Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meetings on 7 and 14 April 2015

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 7 April 2015 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115) and again, same time and location, on 14 April.

The 4/7 session was called to order at 5:05 PM and adjourned at 7:29 PM. The 4/14 session was called to order at 5:04 PM and adjourned at 6:40 PM. The first session adjourned following the report of the Academic Planning Committee. The second session began with the report of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs (item 4. G. below).

1. Calls to Order: 5:05, 5:04, respectively.

2. 10 March 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.

3. Announcements and information: none.

4. Reports

A. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney

In the interest of getting underway with reports and business immediately, the Speaker declined to offer a report.

B. President McConnell

The President thanked the faculty their service to the College and to our students, which service he characterized as a "sacred trust for all of us” and a great benefit to our students. To emphasize the importance of faculty service, he referred to an email he received from a Class of 1993 alumn who spoke to the impact on her life of Professor Goodwin Uwah. She was recently on campus for New Student Weekend with her son and stopped by Professor Goodwin Uwah’s office, but he was not on campus. She said in her email,

I am the teacher I am today because I had teachers like you. I have often spoken of you, sharing the impact you had on my younger life, and though they have never actually met you, my husband and children feel they know you. Thank you for making such an impact on my life and giving me the tools I would need to become an effective and successful teacher.

The President noted that this wonderful, heart-felt testament to Professor Uwah’s effect on his student is but one story of thousands of the “lasting impression faculty make and are making” on our students. “When alumni gather,” he added, “they talk about their professors...you're part of their memory of what it was to be here, in fact, a great part of their memory of the College of Charleston.”

In reporting on matters of facilities and parking, the President noted that the campus master plan approved by the Board of Trustees three years ago has strategically guided decisions about facilities at the downtown campus, North Campus, and Dixie Plantation. Due to the nature of our downtown campus, he pointed out, we have to be
aware at all times of square footage that becomes available for lease or purchase on the peninsula.

He announced that the College has purchased the former Department of Employment and Workforce building at 176 Lockwood Boulevard. The state listed the building at $4.5 million, but we secured $2 million from the state in order to purchase the building as excess property, and thus, we were able to purchase it for only $2.5 million. The building will house administrative operations and this will free space for office and classroom use on the historic campus, as well as opening up some much needed parking spaces.

Turning to the question of parking, the President reported that for the current academic year, we had 1,881 parking permits available near the campus and at the Aquarium garage: 1015 allocated for employees, 840 for students. The College’s initial arrangement with the City of Charleston allowed the College to sell 750 permits at the Aquarium garage, but we were informed later that only 500 permits would be allocated for the College for this academic year. The city now says that for the 2015-16 academic year we can only use 100 spaces in that facility. The College, he said, is in conversations with the city to increase this number, and, in addition, we are making other plans:

- we have an RFD out for 400 spaces
- we are working on potentially either buying or leasing a new garage at an “undisclosed site” at a good location on the peninsula
- we are considering the Brumley development on St. Philip Street.

These efforts are contingent, he said, on whether we lease space at the Aquarium garage and, if so, how many spaces we can secure.

The President said, in accordance with the master plan, the College is pursuing other real estate opportunities. He reported that, due to outbidding by a competitor, the College could not acquire the YWCA property on Coming Street. While it appraised at around $4.5 million, it sold for $6.2 million.

The College will be looking to see, he added, if there are public/private partnerships that can help us expand our footprint.

The President also announced that, in accordance with the master plan’s mandate for new and renovated state-of-the-art classrooms, the College is developing a proposal for a state-of-the-art learning technology center to be built next to the Addlestone Library, an open-campus teaching facility that will provide re-configurable teaching spaces and cutting edge media labs for use by all schools, departments, and programs. The building will also house a digital lab that will allow the digitization of manuscripts and other materials currently in the Avery Research Center and Addlestone Library’s special collections. “This building will be to our future,” he asserted, ‘what Randolph Hall was for the College in 1829, a space that transforms how we imagine teaching and learning at the College.” He invited further input from faculty as this unprecedented proposal is being developed.
Shifting to budgetary concerns, the President explained that in the state legislature efforts are being made to pass a bond bill to support capital projects, which would help fund the College’s budget; however, whether such a bill will pass in a fluid political situation remains to be seen. If there is a bond bill, the College has added its budget requests.

Regardless of whether or not a bond bill passes, the President said that as state economic estimates are being revised, he expects more money to become available in the state appropriations process as it develops into early June.

He reported that we are currently asking the state for, in recurring funds, $750,000 to support the Supply Chain Management program and $2 million for the Computer Science program. He added that the emphasis on these two programs in this budgetary cycle is for numerous reasons. These programs have traction in the legislature, and they satisfy some of the needs of the local and state community. We have the only Supply Chain Management program in the state, and jobs are waiting for applicants in both of these fields. Finally, these programs open up possibilities for public/private collaborations with local and regional stakeholders. The President reaffirmed his high estimation of the liberal arts and sciences education at the College, emphasizing that the attention to Supply Chain Management and Computer Science in this budget cycle does not indicate that there are not “other deserving programs that we should champion.” This particular budget request, he said, is part of a larger strategy of engagement with Columbia in order to increase our appropriations to the College.

The College has also asked for non-recurring funds for capital projects:

- $5 million for the ongoing renovation of the Simons Center for the Arts
- $10 million for the repurposing of the pool wing of the Stern Student Center — 19,000 sq. ft. that will provide student study, day, and meeting spaces
- $20 million for the renovation of the Silcox Gym’s outside envelope and to begin internal upgrades
- $8 million to finish restoration and retro-fitting of the upper floors of the Sottile Theater to return it “to what it was in 1928: one of the finest theaters on the East Coast.” He added that the dome has now been relit. The retrofit will provide flex space in the theater’s long entryway off of King Street and provide access to the upper floors. In the future, the upper floors will provide meeting and flex space, and there will also be a rooftop meeting space that looks out over King.
- $6 million for upgrades to the Grice Marine Lab.

We will probably not get all that we request, but, the President said, we certainly will not get what we don’t ask for.

He reported that the House version of the state budget currently has given us $350,000 additional for Supply Chain Management and $2.5 million for the Stern Center repurposing. In the bond bill, the House completely funded the Stern Center project.

While this current House budget is not ideal, the President said that the College will continue to work to better our position in Columbia and secure as much in
appropriations as we can, “our fair share,” as he characterized it. The process is far from over.

The President noted that we are facing a potential budget shortfall this semester due to our not having met attendance goals for the 2014-15 academic year; added to a slight downturn in student retention in the spring semester. This has been dealt with by an effort to hold down costs. In recurring and non-recurring expenses, he said we have saved over $1 million over the last 7-8 months. This has meant that, in effect, there will be no shortfall.

He also reaffirmed his commitment to transparent, open budget processes that feature open lines of communication and collaboration with faculty to develop an Academic Affairs budget.

The President listed four academic programs/concerns that he said he hopes will be at the center of dialog and collaboration with faculty in the coming year:

1. The Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS)

   The BPS program for transfer and non-traditional students has been and will continue to be vital to the College’s public mission. He thanked the Senate for their support of the program.

   He said that he hopes discussions on the BPS will center on “reforms simplifying the on-boarding process for transfer students and provide even more options for degree completion.” More online, night, and weekend courses will encourage enrollment growth in the BPS program. He said that he hopes “roster faculty will remain open to meeting the needs of our students for such courses.”

   The BPS and other initiatives in the School of Professional Studies should provide additional revenue to support the downtown campus.

2. The “Top 10%” Pilot Program (see September 2014 minutes, pp. 3-4)

   This initiative would bring to the College students from seven SC counties who complete their secondary education in the top 10% of their graduating class. The details are being finalized, and the program has benefitted, the President said, from the input of the Faculty Senate. The pilot program will begin with admissions for the 2016-17 academic year.

3. Improving Campus Processes and Developing More Mature and Effective Approaches to Program Assessment

   The President said, toward this end, that the administration will urge faculty to collaborate with program directors, chairs, deans, and the administration. This is work, he added, is work that we always should be engaged in, but it is particularly relevant to the 2017 SACS reaffirmation. The President observed that in his year in office, he has become aware that some of our challenges with assessment are due to two previous, but largely unsuccessful attempts to revise our general education curriculum. While some changes have been adopted, more opportunities for reform may be identified as a result of the current effort to assess our current general education curriculum. He said that he would
encourage such conversations, especially in the context of the SACS reaffirmation.

4. Exploring in Depth Potential Partnerships with other Institutions

While, in the past, we have tended to see other institutions (he specifically mentioned Clemson, the Citadel, Francis Marion, and technical colleges in the state) as competitors for students and state support, the President asserted that he would like us to view them as potential collaborators to work with “to secure a better future for the citizens of the state and offer them more educational opportunities. Practically, I believe,” he added, “that political leaders will reward those institutions that emphasize and have the vision of collaboration, instead of competition.”

The President closed by saying that it is a privilege to serve faculty and the College and by asserting that “jointly, our dedication, our energy, our ideas can take this college forward. We need to insure that result by communicating our thoughts and working positively.” He thanked, again, the faculty for their dedication to the College and to our students. In our shared efforts to insure that the College is on an “upward trend” programmatically, academically, and financially, the President said, “I need your support, your ideas and criticisms, your constructive ideas of how to change course or what we should be doing as we make choices and chart a future.” That, he said, will be his message to the Board of Trustees in a few weeks.

Questions / Comments / Discussion

Joe Carson, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), noting that the President has talked about improving diversity at the College, asked him for an update on those efforts.

The President said that he studied the issue, put some ideas in place, met with some interest groups and stakeholders, but he said that, ultimately, following an event with students, he was convinced that we need to review what we are doing on diversity. He said that he put together a diversity review panel comprised of participants from the College and respected people from outside the school and charged them with taking a “management performance look” at our recent practices and our plans for diversity and what has been suggested by prior efforts and to make a report on whether or not we are doing the right things and, among other concerns, whether or not we are too fragmented in our approach.

The review panel conducted a comprehensive study and returned, as well, to a large, prior study that was done. They found that in the current plan for diversity, there are no measurements for outcomes; however, in the earlier study there were measurements.

