MBA program at the College for a year, and then return to the School of Law for a year, and in the process they an MBA and JD.

Senior Project brings rising high school seniors (primarily students of color and first generation college students) for a five-day summer experience in which they live in our residence halls and learn about how to apply for college, about financial aid, how to take the SAT, tour CofC, MUSC, and the School of Law. The program encourages students to pursue a college education, it serves to recruit students for the College, and is an investment in underserved groups.

Honors College information reflects numbers yet to be finalized. More students than ever are pursuing the William Aiken Fellowship.

The figures under the "Making Progress" header on the fourth slide refer to external funding. The percentage of external funding that is federal is shrinking somewhat over the past few years. 67% of external funding goes to the School of Science and Mathematics.

Out-of-state applications, compared to in-state applications, suggest that admission to the College is highly desirable among prospective students all over the country. We have a rising national visibility and respect.
Our first-year retention rate is very good among our peers.

Georgia, North Carolina, New Jersey, and New York contribute the most out of state students to our student body.

Items with an asterisk in the slide on the campus master plan are projects that are underway. Within three years, if all goes according to plan, the campus will be transformed with new facilities.

At the presentation's conclusion, there were no questions.

D. **Vince Benigni**, Faculty Representative for Athletics *(Presentation Slides)*

Note: please see the presentation slides accompanying the report at the meeting. See below for moments when Benigni offered significant context, amplification, or remarks that go beyond the slides' content.

Trisha Folds-Bennet has agreed to be the College's leader for the Colonial Academic Alliance's (CAA) program for undergraduate academic research.

At the presentation's conclusion, there were no questions.

3. **New Business**

A. **Election of Speaker Pro Tempore**

   Jen Wright, Senator - HSS, was nominated and elected by acclamation.

B. **General Education Committee (GEC)**

   (1) **Motion to Approve Courses for General Education Status**

   **Introduction**

   Bob Mignone, GEC Chair, explained that the courses up for approval did not make last year's deadline and thus have come to the Senate's first meeting this year. He also explained that the GEC evaluates courses for general education status for alignment with both the approval criteria and the assessment standards.

   Humanities courses up for approval
   - **CPLT 200** - Special Topics in Comparative Literature
   - **CPLT 390** - Special Topics in Comparative Literature
   - **ENGL 226** - Survey of World Literature
   - **JWST 245/ENGL 191** - Introduction to Jewish-American Literature
   - **JWST 335** - Modern Jewish Politics
LATN 305 - Medieval Latin  
LTAR 220 - Modern Arabic Fiction

Social Science course up for approval  
HONS 167 - Introduction to Sociology

**Discussion**  
A couple corrections were made to prefixes in the documents ("LATIN" was changed to "LATN" and "CLPT" to "CPLT")

**Decision**  
All courses were approved.

(2) Motion to Approve New Forms For General Education

**Introduction**  
Mignone noted that once approved, these forms would be on the website and available for proposals this year.

Forms submitted for approval  
Foreign Language  
History (Pre-modern and Modern)  
Humanities  
Math/Logic  
Natural Science  
Social Science  
Writing  
Form for courses proposed to be removed from general education status

**Discussion**  
Kelly Shaver, Senator - Department of Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if the forms could be made so that they can be filled out, saved, and submitted online. He asserted that as many campus forms as possible should be converted to electronic forms.

Cathy Boyd, Registrar, indicated that some faculty forms for student records (grade change, etc.) are going to go electronic only in the near future.

Dan Greenberg, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee (FCC), noted that the FCC has proposed to Checkpoint, a post-Battery committee having jurisdiction over this issue, to have FCC forms made electronic.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, said that the Office of Academic Affairs has committed a leader to the FCC forms project, though to her knowledge, the project has not yet been scored for priority. If the score is high enough, Academic Affairs will do what they can to keep the project moving
Greenberg said the project scored 86, to which Caveny-Noecker replied that a number of project have that same score.

The Speaker said that the answer to Shaver’s question is that we are trying to convert forms on many fronts.

Shaver asked if GEC forms could be made in Microsoft Word format instead of PDF because he could at least fill those out on the computer. Mignone replied that the GEC forms under discussion could be provided Word format.

The Speaker asked Mignone to work with the appropriate parties to make the forms electronic, and he agreed.

Brenton LeMesurier, Senator - SSM, that PDF files can be filled out on a computer or tablet as well.

