Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 2 December 2014

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 2 December 2014 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order: 5:05PM
2. 11 November Regular Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and information: none
4. Reports
   A. Speaker of the Faculty
      The Speaker reported that we have hired a new Faculty Secretariat, who will start in January.
      He also reminded the Senate and asked Senators to remind their colleagues that the December commencement ceremony is coming up, and regalia will be available for faculty to borrow, if needed, through the Office for the Academic Experience on the Thursday prior.
      He reported that, in preparation for reaffirmation in 2016, a large contingent from CofC will be traveling to Nashville this weekend for the SACSCOC annual meeting.
      Noting that he is an ex officio member of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, the Speaker also prefaced the first item in Old Business (F/AM disability academic accommodation-related language) by stating that the committee, over the course of two lengthy meetings, very carefully considered Senate discussion on the proposed language in November (see minutes 22-26) and in the revision before the Senate at the present meeting, attempted to address the concerns raised. Furthermore, he said, all of the processes surrounding reasonable accommodation are up for further review, particularly the audio recording agreement and processes for resolving disagreements.
   B. Interim Provost
      Update on Course and Instructor Evaluations
      The Interim Provost reported that the course and instructor evaluations response rate was 44.5% at the time of the Senate meeting, a significant improvement over prior semesters, likely owing in part to faculty taking up Academic Affairs’s suggestion that they set aside time in class this semester for students to complete evaluations (a practice required of all courses beginning in the spring semester). He noted that the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs was at the top of the list of schools with a 49.6% return rate. He also singled out numerous departments and units for their above-50% return rates: Arts Management (54%), Art History (55%), Eng-
lish (56%), Jewish Studies (58%), Physics and Astronomy (59%), Classics (59%), Religious Studies (62%), Library (65%), German and Slavic Studies (69%), and Hospitality and Tourism (74%). These figures, the Interim Provost asserted, are clear evidence of a department and faculty commitment to the evaluation process.

**Use of the FAST System**

The Interim Provost also, noting that the end of the semester is a time at which faculty may notice students showing signs of distress, asked faculty to consider using the FAST system (Faculty/Staff Assisting Students in Trouble). The system, under the aegis of Undergraduate Academic Services (UAS), is now nearly ten years old. In that time, in the neighborhood of 30-39% of students contacted via FAST referrals have taken up the offer to have a conversation about how they might be helped. Over half of the students flagged through the FAST system, he observed, are flagged for reasons of not turning in assignments or disappearing from class, but for a significant number of referred students, there are a variety of other reasons: they seem to be grieving, have some kind of distress or behavioral issues. The Interim Provost thanked faculty and staff for using the system, which not only helps support students but helps us retain them as well.

**Budget Hearings for Academic Affairs**

The Interim Provost announced the dates for public hearings on the budget, 1/12/15 and 1/26/15, both in the afternoon, specific times and location forthcoming.

**Distance Education and Course Scheduling**

The Interim Provost encouraged departments and programs to consider offering distance education classes not just in summer but strategically during fall and spring semesters as well, which could both help students get the classes they need and make primetime classroom scheduling just a bit easier, particularly as building renovations continue to take classrooms offline.

**Comments on the Senate Meeting Agenda**

The Interim Provost congratulated members of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual and members of the Office of Academic Affairs staff for their time- and effort-intensive work in redeveloping F/AM language on disability issues, and for hearing faculty concerns raised in the November meeting and making adjustments in the policy. In this policy, the College, he observed, is trying to balance the College’s considerable legal duties with our academic mission, which is front and center in all our decisions on this policy. He will continue, he said, to take feedback as the policy is redeveloped.

The redevelopment of the attendance policy language (on the agenda as well) has also, he pointed out, involved the work of an enormous number of faculty and staff colleagues, over the course of 14 months. The current poli-
cy has not changed in substance since 1973, he noted, and has, predictably, fallen out of step with current conditions. We now have many, many more students and many more students by percentage of the population involved in activities outside the classroom formally sponsored by the College. Those who have worked on the policy's redevelopment, he said, have kept in mind the faculty's central role in determining appropriate attendance policies for their classes.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

None.

C. Faculty Budget Committee (Slides - PDF)

Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Faculty Budget Committee, reported that the committee (herself, Tom Carroll, Rohn England, Steve Johnson, Rhonda Mack, Courtney Murren, Tom Ross) has been working with the Interim Provost for help the committee become more conversant with this year's budget realities and to give him feedback on redeveloping the budget process this year. She described the budget outlook as, in keeping with things since 2008, a “little depressing.” Most of our income comes from tuition and fees, and most of the budget increases we will get are for “non-discretionary” items (annually increasing utilities costs, mandated state salary increases, increases to benefits, and other increases over which we have no control). This leaves little for merit increases, new faculty lines, renovating buildings, and so on. There is not a lot to work with, therefore, but she noted that we are on relatively sound footing compared to other institutions.

She then outlined the causes for “movement” we are likely to see from last year’s to this year’s budget. We have had a slight decrease in out-of-state student enrollment, which hurts us. Added to this, any increases in tuition we might see are likely to be small, since the state over the past few years has limited any tuition raises. Reallocation of resources for changing needs or strategic priorities is also possible in this year's budget. Finally, we may see some increases in fees in certain departments and programs.

