
ABSENT: Maria Torres, Karen Aquirre

ELECTION OF FACULTY SENATE OFFICERS: Dave Evans was re-elected Chair, Susan Webb was elected Vice Chair and Susan Slavik was elected Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: A motion was made by Rob Young, seconded by Deb Walker to accept the July 11, 2007 minutes as emailed. The motion passed.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT: We met last week for the express purpose of appointing 5 members to the Senate standing Strategic Planning Committee. Evans will rotate back on, Tom Secrest, Susan Slavik, Charmaine Tomczyk and Keith Walters have agreed to serve. These will be the people, along with those continuing to serve, to be sure that the faculty voice is heard.

Evans said with our growth, we now have 257 full-time faculty. The College of Business grew the fastest (percentage wise), College of Humanities and Fine Arts is now the leader, and there were ten new faculty in Science.

Evans amended the order of the Agenda. Roman numeral VI. Provost and Other Administrative Reports, will now become VI. PRESIDENT REPORT.

PRESIDENT REPORT: President DeCenzo congratulated the newly elected officers, and looks forward to working with them.

DeCenzo said he wanted to talk about communications coming out of his office and some things that are about to take place so that we open up communications and the dialogue between us. DeCenzo said he has about seven items he would to address.

First, DeCenzo said, we can dispense with this rather quickly. Eddie Dyer is here to talk about the Strategic Planning, and questions raised about that will be deferred to Eddie. From DeCenzo’s
perspective he encourages the senators to participate. There are many, many open forums and we are trying to get as much information as possible, working in conjunction with some senate committees, to ultimately present to the Board of Trustees, where we would like to see this University go. “Make no mistake about it,” DeCenzo said, “final call in all of this belongs to the Board of Trustees because they set the policy.”

The second element is communication itself. This is something that DeCenzo needs everyone’s help on. One of the things that he is finding and is about to correct part of it, is that we are moving at rapid speed right now. One of his short falls, DeCenzo said, is “I don’t stop sometimes to get the information out quickly enough.” Part of that is he has not been able to stop given so many of the things we’re doing and he is trying to correct that. He is hiring a special assistant to the President whose primary responsibility will be for communications out of the President’s office. He wants to be sure that there are pieces of information that the senate is aware of, that you understand what’s taking place, and this person will be a primary go to resource for all of us. He will make the announcement soon, but he has hired Mary Eaddy. For those who may not know, Mary was at the University years ago, she is somebody who specializes in communications, and DeCenzo said he thinks she will be a wonderful addition to what we are ultimately trying to do. One of the things he hopes everyone will consider doing, is to ask questions and expect answers. DeCenzo said you have every right to ask those questions, and demand answers for them. He will tell you what he knows, if he can’t answer it, he will tell you he can’t answer it. There are a couple of things people ask that because of some sensitivity or some other matters, he can’t go into detail. When that happens, he will let you know that. There is one thing he is absolutely going to demand, and that is if you have a questions, if you have a concern, if you have a complaint, own it. Sending him an anonymous letter is not helping him. He can’t go through an anonymous letter and pick out what is really being said nor have a contact so that he can seek additional information. He will do what he can to protect your confidentiality, but if it’s simply an anonymous letter that comes into me, there is nothing he can do with it. He hopes that ultimately we build that relationship where you feel comfortable enough to tell him something that is a major complaint, that you will take some ownership and say “this is my perspective.” “I need that information, I need to be able to go back to people and say give me more information. When it comes in anonymously, I have no ability to do follow-up nor do I have any ability if I find there are valid reasons behind it to come back and say thank you for bringing that to my attention.” DeCenzo said he wants everyone to understand that his door is open, his email is open, however you want to communicate, is great, but please take some ownership, as “I cannot deal with the anonymous letters.” DeCenzo said in referring to the letters he receives, he and the administration cannot fix what they don’t know is broken, but he added, don’t create things that are broken that are not.