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, pointed out that the History form has an error at the bottom of the form: in one instance, it says "Modern" where it needs to say "Pre-Modern." Mignone noted the correction.

**Decision**
All forms approved.

C. Graduate Education Committee

**Introduction**
Jon Hakkila explained that motions under consideration were put together by last year’s committee and that he was not on the committee at that time. He said that he could not speak to the motions.

(1) Master of Business Administration

**Motion** to delete MBAD 500 from program requirements and to add MBAD 520 to program requirements

**Discussion**

The Speaker asked if anyone from the School of Business might be able to speak if there are questions.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, spoke against the motion. He read the catalog description of MBAD 500, the course to be deleted:

"A study of legal and ethical issues regarding the structure and operation of corporations. Topics include the corporation as a legal and moral 'person'; legal and ethical responsibilities of directors, shareholders and officers in the U.S. and
internationally; and government regulation of corporations, securities markets, and fair competition."

Shaver asserted that a careful reading of the syllabuses in the eight other core courses for the MBA looking for the words "law" or "legal" reveals no references to either word in any of the core course syllabuses, besides MBAD 500. Doing the same for "ethics" or "ethical," neither word appears in four of the core course syllabuses, brief references appear in two, and some "minor discussion" of these appear in the remaining two. He expressed grave concern that if the motion passes, the College of Charleston will be seen as eliminating the teaching of ethics in business in its MBA program. He encouraged like-minded senators to vote against the motion.

Jen Wright, Senator - HSS, asked if Shaver’s review of syllabuses included MBAD 520’s, the course in the motion that replaces MBAD 500, and queried whether 520 would fill the gap.

Shaver said that we do not have a syllabus for 520. 520, he said, is currently part of the Marketing concentration in the MBA. Raising another issue, he said that moving the course from the concentration to the core allows students pursuing the Marketing concentration to "double dip."

Phil Jos, Senator - HSS, noted that a typical rationale given when a course in ethics is removed from a curriculum is that, rather than locate the concern for ethics in a single course, it is infused throughout the courses in the curriculum. Does anyone know, he asked, if that is the logic in this proposal?

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, said that he teaches in the MBA program and, while he cannot speak to the non-Hospitality courses, ethics is a "big part" of every course in the Hospitality concentration. He added that a discussion of ethics is embedded in a course he regularly teaches.

Shaver replied that he didn't look at the concentrations but exclusively at the core, but that one should expect a coverage of ethics and law in the core.

Paul Young, Senator - Mathematics, asked if anyone could speak to whether these concerns were expressed in the Graduate Education Committee when they were considering the motion or if this concern is being expressed for the first time now.

Amy McCandless, Dean of the Graduate School and ex officio member of the committee, emphasized that there was a great concern for the importance for ethics and its infusion throughout the curriculum. She also noted that that the substitution of 520 for 500 was due to concern for effective course sequencing within the face-paced MBA program.
Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM, asked if the present motion could be tabled until someone could come and speak on it. With advice from the Parliamentarian, Dustan moved that discussion of the motion be postponed until the next Senate meeting. The motion was seconded.

**Discussion of the motion to postpone discussion**

Shaver said that he would vote against the motion to postpone as well, since he thinks the issue is clear.

**Decision on the motion to postpone discussion**

Discussion postponed until the October meeting.

(2) Master of Arts in Teaching

**Motion** to delete EDEE 664 from program requirements and to add EDEE 690 to program requirements

**Discussion**

Beth Lloyd, Senator - Teacher Education, offered to speak on the motion. 664 covers physical education, which is a valued area of instruction, but a survey of students showed that they needed a classroom management course more. The objectives for 664, the course to be deleted, have been moved into the syllabuses of the other courses in the program.

**Decision**

Motion passed.

(3) Master of Science in Environmental Studies

**Motion** to add new course, EVSS 669, and permission to cross-list EVSS 669 with GEOL 469

**Discussion**

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM, asked if GEOL 469 is an existing course and how long it has been taught.

The Speaker asked if anyone from Science might be able to address the question.

Dan Greenberg, Chair of FCC, said that GEOL 469 is in the catalog as "Advanced GIS - Environmental and Hazards Modeling" but that he could not speak to how long it has been taught.

Dustan then asked how the graduate course differs from the undergraduate course.