The panel will produce a report. This will be reviewed by the President’s Advisory Committee on Diversity, who will respond to it. Other involved parties will respond, as well. The responses will help determine what recommendations need to be followed and what restructuring in the programs, if any, needs to be done.
The President said that he is committed to the issue of diversity. He noted that he has been "out front" with legislative committees when they ask about out-of-state students, noting that such students add to the geographical diversity of the school and, with their higher tuition, support in-state students, but if the legislature wishes that to change, they need to provide the funding.

The panel, he said, is headed by Trustees John Bush and Demetria Clemons and is a strong committee. "Some say it should've been broader," he asserted, "but I don't need a bunch of talking at this point...we need results." The emphasis, he said, is on results, and there has been "no let up" on that front.

He added that we have made progress on other fronts, too. He reported that he met recently with a group of African American graduate students who want to help recruit more African-American students to come to graduate school at the College. He also met with the African-American alumni caucus who also wish to help with recruiting and have gotten some assistance to that end from the alumni office.

Irina Gigova, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), asked for an update on what has happened recently in our efforts to collaborate with other institutions.

The President replied that the Collaboration Council of MUSC and CofC have met and our "first foray" will likely be in Public Health. One problem that we will have to overcome is that our registrar computer systems are incompatible.

We also have talks ongoing with Clemson University, he said, who wants to bring a graduate Engineering program to Charleston. CofC would be involved with the Citadel on this, and there have been, as he described them, frank discussions about how the collaboration will work. We have a "happy understanding" he said about who will take the lead, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication.

We have also had initial conversations with Francis Marion, but we have not pushed forward with that yet, he said.

He reported no communication at this point, on the other hand, with any other university.

Tom Carroll, Health and Human Performance, noted that there is a substantial amount of money proposed for the repurposing of the Stern Center pool wing, yet there apparently was not money available to save the pool from closure. He asked for the President to elaborate on this.

The President replied that the $1.5+ million needed just to fix the chillers (apart from the other needed mechanical systems repairs and upgrades on a 40-year old pool) would have to come out of the operating budget, and that only 200 people a month were using the pool. He said that "had the pool been 15 years younger, two feet deeper," and somewhat shorter, the decision might have been different.

The money that would come from the legislature for the repurposing is capital reserve money that the legislature has to spend on capital improvement projects. It is one-time, nonrecurring money. It comes from a pool of 2.5% of the state’s appropriated income, which is kept in reserve for six months, and if it is not needed
during that period, it becomes available to be disbursed. It is money, he explained, that we would otherwise not get. The President said he made pitches for other projects, including the Arts Center, but the pool wing repurposing was the one that caught their attention. "And if they like it, and they're cutting a check," he said, "I like it." The College doesn't have the operating funds to repurpose the wing right now: there are other priorities. But if the state is funding it, we will do it.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if the requested funding for the Supply Chain Management and Computer Science programs is primarily for their undergraduate programs, for graduate programs, or for some mix between the two.

The President replied that the request is for the undergraduate program. We are not, he said, funding graduate programs at this point. He stressed that the College will not take from the core, undergraduate mission to support or fund graduate programs. The goal, rather, would be to strengthen undergraduate programs before building graduate programs.

For Computer Science, the President said the request is for funding “six professors, assistants, and facilities”; for Supply Chain Management, most of the funding is for professors, but part is for scholarships, as well.

**Kirk Stone**, Senator - Communication, asked the President, in regard to potential tuition increases, what he thinks the ideal mix is between in-state and out-of-state students.

The President said that it is not a question of “locking in percentages,” so much as a question of determining the necessary funding to “carry out the mission of the school." The President said that he would not be “bashful" about asking for budget increases, if needed, particularly “if [he has] been a tight steward of the money,” reducing waste where he sees it. He said that we would decline to go into the cuts the College has made, unless asked in Q&A.

He said we will remain as aggressive as we currently are in recruiting out of state, if not becoming more aggressive. And we are being aggressive about recruiting in state: we now have our largest numbers in our history to this point of applications, both in-state and out-of-state. We also have a 15% increase in minority applications.

He reiterated that decisions about the mix of in-state to out-of-state students admitted will depend on what is needed to carry out the mission of the school, and this will inform the request he makes to the Board of Trustees. We have to position ourselves to handle costs outside of our control and balance efficiency with “not being cheap: if we have to find talent, we have to find talent," he said, adding “if we have to keep talent, we have to keep talent.”

**Irina Gigova**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), following up on the President’s mention of spending cuts, asked the President to elaborate on those cuts.

The President said that he has not filled some vacant positions, some vacant positions have been filled at lower pay, and he has cut unnecessary expenses.
He gave several examples of cuts.

Of the iCharleston program, he said, “there's not going to be a bunch of college diplomats flying out of here overseas next year at the College’s expense.” We will continue to fund travel for faculty and staff needed in the program, however.

He said that he has also tried to use fewer office personnel.

There has also been an effort to increase energy efficiency by going to a single type of higher efficiency bulb for outside lighting.

In terms of maintenance, the plan is to catch problems earlier, before they become bigger problems.

The President also said, for another example, that we have been giving contributions to other nonprofits. But the President said, “unless I can translate it into how it enhances the student experience, I cut it.” The causes might be worthy, but the College, too, is a charity, non-profit organization. He mentioned in this connection the recent expenditure of thousands of dollars to support a sporting event in which the College doesn’t even participate. On the other hand, if an event is worthy of our support, then we may support it. He added that he has limited sponsorships to $600, as opposed to the $2,000 high-end he has seen recently.

“We are trying to do little things like that,” he said.

There were no more questions. The President left the podium to applause.

C. Interim Provost McGee (Topics – PDF, Presentation: PPT | PDF)

The Interim Provost expressed his appreciation for the support of the faculty and the staff of Academic Affairs over the course of the year.

He noted that his report will cover a range of topics, some of which he would have reported on at the March meeting, were he not in Columbia at that time.

[The minutes here follow the headings of the slides in the Interim Provost’s Presentation (PPT | PDF).]

Undergraduate Admissions Update for 2015-2016 (Slide 2)

The Interim Provost described this year's recruitment as “not bad, but it was a little disappointing: we missed a few goals.”

His update focused on recruitment for next year, and he began by thanking faculty who participated in making calls to prospective students. While some departments and programs have made this a practice, it is not something we have typically done on a large scale. Anecdotal evidence suggests that our prospective students have appreciated these calls from faculty.

While before May at the earliest, the Interim Provost said, it is difficult to say much meaningful about projected yield, we do find year-to-year comparisons from the same time of year useful. We currently have over 11,500 completed undergraduate
applications, several hundred more than at the same time last year. He provided some “cherry-picked data” from applications so far:

- we’re doing very well with high-achieving in-state students, up from last year at the same time
- we’re doing as well, if not better than last year at the same time with high-achieving out-of-state students
- in-state applications and deposits are up substantially over last year and compared to four-year averages
- the number of out-of-state applications is comparable to last year, and the yield is much better than last year’s, “stunningly so,” he said, compared to the same point in time last year
- minority applications from African Americans, Hispanic, and other students of color are up very substantially

A very strong class appears to be coming to the College in the fall, both in terms of students and in terms of tuition needed to meet our financial objectives.

**Report on Deans’ Surveys (Slide 3)**

The Interim Provost explained that he had planned to give this part of his report in April.

Five Deans from the six academic schools were evaluated on their performance by roster faculty, excluding Dean Tillis of the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs due to his brief time on the job so far. The Interim Provost explained that this survey information will factor into the full evaluations of the Deans to be completed in May.

Response rates were strong: all schools’ response rates were over 30%, four of the five had rates of over 50%, and one school had a rate of over 2/3 of the faculty responding.

Strengths: faculty found that Deans were excellent advocates for meeting their departments’ and programs’ resource needs for the classroom, research, and service. Some comments focused on strengths of Deans as communicators.

Weaknesses: Some comments, on the other hand, pointed out areas in which Deans could improve their communication. In some schools, the survey revealed a desire for greater transparency about how decisions are made. In some schools, results suggested the importance of providing faculty access to their Deans. Across the schools, there also seemed to be some concern that Deans’ attention and energy was devoted more to some programs than others.

The comments that faculty allowed the Deans to see, the Interim Provost said, have already been shared with them, as have the quantitative data, so they need not wait for the full evaluation to be completed in May to begin acting on the responses.
Report on Tenure, Promotion, Third Year Review (Slide 4)

The Interim Provost thanked the departmental review committees for the significant quantity and quality of the work they did; the Deans, who have to read many files in a short space of time; the college-wide, elected faculty Tenure and Promotion committee, who read and evaluated an enormous number of cases; and the staff of the Academic Affairs office, for their extensive work collaborating with the Deans, the chairs, and all the faculty involved.

There were 70 tenure and promotion cases this year. Below are the actions and results:

- 27 Third-Year Reviews (all positive)
- 22 Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor (21 positive, one negative)
- 15 Promotion to Professor (14 positive, one negative)
- 1 Promotion to Senior Instructor (positive)
- 0 Faculty Librarian Tenure/Promotion

Revisions to the Faculty/Administration Manual (Slide 5)

The Interim Provost reminded the Senate of a prior Senate discussion regarding a potential change to the F/AM that would change how we refer to our adjunct faculty by creating the title of “Adjunct Lecturer,” or in cases of very experienced adjunct faculty, “Adjunct Senior Lecturer.” Many committees have vetted this measure.

[Note: this measure was not on the agenda for the meeting]

The Interim Provost also noted that on the agenda are two potential revisions to the F/AM brought by the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual: to more clearly define “Graduate Faculty” and to add “University Professor” as an honorary rank, a successor to an honorary rank of “Distinguished Professor” once extant at the College.

He also called attention to two documents that also would change the F/AM for next year and which he distributed prior to the Senate meeting.