Dave Evans made a comment earlier in the Senate meeting about faculty positions in Science. We are asking for 79 & ¾ positions FTE next year. As you know we have 54 this year, and we have been getting somewhere in the neighborhood of 50, we are going to be able to budget and sustain about another 80 FTE, and here’s how it’s going to break down: we are going to be eliminating the instructor positions and converting all of those to lecturers, and that is basically about 25 FTE. We’re also looking at hiring roughly 26 & 2/3 FTE faculty for a total of new, benefited faculty, 51.67 That is basically 64.7 percent of all requested positions. Now again, DeCenzo said, we have to get approval. But understand that our commitment is to make sure we have the appropriate faculty sourcing on this campus. We want a faculty ratio that is accurate, we want a faculty ratio
that is consistent with what this University is about. Where those positions go, that is up to the Provost and the Deans, but they will be based on specific needs.

Third element: there are a lot of questions about money, and one of the things I’ve seen in the years I’ve been coming to Faculty Senate, people have asked how much do we spend on athletics. This year we are spending 7.8 million dollars or 11 percent of our budget on athletics. This year we are spending 39.3 million or 53 percent of our budget on academics. DeCenzo said he wants the university to know that the majority of our expenditures do go to academics on this campus. That is something that his administration has pledged to make sure stays true.

Couple of other items, there is a lot going on with rumor mills, and let me try dispelling a few of them, DeCenzo said. One – you’re going to see some personnel changes, probably in the next couple of weeks. However, the broad sweeping reorganization that I’m hearing in the rumor mill is not correct. We will do nothing of a major reshaping, reorganizing, if at all, until the Strategic Plan is done. There are some people we are moving out of certain buildings, but there are reasons behind it. If you’re hearing rumors, send me an email or call me. I’ll let you know what is ultimately going on. Basically, DeCenzo said, we’re moving Public Safety, Human Resources, the Post Office, and the Credit Union. A lot of the non-academic offices are moving into the Atlantic Center. The Property Owners Association is adamant that we do not add more students over in the Atlantic Center, we are hopeful that we will be able to capture another 50 acres over at the Atlantic Center, and one of the things we’re trying to do is demonstrate that we are a good neighbor and that we are going to move those things that are non-academic there, the Printing Services and a few other. The Printing Services in part is going over because currently we are having some health problems with the fumes in the Printing Center. One of the buildings in the Atlantic Center gives us an opportunity to ventilate it properly. There are things that are behind this, it’s not just several of us sitting in a room spinning a dial to figure out whose life we can make miserable next.

Parking: we have a parking problem folks, in case you didn’t know that. However, once we get the Board of Trustees Committees finalized, which we hope will be at the end of this month, we’ll be able to do a couple of things with respect to our parking situation, and it is my hope that by Spring Semester we will add nearly a thousand parking spaces on this campus. They are going to be over in the Atlantic Center area, and we will have to go through some approvals for that, but, we are looking at obviously increasing the amount of parking. We simply do not have any excess parking, and I’ve approved some parking on grassy areas, we have some overflow areas identified and I’ve asked our Public Safety to be somewhat lenient in our enforcement. If you’re parked in a handicapped spot you should not be in, they’re not going to be lenient, however. In the area of Shuttle Service DeCenzo said, this is where I need your help. In years past I’ve been one of the biggest complainers about a shuttle system, we have been working with the shuttle folks and we think we have made significant improvements. Right now I need more students riding the shuttle, but the only way that’s going to happen is if that shuttle is on time and it’s running the way that it should. And so one of the things I’ve asked several people, some of the Vice Presidents and a few others to do is to ride the shuttle bus randomly, because we’re going to check the timing of it. However, I’m getting an awful lot of phone calls from parents who are saying their student’s instructors told them, “don’t ride the shuttle bus because it doesn’t work.” Folks, give me a chance to fix it, if it doesn’t work let me know, but don’t judge the shuttle system today based on what it
was a couple of years ago, because that is catapulting itself into a major ordeal. I’m trying to get the shuttle system set-up and hopefully we will find a significantly improved shuttle system.