Under the heading of “some good news,” Eichelberger discussed the new transparency in the budgeting process, something many in the Senate have been asking for for years. Faculty can witness the process and hear the discussion over budget priorities from the beginning, as they unfold, rather than, as in years past, learning of the decisions ex post facto. At the hearings (1/16/15 and 1/24/15) that all may attend, the Faculty Budget Committee will represent faculty's broader interest.

She specified that the conversation at the hearings will largely revolve around “new money,” given that with our budget model, from year-to-year units are given the same budget, unless they request more or, unlikely though it seems, ask that they receive less.
She also provided, for further context, a list of those involved in the hearings and budgeting process who report to the Provost (slide 8) and an Academic Affairs organizational chart (slide 9).

She asked for any committees that have particular concerns to convey those to the budget committee.

Questions / Discussion / Comments
None.

5. Old Business

A. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual (webpage)

1. NOTICE OF INTENT: To Change Faculty Administrative Manual to More Clearly Define Faculty Responsibilities with Regard to Students with Disabilities Policy (PDF - “clean” copy of revised statement | PDF - “comparison” copy, showing changes to the current F/AM language)

Rick Heldrich, Chair of the Committee, explained that these documents are different from those considered by the Senate in November, having been revised to address concerns raised in November. These documents, he stipulated, have not been fully vetted yet by Academic Affairs, however, and, therefore, there could be more changes made even after the Senate discussion.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, asked if the proposed language would affect REACH [Realizing Educational and Career Hopes] students.

Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, noted that, like all other students on campus, REACH students are subject to accommodation, but REACH students are not degree-seeking students.

Deborah Mihal, Director for the Center for Disability Services (CDS), also said that REACH students are qualified students with disabilities and, thus, are entitled to reasonable accommodations. However, the program is unique, in that the course, materials, assessments, and so forth, are often customized by arrangements between the instructor, the student, and the program. Any accommodations CDS might recommend in these situations will still be within the scope of not lowering academic standards, but given the individualized nature of the program, the REACH program and the instructor will coordinate on accommodations.

Smith wondered, for inclusivity, if a section might be added to the language to address REACH.

Heldrich replied that the committee did not consider any particular types of disability or classes of students with disabilities in revising the policy but did build into the language a way of addressing concerns that aca-
ademic programs had the necessary support to offer any required accommodations and weren't left hanging to provide support on their own.

Mihal followed up by saying that the language as presented would apply equally to REACH students as to any other student registered with CDS.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), suggested that the section on student responsibility might indicate a timeline within which students should notify faculty of a need for accommodation. Item number three under that section specifies “providing appropriate notification to the instructor,” but doesn’t mention timeliness, per se. Perhaps, “appropriate notification” includes the sense of timeliness, she said, but we might want to indicate “the sooner the better,” in order to get accommodations in place as soon as possible and with fairness and minimal disruption to all parties.

Heldrich replied that the committee tried to address timeliness by specifying in item number two in the same list “in advance” and also in the responsibility of the College section, where there is a time frame so that the process of deciding on accommodation does not get dragged too far into the semester.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator – Mathematics, cited item number three under instructor responsibilities, “provide and administer reasonable accommodations,” and suggested the addition of “with the help of CDS.” As an example, she noted that the double-time accommodation on exams in Math cannot be administered by the instructor. Only CDS can do that.

Heldrich replied that the committee tried to avoid making the language too procedural. Language that is too procedural might work for one situation but not for others.

**Phil Jos**, Senator – SHHS, observed that while the section of the policy providing lists of responsibilities is directive, the paragraph leading into it, is less direct than it could be, particularly given the concerns raised in the November meeting:

> The following responsibilities foster a collaborative approach in arriving at reasonable accommodations in the context of academic programs. As stated above, accommodations may not be unduly burdensome or fundamentally alter the nature of the academic program.

He had three suggestions:

1. indicate that the collaboration involves faculty specifically and CDS
2. mention “the class” itself, rather than just “in the context of academic” programs (since accommodations take place at the level of the course)
3. indicate, in the context of “burdensome,” that we have in mind burdens on faculty as well as other kinds of burdens.

Any of these, Jos suggested, might be a little more pointed, and thus match what follows, which is also very pointed.

The Speaker at this point asked for further comments or questions, and there were none.

He said that while the language under consideration is in a section of the F/AM not directly under the control of the Senate, he believed it the will of Academic Affairs to get not just the Senate’s thoughts on the policy in its current state, but also a vote that expresses the Senate’s attitude toward it.

The Interim Provost clarified that this is entirely up to the Senate.

Heldrich argued that any vote could only be on the general philosophy of the policy since the language is still subject to change.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, agreed with Heldrich and suggested that the Senate not take a vote. A vote might seem like an endorsement of whatever the language ends up being.

Heldrich suggested that any further comments or concerns be sent to the by-laws committee and/or the Interim Provost.