Jason Overby, Senator - SSM, called attention to the proposal itself, which states that the "graduate-level GEOL 669 will be structured separately and students
will be assessed and evaluated under a different set of rubrics as those in the undergraduate-level course."

**Decision**
Motion passed.

**D. Motion to Approve a Resolution** that the Board of Trustees Conduct a National Search for the next President of the College: Christian Coseru, Senator - Department of Philosophy

**Introduction**
Christian Coseru, Senator - Philosophy, sponsor of the motion, asked the Speaker, whose report indicated that the Presidential search will be national, how certain it is that it will be. He also asked Todd Grantham, Chair of the Department of Philosophy and author of the resolution, to introduce it.

The Speaker said that when she spoke with Greg Padgett, Chair of the Board of Trustees, that is what he said. She added, however, that she thought it was appropriate to discuss the motion on the floor and, if the Senate is so inclined, for it to be approved.

Grantham said that he drafted the resolution working with others, including department chairs across the institution. At the time, there were stories in the news about the search and about the interest expressed by local politicians in the Presidency, and at that time, not having any of the current information about the search, he thought it important that the faculty express its wishes that a national search be done to secure the best qualified candidates. Another focal point in the resolution is inclusivity in the process, with faculty and other constituents being on the search committee. And because of the need for inclusivity, communication to all constituencies should be a priority as well, and this is reflected in the resolution.

The motion was seconded by Scott Peeples, Senator - HSS.

**Discussion**
Scott Peeples, Senator - HSS, argued that considering the motion was still worthwhile and that if it affirms what Padgett has said, that's perfectly fine. But the resolution actually goes a little bit further, adding that candidate should have significant higher education experience, and it's important to voice that.

Jason Overby, Senator - SSM, asked for a clarification: were faculty included in the two previous national searches? And, was there a motion like this for previous searches? It seems, he asserted, that the resolution might be out of bounds, considering the prior searches.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker said that in the two prior national searches, the Speaker
was in conversation with the Chair of the Board of Trustees. In the search from which President Higdon was hired, then Chair of the Board, Joel Smith was sensitive to having good faculty representation on the committee (the Speaker and two other faculty members). In the next search, her recollection is that faculty needed to push harder for the number of representatives desired. In the second search committee, there were more board members and less representation by other groups, which showed in the decision. One thing to remember, she added, is that in searches, boards tend to emphasize fundraising and legislative relationships. Faculty have an additional and important perspective: we want academic leadership or at least respect for the academic leadership of the Provost, the Deans, and the faculty. She cautioned that, while she appreciates the resolution, it will take much more to ensure our voice is heard in the process. We can't underestimate the importance of our having a voice at every stage of the hiring process. It is our collective responsibility, she added.

Brian McGee pointed out that the resolution calls for staff representation, and that addition does mark a material change from past practice. Also, the Association of Governing Boards recommends a broad and inclusive search committee that includes not just faculty and staff, but also community members. He added that he knows the Board of Trustees are aware of that statement, though that is not necessarily an agreement to abide by the statement.

Caveny-Noecker suggested that the resolution might need a change, the addition of "committee" in the fourth paragraph of the resolution, but since she is not a Senator, she could not offer it as a friendly amendment.

Coseru, taking up the suggestion, offered a friendly amendment to the resolution as follows:

Original:
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The College needs to find a dynamic, visionary, and highly qualified person to lead us toward our envisioned future. Toward this end, the Faculty Senate recommends that the Board of Trustees organize a national search for the next President of the College that includes representatives from all stakeholders, including faculty, staff, alumni, students, and administrators; and

Amended (added language underlined):
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The College needs to find a dynamic, visionary, and highly qualified person to lead us toward our envisioned future. Toward this end, the Faculty Senate recommends that the Board of Trustees organize a national search for the next President of the College with a search committee that includes representatives from all stakeholders, including faculty, staff, alumni, students, and administrators; and

Brenton LeMesurier, Senator - SSM, observed that the resolution might also need to include "community members" in its list of stakeholders.

Jon Hakkila, Department of Physics and Astronomy, suggested that "stakeholders" is an inclusive label under which "community" might be expected to fall.
Phil Jos, Senator - HSS, argued to include "community members" in the list following "stakeholders" because if the Board of Trustees, our audience, is already thinking about including community members, then we’ll send a signal that we appreciate that or that it’s consistent with the faculty’s view of an inclusive committee.