The last item I have is probably the one that I think a lot of people have been wanting to hear. It’s got a good news/bad news associated with it. The good news is that as of about 4:00 yesterday (September 4, 2007) afternoon, we have the money to gut the science building. Will Garland will be in Columbia tomorrow for a first level of approval to basically start the process. It is my hope, DeCenzo said, assuming all the approvals go through, that we will be moving everybody out of the Science Building after graduation in May. I know with the move and the renovation what a hassle and inconvenience it’s going to cause, all I can ask is that you bear with us. I don’t know where the classrooms are going, we’re talking about bringing in some portable labs. There are a lot of issues associated with this folks, but it’s time to do something with that building. We’re working with our local delegation and Eddie’s been working with the Government Affairs Group, we are very hopeful that with this move we will also be able to secure some additional money that will allow us the bonding capacity to put a significant extension on the building. First point, we’ve got to get this building back to a level that is consistent with what we want. I’m going to be asking Michael Roberts and Rob Sheehan to work with some facility people, I would like a group out of the sciences to work with us on a building committee. What we are envisioning is that the Science Building will be primarily faculty offices, classroom space, and labs that do not require highly complex equipment. The extension, when we put that on, and hopefully that will be relatively soon, will be the more highly complex labs. That is kind of a two stage process, but I’d like Mike & Rob to have some representatives advising us. I don’t want this thing sitting around another five years. We need to know what we’re going to do, because as I move this forward with the State, I have to have a fairly good picture of what it’s going to be. The State right now is telling all of us, certainly the message to Coastal is you have one time to come to us with a real number, you come back to us for additional money, you’re not going to get it. I need to make sure that we’re doing what we have to do to accommodate those needs. Again, as I stand before you and know that it’s going to be a major inconvenience on this campus. I hope you will at least bear with us. I’m being told it will take about 18 months to get that building re-occupied. If we close it down the end of May, we’re probably looking a good three semesters before we are going to be able to go back into it.

Answering a question, DeCenzo said we are projecting the preliminary estimates to come in between 4.5 and 5 million dollars for the renovation. One of the bigger expenses, he said, is that we’re going to do something with the roof. We’re going to try to get rid of the flat roof.

Answering a question addressed to DeCenzo, Sheehan said, in terms of the elimination of the Instructor and Senior Instructor titles, I believe be a corresponding addition of the Lecturer and perhaps Senior Lecturer membership within the faculty and coverage under the Faculty Manual. Provost Sheehan said one of the task we have ahead of us in the revision of the Faculty Manual is the composition of the faculty, and also respect to the faculty with regards to the governance issues. As we grow from 51 Lecturers to 101 Lecturers, we will be looking very carefully at how those Lecturers fit into the collegiate life and faculty life in their respective colleges. Sheehan said this takes one item from his report “I will ask for a joint faculty and administrative committee to go through the process this Fall and go through and revise the Faculty Manual among other things, and to reflect the reality of appropriate titles and levels.” Sheehan said he certainly doesn’t want to
establish Lecturer positions with no opportunity of being able to move into a Sr. Lecturer as we current have on the Instructors. As we start to clean these up, if you are interested in this particular topic, talk to your Chair, and I will be asking for the opportunity to appoint a couple of folks on the administrative side in hopes of making significant progress on that very topic and remaining topics including Promotion & Tenure.

Answering a question regarding funding, DeCenzo said when you see we got an additional 3.2 million dollars of recurring money in the budget last year in late May or early June, I think that was an indication they (Columbia) were willing to work with us. Obviously, every time I went to Columbia, I was having to answer questions, but I think by and large they are willing to listen to us, and look at opportunities to help us, no guarantees. But I think they have a different perspective and I certainly have been trying to build bridges into some key people in Columbia.