One (PDF) would change the section of the F/AM dealing with Tenure and Promotion by

- instructing departmental evaluation panel chairs to seek out at least 20 recent graduate reviews
- asking chairs to provide more clarity about the selection process for external reviewers
- clarifying that, for faculty colleagues who have not yet been promoted to Professor, service as department chair, program director, and Associate Dean will count as service alongside other kinds of service

The other (PDF) summarizes a change in summer compensation, clarifying both a reference to an obsolete state law and limits on summer compensation.
He offered these two documents for discussion in Q&A.

**Comments on the Senate Agenda (Slide 6)**

The Interim Provost thanked the Budget Committee, who did an enormous amount of work this year as the budget process was revamped. The process was transparent, with Deans, Associate Vice Presidents, and others reporting to the Interim Provost and making requests “in the full light of day.” The Interim Provost has produced a budget out of this process, which he described as very labor intensive for those involved, particularly the faculty committee. He noted that members of the committee informed him that they spent more time on this committee than they have ever spent on any other committee in the history of their time at the College. This was an important change, the Provost said, in our organizational culture and a welcome move toward transparency in the budget process.

He noted that Academic Planning’s work on the course repetition policy represents an important change, and he thanked Associate Vice President Lynne Ford and the Academic Planning Committee for their work on it.

Finally, he noted that in the ‘Constituent Concerns’ section of the current agenda, a faculty colleague will be discussing enrollment limits in Distance Education classes. The Interim Provost observed that there has been discussion about how to set enrollment limits, especially for summer and DE courses, with department chairs, deans, and other faculty colleagues, most recently in an Academic Forum meeting the week prior to the Senate meeting. Additionally, he noted that a meeting of the Academic Council slated for Wednesday 4/8 will also take up the issue. The Interim Provost assured the Senate that class size, as part of a conversation about the quality of education at the College, is being discussed in balance with the awareness that classes also need to enroll at a reasonable level so that we can continue to offer a high quality education.

**At this point the Interim Provost paused to answer questions about the above. There were none.**

**Compliance with State Law, Options, and Motion (Slides 8-11)**

[Also referenced in the following is the Provost’s Memo to the Academic Planning Committee of March 18, Re: Sections 59-29-120 and 59-29-130, South Carolina Code of Laws (PDF)]

The Interim Provost made a motion to suspend the Senate’s standing rule number two in order to immediately consider a motion on complying with state law (see below), asking unanimous consent for the suspension.

The motion to suspend standing rule two was accepted.

The Interim Provost, to provide context for the motion, explained that in Title 59 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, chapters 100 and above deal with higher education, and chapters 1 to 99 cover K-12 education. A few years ago, he went on, a University of South Carolina student discovered a law passed in 1924 and buried in
chapter 29 dealing with instruction in the essentials of the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and the Federalist Papers, an excerpt of which reads:

All [public] high schools, college, and universities ... shall give instruction in the essentials of the United States Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Federalist Papers ..., and no student ... may receive a certificate of graduation without previously passing a satisfactory examination upon the provisions and principles of [these founding documents], and, if a citizen of the United States, satisfying the examining power of his loyalty thereto.

Both high school graduates and college and university graduates of SC schools are required by this law to have instruction in the documents and to pass a test in order to earn a “certificate of graduation.” The student who discovered the statute questioned why his own university and other SC state colleges and universities do not comply with the universal law. And “the long and short of it,” the Interim Provost observed, is that this caught the attention of some state legislators.

By last year, CHE had contacted the four-year universities in the state and polled them as to whether or not they comply with the law. CofC replied, as did many of the other schools, the Interim Provost said, by pointing out the large number of applicable courses we teach and that we have appropriate programming (Constitution Day) every year, but we could not say that students are required to take classes in these documents and pass a test on them. We do not comply with the law and have not since the College went public in 1970.

After telling the legislature earlier that we were contemplating how to comply, a few months ago the College informed the legislature that we will comply with the law.

The law applies to both undergraduate and graduate degrees.

Also, he noted the law as written requires a loyalty to these documents, which is unconstitutional, and in reference to which, the College informed CHE that we interpret this to mean “familiarity” with the documents (loyalty assumes familiarity).

The law also asks for a year of instruction, which is not necessarily consistent with an academic year, per se. The Interim Provost said that in conversation with CHE, the College advised them that we interpret this as instruction across multiple academic semesters. A speaker series over fall and spring semester with at least one lecture per semester and coverage of the documents, the Interim Provost suggested, could meet the “year” requirement.

Compliance options include revising the undergraduate and graduate curricula, but, as the Interim Provost observed, this is not likely something the Senate wishes to do and, furthermore, it is not required by the statute.

Another option, the preferred option, is to provide for non-credit instruction. There will be a graduation requirement in both the undergraduate and graduate catalogs that must be completed, along with the students’ other degree requirements.
Students will be steered to a lesson in OAKS, they will complete a tutorial, and they will have to pass an exam in order to complete the requirement.

While this all sounds easy, it is not, he cautioned. It will need to be set up over the summer. We will need faculty to build the instruction and test. IT, with a very “heavy lift,” initially, will be involved, and Senior Vice President/Chief Information Officer Cape assures it can be done. If the website “blows up” or there’s some catastrophic failure, then we might have to temporarily suspend the degree requirement for the relatively few students who might graduate next year under the new catalog.

The Interim Provost admitted that he is “not eager” to have to meet the requirements of the law, but it is a law and there is no excuse for not moving towards complying with it. Additionally, he said that he does not wish to have legislators think that the College is willfully ignoring something they are very interested in pursuing.

He thanked the faculty who have been working on the issue, particularly Associate Vice President Lynne Ford.

The Interim Provost introduced the following motion:

To assure compliance with Sects. 59-29-120 and 59-29-130 of the S.C. Code of Laws, an additional graduation requirement shall be inserted in all future editions of the College of Charleston undergraduate and graduate catalogs, consistent with the Interim Provost’s memorandum to the Academic Planning Committee of March 18, 2015, with this graduation requirement to be removed from future catalogs following any deletion of the relevant statutory provisions by the South Carolina General Assembly.

[the above text includes a “friendly amendment” to include “be” between “to” and “removed” in line six above]

The Interim Provost called attention to the last phrase of the motion: should the law be repealed, he said, we can remove the requirement from future catalogs.
That said, he added that he doubts it will be repealed.

The motion was seconded.

Discussion

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, asked if the law has ever been enforced.

The Interim-Provost replied that “there are legislators that are highly interested in our compliance with it.”

He added that he can imagine a couple ways in which enforcement could occur: someone might be fired for non-compliance (nothing like that, to his knowledge, has occurred) or funding might be threatened for non-compliance. On the latter, he said “I do not think it would stretch the definition of ‘threaten’ to say ‘yes.’”

Bill Manaris, Computer Science, noted that the law speaks to US citizens: would our requirement apply to international students as well?
The Interim Provost replied that it would apply to all degree-seeking students, international or otherwise.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, asked, since the law governs all SC high school students and most of our students are SC high school graduates, couldn't the requirement operate “transitively,” with these students satisfying the CoC degree requirement by virtue of their high school diploma?

The Interim Provost said that “unfortunately, the law is written to brook no exceptions.” If, he said, all our students were SC public high school graduates, we might be able to make that argument, but this is not the case.

Anguelova countered that at least those that did graduate from SC public high schools could be excepted.

The Interim Provost replied that the managerial problem would be “profound,” since it would require a sophisticated screening process.

He pointed out that a CoC graduate who pursues a second degree at CoC will not have to repeat the requirement again for the subsequent degree. But the practical reality for now is that it is simpler to have all graduates complete the requirement.

[Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, at this point offered the friendly amendment to add “be” to the text (see above)]

Joe Carson - Senator - SSM, asked if the Interim Provost knows how institutions like MUSC and others are planning to comply.

The Interim Provost shared what he knows on this from universities’ responses to CHE’s question. Coastal Carolina University represents themselves as already complying with the law. MUSC’s stance is difficult to discern, the Interim Provost said. USC-Columbia has “stated that they would love for the law to be modernized” and discussed steps they might take to increase students’ access to the founding documents, but this does not clarify how they are complying with the requirements of the law.

Carson asked if our approach is consistent with the other institutions.

The Interim Provost replied that Coastal Carolina has said they comply with the law and, on the basis of complying alone (but not how they comply), we are consistent with them since we will comply with the law. The other institutions he declined to comment on, but he did say that in providing an online access to materials, USC- Columbia’s approach is similar to ours, though they do not have a graduation requirement that satisfies the law, as will we.

Larry Krasnoff, Department of Philosophy, expressed concern about a gap between what students are required to do as laid out in the memo and the year’s instruction required in the statute itself. The speaker series would constitute the year’s instruction as required by the law, according to the memo, Krasnoff said.
The Interim Provost added at this point that the online instruction would also count as instruction.

Krasnoff went on to say that the memo suggests, however, that the instruction is what occurs online. He found this somewhat worrisome because, on the one hand, for compliance, the speaker series is being represented as the year-long instruction, whereas in the memo the instruction seems to be taking place in the online element. He suggested that this might be cleaned up, such that the online elements are not represented as instruction, per se, but as additional materials. The speaker series could then represent more cleanly the year-long instruction required by the law.

Krasnoff went on to say that the statute does not require instruction before the exam, but merely that a student pass the exam.

The Interim Provost replied that it is significant that the language in the statute says "shall give instruction," which does entail that instruction is received.

Krasnoff pointed out that the Interim Provost’s language in the memo says students will "complete instruction," not receive it.

The Interim Provost replied that Krasnoff was correct, and that while the language of the statute was parsed carefully in order to write the memo, the language of the memo can continue to be refined. He invited Krasnoff and any other senators who may be interested to assist in revisions if they are so inclined. He said he would share with Krasnoff another draft.

Phil Jos, Senator - SHHS, asked if there is a report from the Academic Planning Committee, given that the memo to the committee is dated March 18.

The Interim Provost deferred to George Pothering, Chair of that committee.

Pothering noted that the committee discussed the memo and provided feedback to the Interim Provost, in essence giving their assent for him to present it to the Senate.

Kirk Stone, Senator - Communication, said that he would just like to make sure that there is no chance that the faculty will also have to demonstrate their knowledge of the founding documents.

The Interim Provost assured Stone that faculty will not be tested, but he offered to join a reading group on the Federalist papers, should Stone wish to initiate that.

