

TO: Governor Nikki R. Haley
RE: **South Carolina State University (SCSU) – Too Broke to Fix**

- Hip Hop Culture Course (H 320) and Eliminating Required Computer Course for All Students
- Acting President Attempting to Fill Three (3) Positions
- Earvin “Magic” Johnson Coming to SCSU on Thursday, March 26, 2015
- Founder’s Day Weekend Celebration
- South Carolina State Spending like there is no Tomorrow – no belt tightening at all

DATE: March 22, 2015
FROM: Unable to sign name for fear of retaliation

As a conservative Christian taxpaying citizen of this state, I was horrified South Carolina State University (SCSU) offers a course in Hip Hop Culture (H 320) as indicated on enclosed flyer. Why is a state university in severe financial distress offering a course such as this? Students should be studying something more valuable than a course where “**Parental Advisory Explicit Content**” is indicated on the flyer. The hip hop music culture has lead to all kinds of gangs and violence. Why is South Carolina State University offering a course with no redeeming value but one that encourages gang involvement and violence while Dr. Willie M. Legette recommends **eliminating a computer course required for all students** as part of the General Education Curriculum (GEC) (see enclosure)? No wonder South Carolina State University is in such terrible financial condition. There has been mismanagement of state and federal funds for years.

Even during this financial crisis, it has just been announced that Earvin “Magic” Johnson will be speaking at the Executive Speaker Series on March 26, 2015. How can SCSU afford to bring Earvin “Magic” Johnson to campus? Then there is the Founder’s Day Weekend Celebration with entertainers brought in to entertain at various functions. How does this financially strapped university afford all of these highly paid entertainers? The university spends money like it is going out of style or as if there is no tomorrow. **No belt tightening is taking place at SCSU at all – only seeing how much more of the taxpayer’s money they can spend.**

The Faculty Senate (see enclosure) did not want President Elzey selected as President of South Carolina State University even though with his background as Vice President of Finance at the Citadel, he was and is the best person for the job of President. President Elzey inherited years of financial mismanagement, waste, fraud, and abuse created by previous administrations. Instead, the Faculty Senate wanted Dr. Leonard McIntyre to be president. Dr. McIntyre had served as Interim President, was a long time South Carolina State University professor, and one of the “good ole boys.” The Faculty Senate, other faculty, and staff want only the people who have been there forever to be president, provost, vice presidents, deans, department chairs, program directors, university committee chairs, on faculty senate, etc. They did not (and do not) want anyone from the outside selected as president or to serve on the Board of Trustees. As long as the deadwood is in place at SCSU, the problems will continue. At least four or five levels of administrators need to be removed in order for change to take place at SCSU.

Now the Acting President, W. Franklin Evans, announced plans to fill three positions. The Acting President has no business filling any positions at this time. Any vacant positions should remain open until the current financial fiasco is resolved, a new board with entirely new members from outside SCSU, and/or a new president are in place. **The current Acting President should not be allowed to fill any positions whatsoever.**

South Carolina State University should be closed immediately. If SCSU should ever re-open, perhaps it could open as a technological university since South Carolina does not have any university where the focus is on technology like many other states have. **SCSU is just too broke to be fixed.** It is time that institution is closed and if it is ever re-opened, hire new people from bottom to top. **Do not hire anyone that has ever worked there or has ever been affiliated with SCSU or the problems will continue.**

The board of trustees has been and continues to be a major problem at South Carolina State University. A former board chair was recently convicted and is currently awaiting sentencing on federal charges. Considering the board of trustees has been changed a number of times, **changing board members does not solve problems** at South Carolina State University. Another approach is necessary. There have been a number of presidents at SCSU. New presidents and new boards do not change a thing; problems only get worse instead of better. There has to be a different solution to the problem of South Carolina State University.

The time is now to end this fiasco that claims to be a state university. The students deserve a better education than what they are getting at South Carolina State University. **South Carolina State University is just too broke to be fixed.**

Governor Haley, Please to eliminate the waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement at South Carolina State University.