PROVOST AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:

Sheehan said DeCenzo had covered some of the points that he planned to cover, particularly the areas of growth. You can anticipate having over the next two years 100 added or new colleagues sitting among yourselves - three or four years from now at the absolute latest. Sheehan feels that a real challenge at CCU is to provide a welcoming and supportive atmosphere for those colleagues between new positions and replacements. We’re making a significant step in terms of our size and in terms of our influence and somehow we must still preserve the intimacy of our dealings with one another as colleagues while we move up that next step in terms of instruction, externally funded research and scholarship. I think that’s really going to be a challenge for us, Sheehan said.

Sheehan said he wants to encourage faculty to attend the inauguration and the events that are associated with that. The inauguration of a new President is really far more about the strength of community that faculty feel among one another than it is about a particular individual. We are in an unusual state of higher education of having only the second President inaugurated. It really is a celebration of you as scholars, far more than any particular individual who assumes that role, and I would welcome you to join us in all the possible events that you can.

I did promise that I would address one hopefully final time; my explanation for my own recommendations with regard to the required reading for the ‘Big Read’. Sheehan said he would like to approach the end of that explanation because I’d really like all of us looking forward to where we go next, next year with regards to the Big Read. I’ve had some conversations with folks from the English department that we don’t want that department to be defined the whole year around the particular text but rather around the process of intellectual exchange. Sheehan said he firmly believes that the decision for a required text belongs to the faculty who are using that text. Or to say to the FYE instructors, those of you who had anticipated and were in fact using a text for the ‘Big Read’, I believe you should have the primary say with regard to the use of your text. While I did experience a certain amount of what we’d call in this room, pressure from the community, with regards to the text, and I had also simultaneously been experiencing a certain amount of pressure from the Instructors who were using the text who really felt the text was not serving their purpose. In retrospect, as I judged the weight that I put on that particular recommendation, I really was most distressed by having so many non-faculty in fact teaching the FYE courses. Part of what we did when we founded the FYE program so fast, is we didn’t accommodate the full FYE schedule with faculty assignments. I would like to get more faculty
involved in the FYE experience. We still have an opportunity to do that for next year. I do make a distinction, I realize it’s not shared in all the constituent groups of this University, between requirements of a University sponsored program, and a specific set of course requirements. On this we can perhaps agree to disagree with one another, but a text that is a part of a University sponsored program, I believe might need to require a different level of specific decision making. Certainly a text that is required in a course, and I think you’re all clear in understanding any faculty member who is teaching this semester who wanted to make use of Brad Land’s text was indeed free to use it and in fact require it. As I go back and review my correspondence and communications on this subject, what I found myself doing was saying to people over and over again: “I was asking that you not require it, particularly if you are not comfortable requiring it, but I certainly am not telling you that you cannot require it, and I understand that your specific course expectations may need to be met with that particular text.” What I hope is that we get our first list earlier this year that it was received last year and we convene a group who will be majority users of whatever becomes ‘Big Read’. I’d also like to have a group of students who are rising sophomores or perhaps a bit later in their student career to help us reflect what would be best and most appropriate to use for ‘Big Read’. I will end this particular area by saying we might disagree as whether or not my request constitutes a demand, I didn’t see it that way, Sheehan said, we might disagree a bit as to whether or not a University’s sponsored program requirement rises to the same level as a course text requirement. The entire conversation that may be occurring in certain areas of the University about academic freedom will probably do more to illuminate our students, students’ understandings of why they would be in higher education than perhaps the text itself would have in the first place. In my opinion, Sheehan said, I will certainly live with the consequences of the recommendation I gave. I’ll be happy to talk to people either departmentally or individually. I will encourage the ‘Big Read’ process to be inclusive, even more so than it was of individuals who will be using the text, and I encourage you as faculty and to encourage you and your colleagues to work with me to achieve greater faculty participation along with the excellent staff participation we have in those many, many sections of First Year Experience. When all is said and done, what we are attempting to do in FYE is absolutely important, and it is important that we have faculty, Full Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors fully participating in our FYE experiences, because that’s really what the literature says we should be doing. We should be presenting our most experienced, most committed, most involved faculty because it is a welcoming of students into this intellectual life.