Phil Jos, Senator - SHHS, commented that “it’s a sorry affair that we have to trivialize these important documents and the important ideas that they contain with an online test.” He said that he and many others inside and outside of Political Science “take those documents very seriously.”

The Interim Provost responded by saying that Coastal Carolina went the route of writing their general education curriculum around this legal requirement, and there is nothing stopping the CofC faculty from doing the same, he said, and dispatching the requirement in that way.
“Except,” Jos riposted, “severe threats from people like me, being in a department that would have to mount 700 sections of American Government.”

“A point also well-taken,” the Interim Provost agreed.

**Andrew Shedlock**, Senator - SSM, inquired if other states also have similar founding document requirements, or is this just a “South Carolina-ism”?

The Interim Provost, having worked in Texas, said that there is a requirement there for instruction in state politics. He then deferred to AVP Ford, who has some expertise in Texas requirements. She noted that Texas also has a state legal requirement for a full year’s (two semesters) instruction in federal government. Thus, every nationally-distributed American Government textbook has a special Texas edition.

The Interim Provost added that in Texas the instruction is required to be credit-bearing.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked if anyone has inquired into the legal status of the degrees we have granted over the years.

The Interim Provost said that, on this question, he not only claims ignorance, but “invincible ignorance.”

DeLaurell asked if the motion under discussion could be edited to “grandfather” in the degrees already conferred before we come into compliance.

The Interim Provost replied that, though he wish it could, he did not think the Senate has that authority.

**Bonnie Springer**, Chair - Faculty Curriculum Committee, recommended that the Interim Provost consider partnering with the office for students with disabilities in constructing the test questions, since there are ways of constructing questions to better meet the needs of students with disabilities.

The Interim Provost agreed that this is a good suggestion and, he added, a committee will need to be formed to do this work. Volunteers, he said, will be gratefully accepted.

**Betsy Baker**, Senator - English, asked for a clarification: will students graduating next year be affected by the new requirement?

Only, the Interim Provost, responded, if they graduate under the 2015-16 catalog. This requirement, thus, will be phased in over time: eventually all students will be subject to the requirement, but it will take a while.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, said we did without this requirement for a long time. Doing it now demonstrates compliance to the public and the legislature, but a reasonable reading of the law’s “year” requirement would construe that as meaning two courses over two semesters. Is there any worry that our means of complying will appear not really as compliance but as a way of getting around compliance? In which case, the political backlash could be worse?
The Interim Provost said that others may diverge from his opinion, but he said it is “pretty evident that we are moving in greater strides in our attempt to comply with the law and are putting more effort into it earlier than are many other four year institutions,” and this will not earn us punishment.

The legislature, of course, might also amend this law, and there is an attempt to amend it afoot right now, though it would not change any of what we’re complying with (it would remove the loyalty oath). “We are creatures of the legislature, strange as that is to believe, and if they tell us we have to do certain things to comply—and I’d rather they didn’t, but they can,” he said—“I’d say at this point, we’re more likely to get credit for the effort of working toward compliance than we are to be punished for complying in the wrong way, when they’ve given us so few cues.”

The President agreed.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, asked, as long as there are efforts underway to amend the law slightly, is there any way to suggest to the legislature in a friendly way that they might change it to limit it to undergraduate degrees?

The Interim Provost said there have been numerous attempts to suggest revisions. He added that our endorsement of the motion might add credibility to any suggestions we have for changes.

There was no more discussion.

The motion was approved on a voice vote with one abstention.

D. Budget Committee
Chair; Julia Eichelberger

Report: PDF | PPT
Budget Memos to Provost: 1-21-15 (PDF), 2-4-15 (PDF)

Eichelberger echoed the Interim Provost in praising the work of the committee members (slide 1), noting the breadth of experience they brought to the table and the hard work they put in to live up to the committee’s charge.

She suggested that Senators and guests consult the committee’s report during the presentation, as well as the two memos from the committee to the Interim Provost (see above for links).

She explained the process for developing the 2015-16 budget (slide 3), specifying that budget requests follow an “historic” budget model, in which units are expected to receive about the same amount as they have in the year prior, with requests being for funds above this amount.

15 different entities presented their requests at a public hearing, the schedule of which appears in slide 3.

The Budget Committee reviewed and discussed the documents from these 15 presentations, met with the Interim Provost, and submitted a memo to the Interim Provost on 1/21 (PDF) (slide 4). The memo does not rank-order requests
or make very many specific recommendations but, instead, offers guiding principles for what the committee considered in the best interest of the faculty and the College.

With the committee’s memo to consider, among other things, the Interim Provost drafted a budget request presented at a public forum on 1/26. The committee reviewed this budget, drafted a second memo to the Interim Provost (2/4 PDF), and then met with him to discuss it (slide 5). Eichelberger stressed that the committee’s input proceeded and contributed to the development of the budget, rather than coming as a reaction to an already-decided-upon budget, as in the past on the Budget Committee.

She summarized the committee’s take on the results of the process (see slide 6). The committee, though they did not always agree with the Interim Provost’s decisions in his final budget proposal, felt they were sound ones, nonetheless. She noted that there will be a 1.5% inflationary increase in operating budgets built into the budget, which has not always happened and which the committee felt is a good idea to help offset the effects of inflation on departments.

Given the limited budget landscape, many worthy programs that would be very good for the College will not be funded, which Eichelberger noted is very tough to see, but is a reality of a tight budget.

Eichelberger also pointed out that one potential source for income to offset costs currently being talked about is program or course fees, which the committee endorses under particular conditions and restrictions (see slide 8). These fees would not be subject to the same kinds of limitations from the legislature that tuition increases (universal fees) are. Other institutions have such fees, such as the fees at Clemson’s College of Business and Behavioral Science assesses on majors in the college, $1,000 per semester (slide 7).

The committee recommends implementing school-based fees, with restrictions (slide 8):

- Schools do not keep all the fee; at least 25% is returned to the general fund, to offset the higher cost-per-credit-hour that the institution is absorbing for instruction in other schools
- Money can only be spent in ways that directly benefit students; spending must be publicized
- Faculty from the school should assist in setting up a system to oversee the spending of fees (for scholarships, initiatives to enhance student learning, undergraduate research, and so forth)

If the College decides to implement fees, these will not likely be assessed until the 2016-17 academic year.

Eichelberger explained how special appropriations work (slide 9), noting that the President (see above) has already explained these as monies given by the state for special projects or initiatives and the funds are not attached to our regular funding. These are projects and initiatives the legislators want to support, and
the College’s legislative team asks for appropriations for items that they think the legislature will support.

Faculty, she observed, are not part of the process of planning and talking to legislators. She added, as a personal opinion, that she thinks faculty ought to be.

Special appropriations are essential “windfalls,” and while, as such, they do not affect our budget, they may benefit certain people, projects, or units and if we are worried about what units need the most support, it would be good for us to keep track of where these windfalls land.

There is hope that through special appropriations we might secure lines and funding for construction projects and scholarships. And there is, it would appear, more money available this year in the state for special appropriations than there has been in the recent past.

Eichelberger endorsed, on behalf of the committee, the transparent budget process and provided the committee’s recommendation for multi-year appointments on the committee, since the learning curve for new members is very steep (slide 10).

She commented, as well, that there will be no growth in the downtown undergraduate population, which has implications for planning, and so adding new programs may require reducing other, existing programs (slide 10). We should continue to innovate, but we need to understand the financial universe in which we are operating.

Additionally, she conveyed the committee’s suggestion that departments work toward predicting student demand for their programs in order to better allocate resources.

The College, the committee also recommended, should develop some means of better assessing department and program needs. The historic budget model may result in relatively well-funded programs continuing to be well funded, while other relatively-starved programs continue to be starved. The committee does not, at present, have a plan for this, but has identified the need.

The historic budget model may also obscure the fact that the demand for some programs may have gone down, while the funding remains roughly the same. In such cases, a transparent process of reallocation may be appropriate.

Questions / Comments / Discussion

Bob Mignone, Senator - SSM, asked for a clarification. Are not special appropriations non-recurring? And if so, why are faculty lines being spoken of in that context (slide 9)?

Eichelberger replied that her understanding is that special appropriations can be made for recurring funding.

The President confirmed this: special appropriations can be either recurring or non-recurring.
Phil Jos, Senator - SHHS, commended the committee and commented that the report underscores the necessity for the Senate to scrutinize program proposals carefully and perhaps to ask for a higher level of “market research” on likely number of majors and growth. And we should also consider staffing, even though that carries us across a fuzzy line, in that the Senate is typically concerned with curriculum and not staffing. Proposals may need to ask for funding up front. Jos cautioned that if we make decisions with a “fixed pie,” we may be making decisions that change the shape of the College without having a plan to do so: somewhere, other departments may end up with fewer resources because we have approved other programs.

Eichelberger agreed. We have a responsibility to deliver whatever we approve and, thus, resources have to be considered, not just curriculum.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked how much the Budget Committee is likely to be involved in decisions on school-based fees, and if they are approved, how likely, he asked, is the Budget Committee to be involved in publicizing how the fees are spent.

Eichelberger replied that she hopes the Budget Committee will be directly involved. The Interim Provost and the President both agree with having safeguards around school fees, she added. The Budget Committee would be a natural committee for this, but there might be other committees that would be appropriate to do it, as well.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, added her commendation and thanks for the committee’s work, saying that she is proud to be represented by the committee.

She observed, however, that she is disturbed by the classification of students as “customers.” We have to be careful, she cautioned, not to "run after what's hot" and spend our resources on that, because what’s hot will not always be hot and we might find ourselves committing additional resources to supporting it. Being good stewards of the College consists in "knowing who we are," she said, "and being the best at that." This does not mean becoming static, but we should resist the idea of the student as a customer that needs to be fed hot commodities. Instead, being vigilant about making sure all programs truly benefit students is the better course.

She expressed concern about school-based fees, worrying about the funds falling into "a black hole" and, thus, outside of faculty oversight and stewardship.