Enclosures:

1. Summative Statement and Analyses of the Faculty Senate re SCSU Presidential Search Surveys, April 16, 2013
2. Our Students Deserve Better, Dr. Willie M. Legette, Department of Social Sciences
3. Parental Advisory Explicit Content Its Coming, H 320 Hip Hop Culture Flyer, posted by Student Life & Development, September 18, 2014
4. Invitation announcing Earvin “Magic” Johnson Coming to SCSU on Thursday, March 26, 2015

Summative Statement and Analyses of the Faculty Senate re SCSU Presidential Search Surveys
April 9-11, 2013

After a careful review of the responses obtained from the faculty and staff during the above-referenced presidential forums, the South Carolina State University (SCSU) Faculty Senate is providing you with the results of the responses to the survey questions.

Analysis of Data

On January 9, 2013, the SCSU Board of Trustees outlined and advertised the following criteria that a president *should* meet in order to qualify for the appointment.

- Earned doctorate or equivalent from a traditional and accredited institution, preferably in higher education or one of the major discipline areas at SCSU.
- Prior experience as a President of a college/university or CEO of a corporation, and with experience working with a governing board
- Proven track record of successful experience in working in shared government arena, with legislative and government entities and with similar populations which SCSU serves
- Knowledge of accrediting bodies and all aspects of the accreditation process
- A record of research and publications in peer-reviewed journals
- Successful fundraising experience

The instrument that was designed to gather data from the faculty and staff to assess each candidate was aligned to this criterion. Attached are the results from the sample that participated in the process for generalization to the population.

Based on the data, it is evident that Dr. Leonard McIntyre consistently scored higher in each of the categories.

In reviewing the candidates for president, Thomas Elzey, VP for finance at The Citadel, deserves special attention, not only because the faculty ranked him the lowest of the candidates in many key criteria, including those relating to leadership, scholarship, and credentials, but because the most striking thing about Mr. Elzey is his incompatibility with the requirements of a University president. It is not only that he lacks an earned doctorate (*Elzey earned his B.S. in economics from Bradley University and an M.S. in public management and policy from Carnegie Mellon University*), though that certainly could be enough to disqualify him; but that neither the background that was made available to the faculty nor the presentation Mr. Elzey made of himself showed any evidence of scholarly accomplishment, or even of serious interest in that direction. Additionally, Mr. Elzey in his role of VP of Finance at institutions of higher education, including The Citadel that does not have a Faculty Senate, has had limited opportunity to share in governance in a formal process with the faculty. Though Mr. Elzey clearly has an interesting background, having worked in financial positions in large institutions around the country, nothing in this background qualifies him to be president or suggests that he would be a successful president of SCSU.

It is possible that some will look at his credentials and note that previous presidents lacked an earned doctorate, but this a false analogy which ignores the last half century of change. In the past, it was far more common for college professors at SCSU and elsewhere to have the Master's as their highest earned degree. Since that time, the University's graduate program has grown, and as a matter of policy, it no longer tenures faculty who lack a terminal degree. It is also interesting that no other notable HBCU in the nation has a president without a terminal degree. This University should not settle to be led by someone who lacks the qualifications to be an assistant professor at SCSU.

Regardless of which candidate the Board of Trustees chooses, it is incumbent upon them to choose the best candidate based on the criteria that they themselves outlined and one who would command the respect of the academicians who will report to them. Given past experience, on Thursday after the vote, we challenge the Board of Trustees to publicly articulate, why they believe the candidate they chose for president meets those standards.

The SCSU Faculty Senate
April 16, 2013

Our Students Deserve Better

Willie M. Legette
Department of Social Sciences
wmlegette@scsu.edu

Dr. Luke informs us that the General Education Curriculum (GEC), “affects the entire faculty and student body,” and the administration wants “input from all concerned about this very important issue.” It is in this spirit that I provide my review of the proposed changes in the GEC. The GEC should provide the foundation for a well-rounded education and a rewarding intellectual experience for college students. It is through the GEC that the faculty ensures that all our students have the appropriate courses with the appropriate pedagogy to cultivate the skills of reading, writing, and critical thinking expected of college graduates. The GEC must encourage civic-mindedness among our students. A strong GEC is not designed to teach students how to make a living but, to examine how they want to live; and have a culturally and intellectually rewarding and productive life.

A university’s GEC reflects the knowledge, skills, and values the faculty deems important for its graduates to have as college educated adults. The proposed GEC requires less academic hours in mathematics, history, humanities, natural sciences and social sciences than most universities in the Southeast. Are we reducing the number of hours required in the GEC because our students have proven themselves better academically prepared than other students in the Southeast and thus do not need as many academic credit hours in the GEC to obtain the expected intellectual development and performance of college graduates? Or are we simply dumbing down?