On the subject of growth, Sheehan said, we are growing, and I got to tell you, having been at other environments, I would much rather live with the pain of growth, than live with the pain of program cutbacks, or to live with the pain that is associated with simply level growth. I have challenged the Deans, and they have in turn challenged the departments to determine how to grow. We can work concurrently with the Strategic Plan Process, in the likely event that the Strategic Planning Process results in strong recommendation for enrollment growth; we don’t want to have a year go by to determine where we have the capacity to grow in terms of new majors and growing majors current. You will be hearing then a call from my office to request where with programmatic growth over a three year period of time to bring forward perhaps 6 to 8 new master’s degrees to Columbia, when you bring forward perhaps a equal number of undergraduate, new majors in addition to what we have to do to enhance the quality of our existing majors. We have 39 undergraduate and graduate majors, we should have 50, in my opinion, for the size of the population that we are likely to be in 3 to 5 years from now, and we need those majors that will appeal to the instate students as well as out
of state, they certainly should help us aim for a goal of being a bit more comprehensive without trying to be everything to anyone. For those of you who are relatively new to this Institution, this is going to be a wonderful place to be and you will find a lot of quality, you will find students who are as excited about the majors as the Communication Majors are today, and that brand new program.

Lastly, Sheehan said, there are two things that I ask you to work on this year. If we don’t have it already, we should have written down by the end of this year what our expectations are for promotion, for tenure, for renewal and for post-tenure. We need to understand what they are, first at the college level, and I hope to have that written by the end of Fall semester, and then into departmental level and have that written by Spring. Written with approvals and signed off by the departments and colleges and then coming on to the Provost as well. Do we need external letters of reference for these processes or do we not? If so, how do we do that? I prefer external letters of reference, but if you don’t have it written down, without some expectations then we end up all snarled up in the process and penalizing faculty who are involved in building their careers. Elaborations for tenure and promotion should be developed. Therefore, first in the college by this December, and then the department by May, and a revised Faculty Manual pretty far along by May. If we in fact do so that would then be ready and waiting for the coming new group of colleagues who will be indeed coming in as we march forward toward CCU’s growth.

Evans said as a result of our meeting yesterday, I agreed to jointly appoint with the Provost and charge a new ad hoc committee for facilities utilization and see if we can’t come up with a plan to more efficiently use what's available to us on this and our satellite campuses. We have to try and ease this pain of growth with current facilities, so you’ll be seeing that charge soon. If you want to serve on that committee, please let either Dr. Sheehan or me know and we will take care of that from there.

Eddie Dyer, Executive Vice President, referring to the Strategic Planning Committee, said we have had many input sessions for the Strategic Plan, and there are more scheduled. Please feel free to come to any public gathering or committee meetings. We’re trying to gather information, to come to a consensus as a community, as a Coastal family to plot our future. We’d like to get as many perspectives as we can. Faculty are welcome to come and speak if you’d like. Dyer said the minutes of Committee will be on the web site.

Dyer reported on the US New & World Report. We (i.e., Coastal) are grouped with baccalaureate institutions and we’re compared with Furman and Woffard regionally, Williams and Dartmouth nationally, and we know it’s unfair. DeCenzo asked Dyer to look into it, and Dyer has done so. After many phone calls & discussion, he found that in 2004 a reclassification was done, and we were left at the baccalaureate level. Being a master’s university we should be at the first tier, second tier at the very worst but probably first tier in our region. Because Winthrop, Citadel and College of Charleston are first tier Master’s Universities, and our numbers compare very favorably to them, in fact, Dyer said, I think we’re just behind Winthrop and just ahead of Citadel. All be us behind the College of Charleston, but we would be first tier regional which would be a plus for this institution, and will speak the truth about what we’re about. The reason we’re still baccalaureate, in 2004 we gave 46 master’s degrees. To be considered a master’s university, you had to give 50. We were just 4 away. They are going to reclassify in 2008 or 2009. Dyer is going to a conference
in Washington, DC on Friday, and he will visit the offices of the ESB Baccalaureate Board while I’m there and try to have us declared first tier.

