# Meeting Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>11 September 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Members Present:** Roster of Attendees attached  
**Commence:** 7:51 AM  
**Adjourn:** 8:59 AM

**Presiding Officer:** Paul Jacques  
**Recording Secretary:** Tom Smith

**Members Absent/Unexcused:** See Roster  
**Location:** 125 Gazes Auditorium

## Agenda

### Call to Order

The President called the meeting to order at 7:51 am in Gazes Auditorium.

### Approval of Minutes

The July minutes approved as submitted.  
The August minutes approved as submitted.
| OLD BUSINESS | FIR Chair re-presents Faculty Senate Statement on Changes in College APT Guidelines to Address the Initiatives of the MUSC 2010-2015 Strategic Plan in Support of Institutional Accreditation (Attachments). This statement was presented at last month’s Senate meeting, but a quorum was not present to vote on it.  
  - Motion on floor to accept statement as amended following last month’s meeting. **Passes.**  
  - Motion to amend “looked upon” to read “assessed” in the final sentence of the proposed statement. **Passes.**  
  Discussion of main motion, adoption of the statement to provide guidance to College APT committees.  
  - Question called, no objection.  
  - Voice vote with ayes and nays. Motion **passes.** |
### UPDATES

**MUSC Behavioral Support and Intervention Team**, July 2012—Alyssa Rheingold presents power point slides on this newly developed resource under the auspices of Education and Student Life. Discussion of charge, membership, processes, and communication plan for this group. At the conclusion of presentation, the Senate engaged the presenter in lengthy discussion that included the following ideas. Honor council and/or professionalism issues are likely worth reporting to BSIT. Additional clarification: a report to BSIT does not necessarily lead to a contact with the student. If there is an immediate threat, of course, BSIT would likely contact authorities first.

- Question from Senate body about the extent to which this activity is a policing activity. Key point made is that BSIT activities do not go into student records...in fact, the group is currently seeking confidential software for keeping data.
- Question about student awareness when a file on them is created, plus question about student access to their own files. Currently, hope is students will be made aware, but there is not current policy about allowing students access to their own files.
- Currently, post-docs and residents are not included.
- Question about whether or not files are destroyed if concerns are found to be baseless; question about whether or not the documents can/will be subpoenaed.
- What if students don’t wish to discuss their issues with the BSIT? No force or punitive measures.
- Concern about level of subjectivity in assessments.
- Concern about the voice that students have had or will have in how this BSIT will/should work. Suggestion that there may need to be some sort of FAQ link to allow people with concerns, like expressed here, to understand what the BSIT will do typically.
- Members of the BSIT are very much aware about and concerned with the tension between university protection and help for students. Based on consultations with schools/institutions in the region, universities the BSIT committee consulted with found very low rates of erroneous reports.
- Several Senators urged the BSIT to consider getting student representation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD BUSINESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| COMMITTEES | **Governance Committee**: Assisting with getting elections process in order. Election results currently being tabulated. The committee is also working on some suggestions for succession planning, in consultation with Exec. The chair requests input from faculty senators about succession plans. Question from chair—can the committee work to clarify what it means for an officer to need to be “full time,” as designated by the Senate’s bylaws. General discussion of various issues linked to full time status, how it’s defined, and what impacts these may have on holding senate office.

**Faculty and Institutional Relations**—Discussed for some time the post-tenure review issues, including a form that was approved by the Senate in May. The committee has constructed a summary rationale plus a proposed change to the Handbook that links up with the revisions to the process as presented in the form. The key issues the committee felt were important in revising the handbook included the need for mutual agreement between chair and tenured faculty member about what would constitute the annual evaluation procedure. Discussion (as represented in the attached handout) about the justification for “weighting” categories rather than the current wording, which simply says “majority of categories”. Discussion of the proposal as represented in the handout. Discussion of changes.
Motion made to accept revisions as presented in the meeting [attachments]. **Motion passes**.

**Communication and Education**: Planning the promotion and tenure workshop and working on the next edition of the newsletter. Also putting up info from the New Faculty orientation on the website.

**Institutional Advancement**: No report.

**Ad hoc Peer Review**: Moving through the comments/feedback received on a draft they have written.

**Ad hoc Modified Faculty**: Working with provost’s office to look at database for various categories of faculty.

**Ad hoc Clinical Affairs**: first meeting is coming up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADJOURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Meeting was adjourned at 8:59 am. Next Meeting is October 9, 2012.