The proposed GEC does not provide a cohesive curriculum that promotes student development towards the stated competences. With the exception of six hours in communications: English Composition E150 and English E151, the GEC does not provide a core of courses required of all students. (I do not include University 101 because it is not taught by the faculty, and should not be included in the GEC.) Instead the proposed GEC provides students course options within broad academic categories. While there are benefits associated with providing student’s options, too many choices may lead to poor

decisions by students who are not yet aware of what they need. Moreover, providing students too many options may weaken the general education curriculum, if each option does not sufficiently address the desired outcomes. The curriculum must be sufficiently cohesive to promote the goals and outcomes of the program. On a more practical level, the larger the number of course options and the greater the differences in the course content, the greater the challenge for assessment. The full extent of this problem can only be determined when the goals and learning outcomes of each course is clearly delineated.

In the area of communications students are required to take nine hours- E150 English Composition and E151 English Composition and choose from S150 Fundamentals of Speech Communication, S250 Public Speaking, or ET250 Technical Communications. The first two courses that students can choose from are not problematic in that the similarities in the courses are sufficient to provide the same learning outcomes. For example S150 Public Speaking provides “the basic principles of oral communication” and S250 Public Speaking is “designed to help each student” acquire “strong organizational, delivery, and speaking skills necessary for effective communication.” But ET250 Technical Communications is problematic. This course “is designed to familiarize the student with concepts, principles, and contemporary practices used in industry to create, write and present technical information.” If we want students to master oral communications, how can a course on technical writing fulfil that objective? An aim of the GEC is to educate students broadly, so that they may be adaptable to career changes over the course of their lives. Technical writing is therefore too narrow. The curriculum is not aligned with clear goals and learning objectives.

The one required introductory math course “is to be determined by major department” and one “additional math or computer science to be determined by major department.” As pointed out above most universities in the Southeast require more than three hours of math. Are our students’ math skills sufficiently developed whereby they only need three hours of math to prepare them to practice “quantitative reasoning” expected of college graduates. Our students’ performance on standardized test

proves that this is not the case. So why are we reducing the required number of academic credit hours in mathematics? Moreover, what are we to make of the option to take math or computer science?

The existing computer science course for “all disciplines” is CS150 Computer Technology. This class devotes “two hours of structured laboratory each week” teaching “word processing, spreadsheets, data base management, presentation software, the internet, and web page development.” These are not the skills one expects to acquire in a math course. So why are students’ major departments given the option of allowing students to take a math course or a computer science course? What are the common learning objectives?

The faculty should not include a computer science course in the GEC. The faculty included computer science in the current GEC because most students at the time had little experience with computer technology. Most of our students are now familiar with computer technology. The Task Force proposes that students should have “knowledge of and be able to use. . . technology in everyday situations.” Our students already have this knowledge and skills or they can learn them without having to take a three credit hour computer science course. The University can provide lab assistance to help students who may need help in using computers for their academic work. However, each academic program and or department must assume the responsibility to introduce their majors to computer technology as tools to acquire, manipulate, and evaluate quantitative and qualitative data and to generate knowledge in their particular discipline. As a faculty, we may want to ensure that our students acquire an understanding of the dialectical relationship between technology and culture. This can be addressed in the humanities, history, and the social sciences.

The proposed GEC reduces the number of required hours in science from four to three and eliminates the lab as a requirement. Most universities require a lab with the GEC science course. The scientists on the faculty should address this issue and inform the faculty as to whether students can acquire college-level

knowledge and skills in the sciences graduate without being exposed to the scientific work that takes place in a laboratory.

The proposed GEC requires only six hours in the humanities. In literature students are provided an option of choosing E250 World Literature Part I with a focus on “Selected world masterpieces, with emphasis on Western civilization” or E251 World Literature Part II “A survey of literary masterpieces of the world. From the Age of the Enlightenment to the Twentieth Century.” In history students are provided the option of choosing H250 History of World Civilizations from Earliest Times to 1750 or H251 History of World Civilizations Since 1750. Most universities require twelve to fifteen hours in the humanities. It is important to note that the literature courses focus on western civilization. Therefore, it is possible for a student to graduate from South Carolina State University with only one course, World Civilization that introduces them to nonwestern civilizations.