She encouraged the committee to continue its good work and urged the Senate to adopt a serious, conscientious stewardship stance toward curriculum and budget matters.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, noted that the President in his remarks stressed the core role of undergraduate education at the College and how other programs need to enhance and support undergraduate education. He added that the North Campus and also the MBA program were supposed to make money, and
this was a selling point for the latter, particularly. He asked Eichelberger if the committee has looked into this, adding that while the planned profitability of those units has been often referred to, he, himself, has never seen figures that back up those claims.

Eichelberger replied that the committee has not seen such figures either, adding that it is important that there be follow up. If a program makes certain promises about paying for itself, or even producing a profit, then we should check in to see how they’re doing.

Krasnoff agreed — echoing Jos’s concern expressed earlier — that program approval tends to be a one-way thing. We approve it, and then we’re done. There is no oversight of what actually happens.

The Interim Provost agreed that with the help of the Budget Committee, we can look into the finances of the North Campus, the MBA program, and any other program, for that matter.

Addressing the MBA program specifically, he observed that tuition in that program is new revenue to us because the students are only there for that specific program. The program also assesses a fairly large fee, and the Interim Provost noted that he has had a conversation about the fee income with Dean Shao. As a result, next year some of the fee income will be put into the general ledger. "The program is sufficiently mature," the Interim Provost remarked, "that it ought to be returning some resources to the institution in that way."

Of the North Campus, he said it is providing a promising return. We had hoped to have 100 students pursuing the BPS there, but we have not hit that number yet and, thus, we have yet to see the returns that we would like to see. It is, he said, "a work in progress." He added that "more precision" can be added to this discussion in the coming academic year.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, noted that there is a lack of transportation to the North Campus, which prevents both students from the downtown campus who might wish to take classes there from being able to do so and teachers from the downtown campus from being able to teach there. Providing a shuttle would help.

Anguelova also raised a concern she has with the Office of Institutional Diversity (OID). It is, she said, a well-funded operation, but "not very effective." She wondered if some of the money dedicated to this office might be better used for scholarships.

Eichelberger noted that OID is not covered under the Academic Affairs budget, but that the President did speak to a study of diversity efforts in his report.

Anguelova added that a significant part of the high cost of running the College is the cost of administrative offices, and she said her "personal pet peeve" is the OID.

Kevin Keenan, Political Science, advised that there is CARTA express service with a transfer to the North Campus, to which Anguelova replied that express
service stops at 7:30 PM, to which Godfrey Gibbison, Dean of the School Professional Studies, added, the North Campus has parking.

**Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker** observed that Kristi Brian of the OID runs "an incredible faculty diversity series," that she recommend to Senators for next year.

**Bob Mignone**, Senator - SSM, said that "in my many decades here, my several stints on the Budget Committee, this is the most promising turn of events that I think I have experienced with regard to the budget. The fact that you all have worked so hard this year breaking trail, the fact that President McConnell and Provost McGee have facilitated having faculty in the process, in the loop, is wonderful. I just hope it continues, and I will do everything I can to help."

Someone exclaimed, "Hear! Hear!," and applause broke out.

**There were no more questions or comments.**

Eichelberger added that the Budget Committee also prepared a report on the closing of the Stern Center pool. She explained they did not want to take time to present this at the meeting but that it will be posted on the Senate website the following day. She encouraged Senators to review the report.

**E. Faculty Compensation Committee (Report: PPT)**

**Susan Rozzi, Chair**

Rozzi explained that the committee's report is dedicated to an update on progress made toward recommendations made in the committee’s resolution approved by the Senate in March 2013:

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

The committee, she noted, works in cooperation with the Academic Affairs and the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Information Management, and she thanked both offices for their help, without which the committee could not do its work.

Slide 3, "Peer Institution Salary Comparison," shows data from IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) comparing CoC faculty salaries across the board to those of 20 peer institutions. The data is from 2013-14. New data, Rozzi said, comes out a week or two from the date of the present meeting.

Slide 4 shows a just-under-$1,000 increase in our average salary (across all ranks and all disciplines) from 2012-13 to 2013-14. Even so, we ended up dropping one rank by comparison, from 13 to 14 out of 21, respectively.

Slide 5 shows our progress over five years, from 2009 until last year, comparing the College (burgundy line) to the mean of the means of the other schools (blue
line). She noted that this slide demonstrates that we are making progress, observing also that, at times, our ability to move toward the salary averages of another institution is a function of the other institution's drop in average salary. Although, this at times is the case, she pointed out, we are still making progress.

Slide 6 breaks down the comparison by rank (but not by discipline) for median salaries. She noted that there might be some uncertainty in the IPEDS data because we cannot tell if all the reporting institutions are reporting all of their data for all of their faculty in all ranks, and what is reported may vary from year to year. The slide demonstrates that we are making progress at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks, and that we are doing well at the Senior Instructor and Assistant Professor ranks.

Slide 7 makes the same comparisons as Slide 6, but for mean salaries (the resolution calls for comparison on medians).

Slide 8 accounts for the causes of our progress toward reaching the goal as stated in the resolution: competitive salaries for new hires (particularly Assistant Professors), increased Associate and Professor promotion increments, across the board salary increases for 2013-15, and merit/market increases in 2013-14.

Rozzi recommended, on behalf of the committee, that the College try to determine the true drivers of comparative increases in CofC average salaries, continue to raise salaries at the Associate and Professor ranks, and allocate funds to meet the goals of the resolution before the resolution’s stated date of September 2018.

**Questions / Comments / Discussion**

**Beth Meyer-Bernstein**, Senator - SSM thanked Rozzi for the report and asked if the committee analyzed data for comparisons by discipline.

Rozzi said that the committee has looked at that but they have not reported on it.

Associate Provost Cavney-Noecker added that Academic Affairs does provide discipline-specific data for salary every year to the chairs and deans.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator - SHHS, asked what she characterized as a "self-serving question." It is commendable, she said, that promotion increments have increased over the past couple of years. She noted that her tenure and promotion came before the increments were increased and asked if there has been discussion about what can be done for faculty in the same position as she.

Rozzi replied that for those who have already been tenured and promoted, post-tenure review increments have been increased, as well, which is helpful.

She deferred to the Interim Provost, who explained that the approach of the last two Presidents of the College has been to raise promotion raises somewhat incrementally over time so as not to create big gaps in pay from person to person separated by only a few years as they move through the promotion cycle. For those in the position that Gigova described, the Interim Provost said that they will see some benefit from the increased increment for promotion from Associate
to Professor. Additionally, he said there have been increases in the Post-Tenure Review increment for those with a superior rating. He noted that some feel that that increment ought to be even higher, and this has been an ongoing discussion, he said, which he takes quite seriously. He emphasized that across two presidential administrations and two Provosts there has been an effort to create a wider range of opportunities for salary growth in the Associate and Professor ranks, while simultaneously also pushing for merit-based increase opportunities year-by-year.

The answer to the question of whether or not there will be some kind of adjustment made retroactively for those who did not benefit from recent promotion increment increases, however, the Interim Provost said is "no."

Except that, Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker countered, Deans and Chairs might, when we have merit/market processes, be granted some discretion to address such individual salary issues. There are, she affirmed, individual issues as much as system issues. One should not feel, she said, as if "my problem can never get fixed."

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, noted that "compensation is multiple things" and asked if the committee had plans to look at the issue of insurance. He added that it is his sense that the quality and diversity of insurance options is going down. The state plan, he said, even has a "grandfather clause" to get out of ACA obligations, such that certain kinds of basic care mandated by federal law the state plan does not have to provide. Insurance, too, he argued should be part of the conversation.

Rozzi said that she agrees and that the committee agrees. The committee has had conversations about widening the understanding of compensation, and she said she will pass his comment on to next year's committee.

There was no more discussion.

F. Academic Planning Committee (PDF)

George Pothering, Chair

Pothering passed his duties as Parliamentarian on to Larry Krasnoff in order to deliver his committee’s report.

Pothering explained that the committee has brought to the Senate changes to the course repetition policy in four different spots in the undergraduate catalog (see PDF). Associate Vice President Lynne Ford, he explained, brought the issue to the Academic Planning Committee, and it also went to the Academic Standards Committee. The Academic Planning Committee took input from all the parties, came up with language and sent it back to Academic Standards and AVP Ford.

The changes are meant to clarify catalog language. Pothering went through the changes specified in the document, reiterating the rationale as provided therein.

For the change on p. 26 under “General Repeat Rules” that would strike the entire bullet, “Prerequisite Rule: A student may not take a course that is a prerequisite for a course that he/she has already passed and received credit for the second
course,” AVP Ford explained that “the way it is stated [in the current catalog], there is absolutely no way we can enforce that rule using the systems that we have in place” (Banner, DegreeWorks). Additionally, it is “unmanageable” to enforce it at the department level.

**Questions / Comments / Discussion**

**Jon Hakkila**, Physics and Astronomy, asked a question after Pothering went through the foreign language policy that disallows credit when students take a numerically lower numbered language course (such as taking SPAN 101 after already completing 102).

Hakkila explained some related problems in the Physics major. There are two entry points into the upper-level physics courses, an algebra-based or a calculus-based course. He gave an example of a student who took the calculus-based course, got into upper-division classes, but later went back and took the algebra-based course. Is this allowed?, he asked. Is there a way to stop it?

AVP Ford replied that it is up to the department to write the rule into its curriculum.

**Rick Heldrich**, Senator - SSM, asked for a clarification: what cannot be enforced system wide can be enforced at the level of the course within the department?

AVP Ford and Pothering answered in the affirmative.

Pothering added that departments should periodically review the specific catalog language governing course repetition for their curriculum.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator - SMM, asked what the approval process would be for a department to make a specific addition to their course repetition policies.

Pothering suggested that those might be sent to AVP Ford, Academic Planning, or Academic Standards: all three will be reviewing them.

AVP Ford replied that it would be important to figure out if what is being proposed is a curriculum change or just a wording change/clarification. A consultation between the department, the Registrar, and the Chair of the Curriculum Committee would help determine what the next step is.

**Dan Greenberg**, Psychology, asked, in the hypothetical case of a student who retakes a course he earned a “D” in and then earns an “F” on the repeat, has the student exhausted his repeats?