Jos offered the above as a friendly amendment, which was accepted by Coseru, and resulted in the following:

Amended (added language underlined):
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The College needs to find a dynamic, visionary, and highly qualified person to lead us toward our envisioned future. Toward this end, the Faculty Senate recommends that the Board of Trustees organize a national search for the next President of the College with a search committee that includes representatives from all stakeholders, including faculty, staff, alumni, students, administrators, and community members; and

Phil Dustan expressed skepticism about the addition of "community members" as too much of a "catch-all" term. It could be interpreted to mean any number of communities.

Darryl Phillips, Classics, objected to the friendly amendment of adding "community members" to the resolution as above on the grounds that it is a substantive change and not merely something that might have been inadvertently left out of the original.

The Parliamentarian at this point instructed the Senate that the amendment would need a second for discussion to continue.

A second was offered and discussion continued.

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, argued against the amendment because the stakeholders already listed have particular knowledge of the College, and outside community members may not know enough to render a good decision.

Brenton LeMesurier, Senator - SSM, mentioned that we ought to in some way consider in the search process the the community of future students we might serve as well and the addition of "community members" would allow for that.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asserted that he would be amazed if the Board of Trustees would think "community members" to include potential students. The phrase can be so easily misread, he added, that it should not be in the resolution.

Coseru argued that "community members" simply further specifies that there could be other parties not include in the specific list following "stakeholders." This would allow the statement to be inclusive, without nailing it down too narrowly.

Dustan replied that "stakeholders" has a special meaning, while "community
members" is too broadly construable and might allow the inclusion of parties that we might not have considered stakeholders.

David Moscowitz, Senator - HSS, asked if the addition of "community members" is essential to central purpose of motion.

Jos replied that it is not.

Morgan Koerner, Senator - German and Slavic Studies, noted that the resistance to the amendment that would add "community members" to the list of stakeholders seems to be coming from fear of what possibilities it might open.

Coseru replied with a suggestion that we might further specify the phrase's meaning via a phrase like "community members at the College of Charleston."

Overby called the question and it was seconded and passed with no discussion.

The motion to amend the resolution to add "and community members" to list of stakeholders failed.

Tony Leclerc, Senator - Computer Science, said that the language of the resolution is bloated and wordy, and that it offers statements that would be hard to test in terms of measuring outcomes.

Grantham argued that, for what it's worth, the resolution, worded as it is, is what we have before us, and that if senators like the sentiment, they should vote for it. The senate floor, he added, is not a good place to wordsmith.

**Decision**

The motion for the resolution passed, as below:

A Resolution that the Board of Trustees Conduct
A National Search for the next President of the College

WHEREAS: Public Colleges and Universities in the United States are facing complex challenges, including: lower levels of State support, rising tuition, rapidly changing technologies for delivering course content on-line, and increased State and Federal oversight aimed at increasing accountability and controlling costs; and

WHEREAS: The Faculty, Administration, and Board of Trustees of the College are all committed to enhancing the quality of the graduate and undergraduate programs we offer; and

WHEREAS: The By-Laws of The Board of Trustees do not explicitly state any procedures for how to search for a new President.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The College needs to find a dynamic, visionary, and highly qualified person to lead us toward our envisioned future. Toward this end, the Faculty Senate recommends that the Board of Trustees organize a national search for the next President of the
College with a search committee that includes representatives from all stakeholders, including faculty, staff, alumni, students, and administrators; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: In order to successfully lead our institution in this challenging environment, well-qualified candidates must have significant administrative leadership experience in higher education (or must have both significant leadership experience and a thorough understanding of the current challenges facing institutions of higher education); and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED THAT: The organization and progress of the search be communicated to the campus community in a timely fashion.

E. Re-envisioning the Faculty Senate: Heath Hoffman, Chair of Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Heath Hoffman noted that in his experience of serving in the Faculty Senate for two years as a Senator at large for the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, he too frequently found the senate to be operating as a reactive and rubber-stamping body. The operations are often terribly inefficient, as exampled by the prior 20 or more minute discussion and wordsmithing of the resolution just passed. He expressed concern that we need a better system, though he qualified that by suggesting that we have a culture problem. System changes won’t necessarily change culture, but they might help. He named some specific areas that we might address, including the need to trust in the work done by our colleagues on some of the committees, notably the FCC, rather than having them laboriously present already thoroughly vetted proposals for approval on the Senate floor. He also singled out the practice of delivering reports on the Senate floor as time-consuming and inefficient. We might consider, instead, having reports provided earlier, asking Senators to review them ahead of time, and to reserve the Senate’s floor time for questions and discussion. In the end, he asserted, we seem to be spending too much time on things that don’t much matter and less on our many significant issues.