COMMITTEE REPORTS: Michael Ruse, Chair, Faculty Welfare & Development, said decompression is an ongoing issue. There have been some changes and additions, there are some others pending, but this year we have to close the books. Any questions that you have regarding decompression, whether you should have received it, what your reception was, how it was all done, contact Ruse.

PENDING BUSINESS: A motion was made by Susan Webb, seconded by Rob Young to take the following item (Course Repeat Privilege) from the table. The motion to discuss passed.

A motion was made by Susan Webb, seconded by Rob Young to accept the amended Course Repeat Privilege.

An amendment was made by John Navin, that if this passes, it will not move through the Administrative Action process until other legislation comes through indicating there is grade specified for S – Students Academic Misconduct so there is no doubt that we will know what those are. The amendment passed conditionally.

An amendment was made by Mike Ruse, seconded by Donald Rockey to include D+ grades. The amendment passed.

A Catalog Change Proposal from the CCU Student Retention and Assessment Committee (University Catalog p. 38)

Approved by the Academic Affairs Committee 4/10/07

Amended Course Repeat Privilege

Degree-seeking undergraduate students may repeat any course taken at CCU. All grades will appear on the student’s transcript, but a course that has been repeated will be counted only once for the graduation requirement. For financial aid and scholarship purposes, duplicate credits do not count as credits completed for satisfactory academic progress except in certain cases. As specified in the college catalog, some courses such as those requiring physical skills, performance, or working on student publications may be repeated for credit and grades. All grades will be included when calculating the student’s grade point average with the following possible exception.

Students may elect to exercise a “repeat forgiveness” option for up to 13 undergraduate credits during their enrollment at CCU for courses taken at CCU. For credits taken under this option, CCU will exclude the grade and credit hours earned for the first (and any subsequent) enrollment in the course when calculating the student’s cumulative GPA and earned credit hours. Both grades will appear on the transcript. Only course grades of C, D, F, WF, or IF are eligible for “repeat forgiveness.” A student may not exercise the “repeat forgiveness” option for courses in which the student was assigned a grade as a result of academic misconduct. Students selecting the “repeat forgiveness” option should be aware that professional schools, graduate programs, and
future employers may apply their own criteria that may not recognize a “repeat forgiveness” option in evaluating credentials for prospective students and employees. For ‘repeat forgiveness,’ undergraduate students must submit a completed Course Repeat Request Form for approval to the Registrar’s Office by the end of the drop/add or drop with no academic record period for the semester in which the course is being repeated.

Note: The course repeat privilege may be used by students to achieve the Dean’s List or President’s List. The cumulative collegiate grade point calculation for graduation with Honors will include all grades, including original and repeat grades, as well as any attempted coursework completed at other institutions, provided the GPA achieved at CCU meets the level specified for the honor sought. See the Graduation with Honors policy.

The motion to accept the Course Repeat Privilege with all the amendments passed.

NEW BUSINESS: A motion was made by Lee Bollinger, seconded by Deb Walker to approve the Women’s and Gender Studies Minor as revised. The motion passed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Charmaine Tomczyk reminded the Senate that the Celebration of Inquiry is scheduled for February 13 – 15, 2008. Deadline for proposals is November 2007.

GOOD OF THE ORDER: None

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 6:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by Susan Slavik
Faculty Senate Secretary

Janet Straub
Faculty Senate Recorder