AVP Ford replied “yes.”

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The 4/7/15 session adjourned at this point in the agenda. The 4/14 session began with the item below.
G. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs (Powerpoint Presentation)

Jon Hakkila, Chair

Hakkila observed that the title of the committee indicates something about its inception years ago, when the items covered by the title had a kind of “leftover” status. Yet, much of the growth in the College over the past two years has occurred in these areas, making the committee’s work both exciting and challenging, and, he said, he hoped to impress upon the Senate some of the committee’s concerns, wishes, and hopes as we move into the future.

Hakkila thanked the official members of the committee (slide 2), and then shared an extensive roster of persons not elected to the committee but regularly in attendance (slide 3). The guests often outnumber the committee members, he observed, and given who these regular attendees are and the pressure the committee is under, he said, some of the junior committee members often felt somewhat uncomfortable. Most of these non-committee members have good reason to be at the meetings regularly.

Hakkila explained that this is an opportune moment at the College, conditioned by specific developments over the past couple years (slide 4).

• pressure from the legislature and local and regional business to expand graduate programs. We held conversations with the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, who, in the end, were not entirely sure what they wanted. There was, emerging out of that, pressure to merge with MUSC, to create a university by melding a graduate and undergraduate school. While this also faded, it nonetheless affected the discussion about the directions we might take.

• expansion of USC and Clemson into the area, fueled by the bona fide need to expand graduate education in the Lowcountry, whether we want them here or not, bringing potential for collaboration.

• development of new programs at the Lowcountry Graduate Center (LGC), with or without CofC’s help, though the LGC was originally to be home for the graduate efforts of the College, the Citadel, and MUSC.

• the College’s development of for-profit, non-credit bearing courses at the North Campus.

All of these issues, of course, have implications for the work of the committee.

Among the new programs and courses shepherded by the committee (slide 5), Hakkila singled out the MFA in English as a program that takes advantage of the distinctiveness of the Lowcountry setting, handled finances carefully, and offers two clever tracks (studio or arts management).

The MAT revision, he observed, smartly moved away from an either/or model for special education to an embrace of a more comprehensive approach.
He praised all the proposals across the board for their innovation and held them up as models for how to expand graduate offerings and programs.

Turning to the LGC (slide 6), Hakkila characterized the relationship between CofC and the LGC as “very strained,” adding that many on the committee are uncomfortable that the Director of the LGC, who reports to the state, is also an Associate Dean at the North Campus, which is the College’s campus and is supposed to bring in money to the College. Yet, if the LGC brings in programs or courses that compete with the College’s, then there's a bit of a problem. He said that the College should certainly get the first opportunity to bring in programs on the North Campus.

The committee, he said, wrote a memo to the Interim Provost asking him to initiate a formal review of the memorandum of understanding that governs our relationship with the LGC and which was signed off on by the committee he [Hakkila] now chairs and a number of other committee chairs and staffers at the College. He explained that if a program is developed for the LGC by the College, it goes through a vetting process here and is signed off on by the College. Other programs developed elsewhere for the LGC are not developed and vetted by the College but still have to be signed off on by the College, and this, he said, occurs at the highest levels and only through memoranda of understanding. The committee is asking, he said, for a review of these programs, a clarification, and if possible, a method of providing for staff and faculty vetting and feedback on memoranda of understanding, just to be sure that we are not competing with ourselves or with other developing programs.

He asked, by way of closing this part of the report, “What is the role of Graduate programs at the University of Charleston, SC at the College of Charleston? How can we expand our graduate programs and create a better working environment with the LGC?” These are questions, he said, that he hopes will help clarify our relationship with the LGC.

Hakkila noted (slide 7) that the committee ceded the prerogative to review non-credit courses five years ago, an action approved by the Senate on the grounds that the courses are non-credit and the turnaround time on the proposals was tight. But while the Senate approved the move, the By-laws Committee, he said, did not, which is cause for confusion but ultimately may be immaterial to moving forward.

In the past five years, he said, there have been only two reviews of noncredit courses offered in the North Campus, and that was in the form of informational presentations. The Senate was shown a list of the courses, but feedback was not expected. He raised particular concerns:

- Few courses are staffed by faculty.
- Course assessment is non-standard. The committee is not sure, he said, at all how the courses are assessed.
• The North Campus relies on CofC’s reputation to charge more than our competitors for canned or prepackaged courses we buy from a vendor. The downside is that the main campus reputation can be affected by education at the North Campus.

The committee feels strongly that we need to ensure that North Campus programs strongly benefit the College.

The committee offered two possible ways to address the problem and provided them for discussion:

a) form a new Faculty Committee for reviewing non-credit courses, or
b) expand the size of the Graduate Committee so that a Non-Credit Subcommittee can be formed within it.

As it is, the faculty membership on the committee is small, relative to the non-committee members frequently present at meetings.

Hakkila raised a concern about huge inconsistencies in the numbering of graduate courses across the College, the details of which can be found on slide 8. The problem is a serious one. The committee proposed that a College task force be appointed, composed of faculty, staff, and administrators, to address this very involved problem.

Questions / Comments / Discussion

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship - asked if the committee has a preference between forming a new committee or expanding the size of the current committee to deal with vetting non-credit courses.

Hakkila said that the second option only came up at last meeting of the year, so he’s not sure if the committee has a preference one way or the other. To some extent, it depends on nature of review. The North Campus should have flexibility and, he said, the committee doesn’t want to interfere, but there needs to be some give and take.

Shaver followed up by asking if the formation of a new committee would require by-laws sanction.

The Interim Provost replied “yes.”

George Pothering, Parliamentarian, noted that the other solution (adding to the standing committee) would also require by-laws sanction.

Scott Peeples, Senator - SHSS, asked if there is any concern with the “canned” non-credit courses about potential student/consumer confusion as to whether those courses are being taught online by CofC faculty? He said that the information on the website appears that way. Is there any potential damage to the CofC brand?, he asked.

Jo Ann Ewalt, Political Science and MPA Program Director, a member of the committee, replied (though she specified that she was only speaking for herself). She said she was concerned, and if the information as to the nature of the class is
not there on website, we need to address that because we value both transparency and our reputation.

Peeples followed up by saying that while he doesn’t believe anything “nefarious” is taking place, he was “a little bit shocked” on seeing writing courses being offered and that it would be reasonable to assume that these courses are taught by CofC faculty and, thus, that the Department of English is responsible for what happens in those classes.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHSS, agreed, saying that we could be more vigilant about the online “canned” courses. There is nothing wrong with retailing a canned course, per se, but the online courses might be especially confusing. She reported that, looking at the website, she can see how it might unclear. As we offer more online CofC courses, she said, it is more important to monitor packaging of the non-credit courses so that we do not aid a false association between our faculty and courses that we do not teach. As it is, the website, she asserted, makes a tempting association: “the College of Charleston has vetted these courses.”

Dean Gibbison replied that so far, in his experience, there has been no expression of confusion from students that they are taking a College of Charleston course.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, said that Eichelberger’s point wasn’t so much that students taking a course would be confused about the course itself so much as expressing a concern that we are legitimizing the courses by association with the CofC brand.

DeLaurell then asked how large the market is for these courses. How many non-credit courses are we retailing?

Dean Gibbison said that we have a number of noncredit courses on the list, but we’ve had fewer than 50 people take them so far, many of them CofC students and faculty. This is not an uncommon arrangement: “Clemson University,” he said, “plays in this space”, as do a number of leading universities worldwide. It is not unusual to partner with a third-party to provide non-credit courses.

DeLaurell followed up with what she called a “vulgar question”: are these courses making money?

Dean Gibbison said "yes." Most of them are offered for $119 for 30 hours of instruction. We make enough money to market other non-credit courses, many of which are taught by College of Charleston faculty in community education, face-to-face settings.

DeLaurell suggested that if we are making money on these courses and they may be trading on the CofC brand, CofC could be held accountable for the quality of the courses. While this might not be a concern for those in other disciplines, she said that in the discipline of Accounting it is very important to not leave a false impression about the nature and quality of courses. She asked the committee to consider potential accountability for non-profit courses.
Dan Greenberg, Psychology, suggested that adding a new, separate committee might just fracture the process further. Is there an advantage, he asked, to having a separate committee over having a subcommittee of the larger committee?

Hakkila remarked that one of the biggest concerns he actually sees is continuity. It’s rough going when committee makeup changes quickly. Neither of the proposed solutions, he said, is good, given that it is already hard enough to seat the existing committees we have.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy and Director of the Pre-Law Program, as someone who offers a non-credit program that was vetted by the committee under the old process, spoke in favor of some kind of vetting process to protect the credibility of the course. The LSAT prep course offered by Pre-Law is always taught by faculty.

Prelaw also charges a lot less than commercial courses, he said: it’s a student service. He went on: when the goal of the people who are running the non-credit courses is to make as much money as possible, though, certain tensions can arise. So far there has been no pressure to raise the course fee, though there has been some pressure to increase enrollments.

“To be honest,” he said, “since the non-credit office was set up, I think there has been more pressure to make money, precisely to pay the salaries of the people who run that office, even though they didn’t do anything to create the course.” Having some sort of authority vested in the faculty would be good.

Hakkila replied that the committee has only the best interests of CofC in mind, and mainly desires to foster consistency.

Associate Vice President Lynne Ford responded to Krasnoff. While Krasnoff developed the course, she pointed out, before we had the office that Alice Hamilton now runs for continuing education and non-credit courses, faculty who wanted to do what he does, she said, would “literally take cash.” There was no monitoring quality of such courses. The office, while it may not develop the course — “that’s your job,” she said — does provide enrollments, marketing, and the protection of offering a legitimate course under the umbrella of the College of Charleston.

Further speaking of legitimacy, Ford asserted, “the North Campus is the College of Charleston, not a branch of the College or another university. We need to acknowledge that the North Campus is serving the broader community in a way that the downtown campus simply cannot. The North Campus houses a diversity of programs for that mission. The Bachelor of Professional Studies is a direct response to what the community has asked for.