It is most striking and disturbing that the proposed GEC does not require one course in American studies. Students can graduate without taking an American literature or African-American literature course. They can graduate without taking an American history course, an African American history course or American Government. Yet, the proposed GEC lists as a core competence that students have “knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of one’s own culture, history, and arts as well as those of other, diverse peoples?” In what courses are students going to acquire this knowledge? Once again the curriculum is not aligned with the objectives of the GEC.

To correct this problem more humanities courses in history and literature, including HHU250 The African American Experience must be included in the GEC. If students are going to take only one course on the African American experience, the faculty has the responsibility to

ensure that the course offers the breadth and depth to ensure that our students do not acquire a myopia view of the role of race and African Americans in shaping American development. In this regard we should require HHU250 The African American Experience not so much because South Carolina State University is an HBCU but because as a HBCU we understand the role of African American culture and the African American struggle for freedom and equality in shaping American society. The HHU 250 is the only course that can provide our students this understanding:

This course will survey the experience of African Americans in the United States. It will focus on specific historical periods that significantly impacted black life and were important in shaping the social, economic, political, ideological, and cultural landscape of American society. Major topics covered will include the following: the African background; the Atlantic slave trade; slavery; the Civil War; Reconstruction; Jim Crow and segregation; blacks and the welfare state; and black political activism. The course not only delineates the experience of African Americans as they confronted hostile institutions and social forces in America, but it also juxtaposes those experiences with the ideas and themes articulated in African American social and political thought.

The Task Force does not provide a rationale for the proposed GEC. Compared to other Universities the proposed GEC will provide our students with an inferior education. The problems are not only in terms of the reduction in required hours but there are serious problems with the objectives and the extent to which the curriculum is aligned with the state competencies. Our students deserve better.

In order to developed a strong GEC the faculty needs to answer three questions posed by Mary J. Allen in *Assessing General Education Programs*:

1. What should students know when they complete the general education program?
2. What should students be able to do when they complete the general education program?



School of Business - 43rd Annual Business Week

PLEASE JOIN US

for

The Executive Speaker Series

featuring

Mr. Earvin "Magic" Johnson

Basketball Superstar and Entrepreneur

Thursday, March 26, 2015

Meet and Greet/Photo Session

~by Invitation Only~

11:00 - 11:30 AM

The STATE Room

~ Doors open at 10:30 AM ~

Program

~ Open to the Public ~

Mr. Earvin "Magic" Johnson
Speaker

12:00 PM

Martin Luther King Auditorium

~ Doors open at 11:30 AM ~

RSVP

~ Meet and Greet/Photo Session ~

by March 13, 2015 to (803) 536-8186

P A R E N T A L
A D V I S O R Y
E X P L I C I T C O N T E N T

Its Coming....

H 320 Hip Hop Culture

Spring 2015

APPROVED FOR POSTING
STUDENT LIFE & DEVELOPMENT

Signature TQH
Date 9/18/14

South Carolina State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Tuesday, March 4, 2014
Room #121A Turner Hall
MINUTES

Senators Present: Dr. Lucinda Barron, Dr. Thomas Cassidy, Prof. Avery Daniels, Dr. Thomas Dempster, Dr. Omari Dyson, Dr. Legun Emmanwori, Prof. Stephanie Felks, Dr. Janice Hawes, Dr. Jean Michelet Jean-Michel, Prof. Carlana Kohn-Davis, Dr. Samuel Littlejohn, Dr. Bonita Manson, Dr. Linda McIntyre, Dr. Abdul Miah, Dr. Muhammad Mustafa, Dr. Justin Niati, Dr. Crystal Nixon, Dr. Bobbie Perdue, Dr. Nikunja Swain, Dr. Larry Watson, Dr. Reginald Williams

Call to Order:

Faculty Senate (henceforth FS) President Cassidy called the meeting to order at 3:43 P.M., at which time a quorum was declared.

Adoption of the Agenda:

Senator Williams made the motion to adopt the agenda as amended; Senator McIntyre seconded. Vote: unanimously approved.

Approval of the Minutes:

Senator Williams made the motion to approve the minutes as amended; Senator Mustafa seconded. Vote: unanimously approved.