Questions/Discussion

Jen Wright, Senator - HSS, asked how we can go about making substantial change.

Hoffman reiterated that we will need a cultural shift to see substantial change, but that we might consider having more delegation, even the creation of ad hoc committees, in cases, for instance, where the language of a motion or resolution might need to be changed. Not only was this meeting’s resolution debate an example of such a moment, but, to his mind, debate last year over suggested Faculty Administration Manual (FAM) language regarding diversity training as evidence for effective teaching was as well.

Small steps and small changes could help form a better culture.

Meg Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, expressed strong support for the sentiment of Hoffman’s presentation but felt that we need to be cautious in cases
like language of the FAM. The language changes in that document seem significant enough to warrant some floor debate and changes, if needed.

The Speaker clarified that the FAM-language debate was over a resolution. The Senate does not have jurisdiction to make changes to the FAM.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, pointed out that the Faculty By Laws Committee is tasked with ensuring the FAM is kept in good shape. The Provost has authority to make changes to certain parts of the FAM with or without faculty approval, so it’s essential that we always be in conversation with Academic Affairs over FAM matters.

Phil Dustan, Senator - SSM, expressed agreement that we need to be in an ongoing conversation with the Provost, but he added that a central problem is a lack of truly shared governance. If the faculty had greater say and authority, the Senate would be more proactive. As things are, however, the faculty does not have much say.

Hoffman noted that faculty committees are getting things done, and to that extent, at least, we are sharing governance.

Darryl Phillips, Senator - Classics, noted that he has served in the Senate going on nine years, including a year as Speaker, and he expressed full support for Hoffman’s analysis. He thinks there’s a real problem, and the present meeting was a clear example. He asserted that Senators, those making reports or motions, and committee chairs and representatives shepherding work through the Senate need to come prepared and need to understand the procedures (Roberts Rules).

Scott Peeples, Senator - HSS, expressed agreement with Phillips and noted that a few years prior there was an effort to make the Senate more efficient, the signal achievement of which was to make it a smaller. The present meeting served as evidence that the efficiency effort was not completely successful. We need, he asserted, to take the job more seriously, and he asked how we might reconstruct our processes.

Hoffman reiterated that culture is really hard to change, and changing a few rules won’t do it alone.

Mary Beth Heston, Senator - Art History, pointing out that many in the room were clearly tired after a long meeting following a long day, asked if we should invite colleagues to contact Hoffman to get a conversation started outside the Senate.

Susan Farrell, Senator - HSS, said that part of our problem is the “endless” reporting. We could go a long way toward improving conditions by cutting the reporting.

Irina Gigova, Senator - HSS, indicated that one of the most positive features of the Senate is the chance it affords faculty to develop a broader understanding of the
larger issues afoot at the College and to have conversation with colleagues across schools, departments, and programs. We should try to retain that valuable element of service in the Senate as we think of changes to make. Also, she agrees that reports could be posted ahead of meetings, read by members before the meeting, and that members could be prepared to ask questions.

Evan Parry, Senator - Theater, noted that he agrees with many of the ideas circulating in the discussion. But he offered a note similar to Gigova's. After a year of conversations and debate on general education reform, the votes on which went against his own position, he said that he initially felt let down. Yet, he asserted, that the process was of great value to him, and he thinks, to the faculty, in his realization that across different organizational units and departments, we sometimes have very different viewpoints and modes of thinking. The Senate, even at a contentious time, has value in that way.

Jason Overby, Senator - SSM, said that while he applauds Hoffman for his candor; the bigger issue is shared faculty governance: what do we have power over?

Closing the discussion, the Speaker noted that there seems to be consensus around the issues and ideas Hoffman raised and asked Hoffman if he would be willing to keep the conversation going outside the senate and to keep her in the loop.

4. Old Business
   None

5. Constituents’ Concerns

   Brian McGee offered his thanks and appreciation for the work done by Jim Posey and the IT staff for all their work on the Great Colleges to Work For survey.

6. Adjournment

   The meeting was adjourned at 7:17PM