The online courses that we have been talking about, Ford went on, are hosted by ed2go (Ed to Go) and are available nationally. We serve as a portal for students to access those courses 24 hours a day, five times a year for $119. The College makes enough money to offer the courses and ed2go makes enough money to vet the courses, the same courses offered all over the country, including at Clemson.
She encouraged faculty to take a look at the courses, which are not intended to make you an expert, but to offer you a service. She gave some examples of some courses: Excel skills, test prep, double-entry accounting for small business owners.

She said it is important not to confuse these different kinds of courses and programs.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Accounting and Legal Studies, asserted that the point AVP Ford made, the North Campus is the College of Charleston, argues in favor of the need to be involved in vetting non-profit courses. She said that we could distinguish between courses developed by a CofC faculty member (like the one Krasnoff referenced) and those offered through ed2go with some kind of disclaimer so that the purchaser understands that the College has not vetted those courses. By this means, the consumer can make an informed choice and we will only need to vet some of the non-credit courses.

Hakkila pointed out that the offerings are not limited to those two types. He said, for instance, that there are also non-credit courses taught by members of the community. In some cases, a course will be offered initially as taught by a CofC faculty member, but then that doesn’t pan out, and a community member steps in, instead: how would such a course be categorized?, he asked.

DeLaurelly replied that if the course is prepared by a CofC faculty member and vetted by the committee, it would be a CofC course. A disclaimer, however, would have to accompany courses like ed2go offerings. That might, she said, protect our brand.

Dean Gibbison said that we do offer a number of instructor-led, face-to-face non-credit courses, and, he said, we look for CofC faculty to lead such classes, but if no CofC faculty come forward, he said, we look for others in the community who are qualified.

He added that the North Campus has no problem with a committee vetting such courses, but this is a “rapid response” situation. Turnaround is tight, and if we have to wait for approval, it might come too slowly.

He encouraged faculty who have said that they do not know what is going on at the North Campus to peruse the website. You can find out a great deal there, including reading the bios of instructors. He also strongly encouraged faculty to drop by.

The **Interim Provost** at this point, mindful of the hour and the business remaining to be completed, said that the committee chair has gotten what he sought—thoughtful discussion of the issues he laid out—but that until the Faculty By-Laws are amended, the program under discussion continues to fall under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs. He suggested that we return this matter to the
committee to consider next fall in light of the feedback received at the meeting, if that is acceptable to the Senate.

Hakkila asked what the review expectations would be of the committee next year. The Interim Provost replied that the committee could take up its own suggestions, informed by the Senate discussion, and that he or his successor would happily sit down with the committee to discuss how to address the concerns, and, given that Dean Gibbison has expressed no opposition to some Senate screening function, come back to the Senate with a concrete proposal next year.

**There was no further discussion.**

### H. Faculty Curriculum Committee: Special Topics, Variable Topics

Bonnie Springer, Chair  
Steven Jaumé, Secretary, reporting

Jaumé read into the record the following report from the committee chair.

[A] task force took on the task of looking at issues related to courses that would fall into a broad category of Variable credit or content courses. It was discovered that courses of this type pose several challenges for curricular integrity as well as administrative management.

Outcomes of the initial study this year led to the following issues which will be acted upon by next year’s curriculum committee

1) There appears to be lack of clarity around the differences between Special Topics, Varying Topics and Variable Topics courses. Faculty need guidance through the development of definitions and purposes of these different types of courses so that courses proposed meet the curricular needs of the department and/or program.

[Basically, Jaumé added, we have different groups of courses that have variability to them. At issue is how they fit into their departments and programs and how the Curriculum Committee should assess their content.]

2) There appears to be a lack of consistency in the use of the 3 in 5 year rule for Special Topics courses and the monitoring of those courses.

[This is the rule that says, Jaumé specified, that you cannot offer the same special topics class more than three time in five years without having having to propose the regular course for inclusion in the catalog].

In 1994 the Senate adopted a rule indicating that the Registrar’s Office would monitor Special Topics courses to insure that the rule was met. Over time, it has become apparent that the monitoring of Special Topics courses involves knowledge of the content as well as the title of each course, and therefore is clearly a curricular responsibility that is more appropriately monitored at the department level.
It is really hard for the Registrar’s office to monitor content in such courses, he said. Therefore, it needs to be done at the department level.

3) Next year the Curriculum committee will be bringing forward suggestions for changes to the 1994 Senate decision related to the Registrar’s role in monitoring Special Topics courses. And will be working on the creation of clear definitions and purpose statements for the range of courses under the "special topics/variable topics umbrella.

There were no questions.

5. Old Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee

New Course Proposal: LNSA 101 – Language and Cultural Competencies for Studying Abroad (PDF)

The Speaker explained that discussion and a decision on this proposal was postponed from the March meeting, the questions posed at that meeting being thought to require the presence of someone more expert in the proposal.

[See March minutes, pp. 7-11]

Questions / Comments / Discussion

Sean Morrison, Associate Dean - School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs (LCWA), offered to answer questions.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, noting that LNSA 101 would not be required for all study abroad experiences, but that it would be required for some, asked what would trigger such a requirement? He added that it is odd for the Senate to approve a course that is sometimes a requirement and sometimes not.

Associate Dean Morrison explained that LNSA 101 is a course that LWCA would like to be made available for any faculty member offering a study abroad experience in a non-English speaking country to prepare students linguistically and culturally for when they go. The student would find the requirement to take LNSA 101 in their course of study as represented on the study abroad website.

Krasnoff asked if LNSA 101 could be required for any study abroad program.

Associate Dean Morrison replied: it’s only for our (CofC) programs, if faculty choose to require it.

Krasnoff asked if there is any particular mechanism for a department to make the requirement?

Associate Dean Morrison explained that if a department wants to require LNSA 101 for a study abroad program, it should contact LCWA, who will assist in locating a faculty member who might be able to offer the course.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, raised a different issue: what if the faculty member going abroad wants to teach the course?
Associate Dean Morrison noted that there are faculty members who do their own language prep as part of their course of study. LNSA 101 would not interfere with that at all.

**Decision:** the proposal passed on a voice vote.

### 6. New Business

**A. Nominations and Elections: Election to Senate Committees**

Denis Keyes, Chair

Richard Nunan, a member of the committee, stood in for the Chair, who could not make the meeting due to a teaching obligation. He explained the committee’s business before the Senate was to elect members for the three standing Senate Committees: Academic Planning, Budget, By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual. Nunan presented a slate of nominees for each, and called for further nominations from the floor.

The Speaker explained that these three committees are elected by the Senate, while the other committees are standing committees of the college and are elected by the faculty at large.

There were no additional nominations.

**The slates for the Senate standing committees for 2015-16 were approved on a voice vote.**

The Speaker noted that the Committee on Nominations and Elections has also concluded their business of constructing the slates for the standing college committees, and the Speaker said that he would share those via a campus email. Additional nominations may be made at that point. An election will follow shortly thereafter.

The Speaker then explained that the Committee on Nominations and Elections cannot put forth a slate to replace itself; therefore, nominations are needed to seat this committee. He called for nominations, advising that there is need of seven members, all of whom must have been at the College for at least three years.

Irina Gigova nominated Jennifer Kopfman.
Larry Krasnoff nominated Carmen Grace.
Tom Kunkle nominated Richard Nunan.

Seeing no more nominations, the Speaker said that he will, in the same email mentioned above, call for additional nominations for the committee from the campus.

Nunan asked if a week turnaround is expected for this. The Speaker replied in the affirmative.

The Speaker said that an election would probably occur in the next week, once the Adjunct Senator election has concluded (our system, the Speaker noted, can only do run election at a time).
Nunan asked those who have questions about committee assignments or service to direct them to Denis Keyes, Chair of the committee.

B. General Education Committee (webpage)
Karen Smail, Chair

Smail observed that, since the General Education curriculum is “frozen” at present for assessment purposes, these changes, if approved, will not take effect until the 2016-17 academic year.

- Request for General Education Certification, Social Science Requirement: URST 361 - Water Use Law (PDF)

There was no discussion.
The proposal was approved on a voice vote.

- Request for General Education Certification, Social Science Requirement: URST 313 - Sustainable Urbanism (PDF)
no discussion

There was no discussion.
The proposal was approved on a voice vote.

C. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs - Proposals to Change Programs

1. Proposal to Change a Program: M.A. in English (PDF)
Add new courses:
ENGL 574 – Special Topics in British Literature Before 1800 (PDF)
ENGL 575 – Special Topics in British Literature After 1800 (PDF)
ENGL 576 – Special Topics in American Literature (PDF)
ENGL 703 – Seminar in British Literature Before 1800 (PDF)
ENGL 704 – Seminar in British Literature After 1800 (PDF)
ENGL 705 – Seminar in American Literature (PDF)

Scott Peeples, Chair - Department of English, explained that these proposals make the degree audits simpler.

The Interim Provost at this point sought and received unanimous consent to treat all the proposals moved by the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs as approved by a single motion.

All the proposals were approved by voice vote

2. Proposal to Change a Program: M.Ed. in Science and Math for Teachers
Change Credits & Edit Description for course SMFT 540 – Fundamentals of Physical Science (PDF)

D. Faculty Curriculum Committee (webpage)

1. Course Changes
a. Deactivation: HBRW 290 - Special Topics: Advanced Hebrew (PDF)
b. Change Course Title: CLAS 270 - “The Romans in the Cinema” to “The Classics in Cinema” (PDF)
c. Change to Honors College Requirement #8 (Independent Study and Tutorial) (PDF)
d. Course Change: COMM 310 - Message Design and Influence course change (PDF)
e. Course Reactivation: BLAW 499 - Bachelors Essay (PDF)

There was no discussion.
The proposals above were approved on a voice vote.

2. New course proposals
   a. MATH 449 - Linear Models, with changes in multiple programs (PDF)
   b. Physical Education Activity Courses (PDF)
      PEAC 106 - Beginning Table Tennis and Pickleball
      PEAC 122 - Social Dance I
      PEAC 124 - Stand Up Paddleboarding
      PEAC 132 - Intermediate Yoga
   c. LING 101 - Introduction to Language, with change of minor (PDF)
   d. LTHI 250 - Hindi Literature in Translation, with change of minor (PDF)
   e. THTR 283 - Model Making for the Stage (PDF)
   f. HIST 226 - American Monsters: History as Horror, with change of minor and change of major (PDF)

There was no discussion.
The proposals above were approved on a voice vote.