Treasurer's Report:

A copy of the treasurer's report was provided by Dr. Crystal Nixon, treasurer. It showed cash on hand in the amount of \$2198.83 as of March 4, 2014.

Report of Committees:

Executive Committee—No report at this time.

Membership Advisory Committee—Report received as information.

Elections Committee—No report at this time.

Educational Policies Council

- Dr. Larry Watson, Professor in the Department of Social Sciences proposed the following:
 - New course—H320 Hip Hop Culture and Politics, an elective for History majors.
Senator Perdue made the motion to approve the new course; Senator Mustafa seconded.
Vote: unanimously approved.
 - Course title revisions:
 - H310 from *European History, 1500-1815* to *Early Modern Europe, 1500-1815*
 - H312 from *European History 1815 to the Present* to *Modern Europe, 1815 to the Present*
 - H333 from *History of Women in the West* to *History of Women in Europe*
 - Course description revision—H415—Revolutions in Modern History
Senator Perdue made the motion to approve the course title and description revisions; Senator Mustafa seconded. Vote: unanimously approved.
 - New concentration—History: *International Studies*

Senator Fields made the motion to approve the new history concentration; Senator Dyson seconded. Vote: unanimously approved.

- New concentration—History: *African American Studies*

Senator Perdue made the motion to approve the new history concentration;

Senator Daniels seconded. Vote: unanimously approved.

- Dr. Jae Hong, Professor in the Department of Industrial and Electrical Engineering Technology proposed a new degree program—BS, Industrial Engineering
Senator Watson made the motion to approve the new degree program; Senator Mustafa seconded. Vote: unanimously approved.

Planning and Projects Committee—No report at this time.

Educational Facilities Committee—No report at this time.

Graduate Studies Council—No report at this time.

Welfare Committee—No report at this time.

President's Report—FS President Cassidy reported on:

- Campus safety—According to the University Chief of Police, crime on campus has declined over the past three years, and University police is reviewing procedures after the campus shooting in January.
- Board of Trustees (henceforth BOT) Presentation—FS President Cassidy made a presentation to the Academic Affairs sub-committee of the BOT highlighting needs on campus (i. e., additional faculty, enriched working conditions for faculty, student scholarships, credible University structure, protection of shared governance).
- Provost Search Committee—President Elzey expanded the committee to include one member of the FS Executive Committee.
- FS Executive Committee meeting with President Elzey—The committee met with the President February 7, 2014, at which time President Elzey indicated a \$500K cut from Academic Affairs was necessary. The FS Executive Committee drafted a response, which was sent to President Elzey.
- Faculty Handbook
 - Ed Policies will consider the draft, submitted by the Faculty Handbook Committee, March 6, 2014.
 - Dr. Luke asked the FS to consider the draft March 18, 2014.
- FS Constitution—The Constitution needs to be updated, and decision must be made as to whether or not it is to be included in the Faculty Handbook.
- Faculty Luncheon—FS President Cassidy thanked the committee, panelists and participants for a successful luncheon.

Action Items

- Senators were asked to review and vote on the statement submitted by the College of Charleston's Faculty Senate regarding academic freedom. Senator Perdue made the motion to approve electronic voting; Senator Rahman seconded. Vote: unanimously approved.
 - March 20, 2014, FS President Cassidy sent an email indicating the FS, through electronic vote, approved the following statement, 23-0.
We strongly support the vital importance of academic freedom in our institutions. This freedom and the occasional controversies it can cause are vital to the pursuit of knowledge and truth in every discipline. Further, securing this freedom is a key obligation to accrediting bodies of our faculties, institutions, and governing

boards. We therefore condemn any effort on the part of the government or other parties to restrict, through legislation or other ways, free academic inquiry.

—The South Carolina State University Faculty Senate

- A Faculty Constitution ad hoc Committee—Senators Cassidy, McIntyre, Nixon, Rahman, and Watson—was formed. The committee's charge is to update the Constitution, as well as decide whether or not to include it in the Faculty Handbook.
- A Program Evaluation ad hoc Committee—Senators Niati, Perdue, Smith and Dr. Sligh-Conway—was formed. The committee's charge is to look at how programs on our campus are assessed.

Adjournment—The meeting adjourned at 5:24 P.M.