3. Combined proposals – Program changes involving new courses, course changes etc.
   a. Religious Studies: Change of Minor (PDF)
   b. Accounting (PDF)
      - New Course: ACCT 418 - Intermediate Accounting III
      - Change Course Descriptions for ACCT 316 - Intermediate Accounting I and ACCT 317 - Intermediate Accounting II
      - Change Program Requirements and Prerequisites
   c. Public Health - BS Program change, course changes, deactivation and delete minor (PDF)
   d. Urban Studies - Changes to program, adding existing courses, deleting courses (PDF 1) (PDF 2)
e. Public Health, BA: Changes to Requirements for Major (PDF)
f. British Studies Minor: Program Changes (PDF)
g. Business Language in French: Change to Minor (PDF)
h. International Studies Major (PDF 1) (PDF 2) (Letters of Support)

**[PDF 1 - INTL part 1]**
- Deactivation: INTL 300 - Comparative Methodology in International Studies
- Add Courses to and Delete Courses from Requirements in All Concentrations
- Change of Course Description for INTL 350 - Cross Regional Studies
- Add Course to Requirements and Modify Africa Concentration
- Add Course to Requirements and Modify Asia Concentration
- Add Courses to and Delete Courses from Requirements and Modify International Comparative Literature Concentration
- Add Course to Requirements and Modify Latin American and Caribbean Concentration

**[PDF 2 - INTL part 2]**
- Add New Course to and Delete Courses from Requirements and Modify Europe Concentration
- New Course: INEU 101 - Introduction to Europe

i. International Studies Minor : Add Courses (PDF)

j. Bachelor of Professional Studies: New Course Proposals and Addition of Courses to All Concentrations (PDF)

   PRST 220: Introduction to Analytical and Critical Reasoning
   PRST 230: Professional Presentations
   PRST 360: Special Topics
   PRST 420: Independent Study

k. Real Estate Minor and Concentration: Change Requirements (PDF)

l. Philosophy (PDF)
   - New Course: PHIL 105 - Contemporary Moral Issues
   - New Course: PHIL 252 - Topics in Continental Philosophy
   - Deactivation: PHIL 250 - Marxism
   - Changes to the Major
   - Changes to the Minor
m. Computing in the Arts - Changes in Courses and Changes in Program (PDF)
n. Global Logistics and Transportation: Change Prerequisites for TRAN 431 - Issues in Global Logistics and TRAN 432 - Global Logistics Systems Management (PDF)
o. Supply Chain and Information Management
   New Course: DSCI 323 - Computer-Based Decision Modeling; and Program Change (PDF)
p. Business Administration: Concentration in Marketing - Change in Requirements (PDF)
q. Environmental Studies: Change in Minor (PDF)
r. Psychology (PDF)
   - Deactivation: PSYC 376 - Mass Media and Human Development
   - Neuroscience Minor: Add Course to Requirements
s. Historic Preservation and Community Planning (PDF)
   - Deactivation: HPCP 250 - Architectural Drawing and Drafting I
   - Deactivation: HPCP 251 Architectural Drawing and Drafting II
   - Change Course Title: HPCP 375 - “Landscape Preservation and Design” to “Landscape Preservation and Design Studio”
   - Program changes to Major and Minor in HPCP
t. Exercise Science (PDF 1) (PDF 2)
   - New Course: EXSC 322 - Chronic and Communicable Diseases
   - New Course: EXSC 497 - Mentored Research
   - Program Changes
   
   **There was no discussion.**
   **The proposals above were approved on a voice vote.**
E. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual
   Rick Heldrich, Chair

1. NOTICE OF INTENT: To Change Faculty/Administrative Manual to More Clearly Define Graduate Faculty (PDF)

   Rick Heldrich explained that the language in the notice has been through several committees, and he believes it is now in a form that the Senate can accept.

   Questions / Comments / Discussion
   Irina Gigova, Senator - SHHS, commended the committee for a job well done in clearly explaining the distinctions.

   There were no further comments or discussion.

2. Notice of Intent: To Change Faculty/Administrative Manual with Addition of University Professor as an Honorary Rank (PDF) (List: Distinguished Professor Programs at U.S. Universities)

   Rick Heldrich explained that the language in the notice is the idea of the Interim Provost and that it got full support by all parties involved in vetting it. He added that he thinks the faculty will support it as well.

   The Speaker noted that this change to the F/AM would introduce an honorary rank of University Professor along the lines of the old honorary rank of “Distinguished Professor” at the College, which disappeared in the early 1990s.

   Questions / Comments / Discussion

   Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, noting that the language provides for a committee of University Professors to make selections, asked how selection will work at the beginning, when there are, as of yet, no University Professors.

   The Interim Provost replied that buried in the language is a provision for a screening committee until there are enough University Professors to do the job.

   Betsy Baker, Senator - English, asked why the title “Distinguished Professor” was not used.

   The Interim Provost replied that we use the word “distinguished” in a couple different ways already on campus and that this program is meaningfully
different than the prior one, so a clean break is desirable. But he added that the Board of Trustees will have to approve the program, and they can change the program or its title as they see fit.

There was no further discussion.

F. Resolution from the Interim Provost to Award Degrees (PDF)

The Interim Provost moved the following resolution, which was seconded.

Resolved: The Faculty Senate approves the May 2015 degree candidates for graduation, as certified by the Registrar’s Office, subject to review and determination by the College of Charleston Board of Trustees.

The resolution passed on a voice vote.

6. Constituents’ Concerns

David Desplaces, Management and Marketing, noted that he was an early adopter of distance education (DE) at the College, holds a Masters degree in Instructional Design, Development & Evaluation, and served as a DE mentor. He said that while he believes DE has a place at the College, he finds troubling signs regarding how we do DE at the College.

He sees inconsistencies. For one, we have policies for DE that we do not have in face-to-face courses. He maintained that students in DE classes cannot possibly get the same quality experience they get in a regular class. As faculty, we should be concerned with this.

Students used to face-to-face classes, he said, are taking distance education classes and are simply not prepared for the online experience.

He added that he will not be teaching DE courses any more at the College. While we have a focus on pedagogy and quality instruction at the College, he asked for DE, where is the quality assurance? Where is the review?

He reiterated that he has not brought an action before the Senate, but he is asking the Senate to look into DE at the College.

Questions / Comments / Discussion

Irina Gigova, Senator - SHHS, asked what Desplaces would like to see done to alleviate his concerns.

Desplaces replied that he would like to see better preparedness, pedagogy-driven decision making, faculty discussion about DE, consistency between DE and non-DE courses. He added that we need to question whether we are doing DE for the right reasons, or are we doing it just to generate revenue?

He said the he was a member of the DE task force, the first principle of which was the DE should not be done to make money.

He questioned how faculty could have a “meaningful learning engagement” with 30 students in four and a half weeks?
He added that he was told that he might need to lower his expectations in DE, which he took as a bad sign.

**Jannette Finch**, Senator - Library, said that she, too, was a member of the task force (actually, she noted, several task forces). She said that there is a DE quality rubric at the College developed from three other programs. TLT and others adapted the rubric to DE at the College. There is now a DE readiness course that faculty have to take in order to teach online, and, she said she thinks that the rubric is being applied in the class. However, she noted that the rubric is not being applied to existing classes. She said that DE needs to do a better job of making the college community aware of what’s going on in the program, and she said that she hopes to have a report in the early fall.

**Margaret Cormack**, Senator - Religious Studies, said that she has no intention to offer DE courses, but called attention to Desplaces’s observation that students, too, need training for DE. Perhaps, she went on, students should not be allowed to take a DE course until they have demonstrated the necessary responsibility, time management, and so on. They could undergo a tutorial before taking a course.

Finch replied that we do, in fact, have an online tutorial for students.

**John Hakkila**, Physics and Astronomy, mentioned that he was disturbed to see a recent story about the University of Phoenix, who have lost over the past two years over 50% of their enrollments, causing investors to dump them. He speculated that the students might going elsewhere or there’s a serious problem of some sort with the model. He asked if anyone could fill in the gaps.

Dean Gibbison said that U of Phoenix’s students were “going” to that institution because they could not get the programs they wanted and on the schedules they needed at traditional schools, but as more traditional schools, like the College, go online, with some even offering complete online programs, Phoenix’s market is tightening. They are also, apart from market concerns, strategically reducing enrollment to ensure higher quality and higher rates of degree completion.

There was no further discussion.

---------------------------

**Irina Gigova**, Senator - SHHS, introduced a resolution that she said she was asked to introduce by a number of parties:

**A Resolution Celebrating Jack’s Cafe**

WHEREAS, the original Jack’s Café was a signature College of Charleston diner over the past four decades;

WHEREAS, Jack Sewell, former owner and operator of Jack’s, manned the grill to a faithful college crowd and community members every weekday for the past forty-two years;

WHEREAS, Jack Sewell sold the restaurant and had his last shift on Friday, October 31, 2014;
WHEREAS, Jack’s is a relic of time and a Charleston institution;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT —

RESOLVED, that The Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston hereby acknowledges the pride and passion that Jack Sewell demonstrated for the culinary arts;

RESOLVED, that The Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston hereby expresses its gratitude to Jack Sewell for providing a special dining experience for forty-two years; and

RESOLVED, that The Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston hereby conveys its highest respect, admiration, and thanks for the lasting and transformative impact that the original Jack’s Café has had on the College of Charleston community and the City of Charleston.

The Interim Provost asked and received unanimous consent to allow the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was seconded.

There was no discussion.

The resolution was approved on a voice vote.

----------------------------------------

Larry Krasnoff - Senator - Philosophy, asked the Senate to thank the Speaker, Secretary, Secretariat, and Parliamentarian for their service.

Applause followed.

7. Adjournments: 7:29 PM, and 6:40 PM, respectively