Krasnoff also pointed out that a vote on the spirit of the policy would be somewhat odd, amounting as it would, to our saying that we agree with the spirit of complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

No vote was taken.

The Speaker asked Heldrich to introduce the next item in old business.

2. NOTICE OF INTENT: To Change Faculty Administrative Manual to More Clearly Define Faculty Obligations with Regard to Class Attendance Policy (PDF)

Heldrich noted that, to his understanding, the policy as offered was vetted last year by the Council of Chairs; thus all chairs weighed in on it.

Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker added that the policy, in an earlier form, came to the Faculty Senate, and there was, essentially, no discussion and a sense that there were no objections to it. The policy was created by the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics, went to the Council of Chairs last year, and the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid Committee had no problem with it, either. This year’s Academic Standards committee, however, had some feedback and objections: the current version of the policy is meant to address those concerns.

Questions / Discussion / Comments
Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, suggested that, if the Academic Standards committee has a strong objection to a rule that absences be excused for activities in which students represent the College, the Senate should discuss that objection. He argued that interpreting such a rule as an abridgment of academic freedom doesn’t make sense, since much of how classes are structured faculty don’t get to decide upon, such as when classes meet and so forth.

There was no further discussion.

The Speaker asked for a motion from the floor to vote on the proposed attendance language.

Phil Jos moved that there be a vote, and the motion was seconded.

The Speaker noted that the vote would be a vote “in support” of the proposed language and not a vote for including the language in the F/AM, since the language would go in a section outside of faculty control.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker said that, given that the language has already been thoroughly vetted and approved by Academic Affairs, we should expect no further changes. It should go in the F/AM as is.

The Senate voted to support the language as presented.

B. Resolutions Concerning Course-Instructor Evaluations

Iana Anguelova, Senator – School of Science and Mathematics

1. Resolution to Set the Deadline for Collecting Course-Instructor Evaluations at the End of Reading Day for Each Semester (Word | PDF)

| Resolution to Set the Deadline for Collecting Course-Instructor Evaluations at the End of Reading Day for Each Semester |
| WHEREAS, student evaluations of teaching are seriously considered in all promotion and tenure decisions and thus affect all the Faculty at the College of Charleston, and, therefore, a consistent deadline for collecting student evaluations each semester should be set in consultation with the Faculty Senate; |
| WHEREAS, online student evaluations as a self-selecting sample are a non-probability sample (i.e., no credible conclusions can be made with any confidence/probability from such samples), and bias towards lower extremes is known to exist in such samples, in order to reduce this bias the student evaluations deadline should be set BEFORE the start of final exams each semester; |
| WHEREAS, students with final exams early in the final exam week may be able to see their final grade on OAKS in some classes even before the end of final exam week (and thus before they potentially write their student evaluations), and this potentially adds further to the lower-extremes bias and also |
potentially affects unfairly the faculty trying to follow best practices in submit-
mitting their grade-work on OAKS as early as possible;

THEREFORE,

be it RESOLVED that we, the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston,
request that the deadline for collecting student evaluations of teaching be set
no later than the end of Reading Day for each semester.

2. Resolution that a Policy be Delineated in the Faculty/Administration
   Manual Concerning the Administering and Collecting of Course-In-
   structor Evaluations (Student Evaluations) (Word | PDF)

Resolution that a Policy be Delineated in the Faculty/Administration
Manual Concerning the Administering and Collecting of Course-In-
structor Evaluations (Student Evaluations)

WHEREAS, student evaluations of teaching are seriously considered in all
promotion and tenure decisions and thus affect all faculty at the College of
Charleston;

WHEREAS, specifically, as part of the policy for evaluation of faculty
members, student evaluations are mentioned in several instances in the Fac-
ulty/Administration Manual, such as,

− “Student evaluations of teaching shall be collected from students in
classes taught by any faculty member of special status” (46) (Faculty mem-
bers of special status are all the non-tenured and non-tenure track faculty in-
cluding the Instructors, the Senior Instructors, the adjunct faculty, etc.), and,
concerning tenure and promotion,

− “The Summary Rating for all courses in the Department for each se-
semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder with the
summary student evaluations” (94-95)

− “Student course evaluations will be completed for every section of
every course, every semester, with the exception of a course that has only
one student enrolled” (94);

WHEREAS, the FAM also includes language about the relevance of student
evaluations in the tenure and promotion process (“Student evaluations
should be consistently good” [82] and “numerical items from student evalu-
ations…are important” [82]);

WHEREAS, student evaluations (a.k.a. Course-Instructor Evaluations) are
thus of sufficient importance to affect the tenure and promotion process and
the considerations of tenure and promotion committees across the College of
Charleston, and, therefore, a consistent policy for collecting and adminis-
tering student evaluations should be set and delineated in the Faculty/Adminis-
tration Manual in consultation with the Faculty Senate;

THEREFORE,
be it RESOLVED that we, the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston, request that the policy for administering and collecting Course-Instructor evaluations (student evaluations) of teaching be delineated in the Faculty/Administration Manual. In particular we request that a deadline for collecting student evaluations be set no later than the end of Reading Day each semester.

Anguelova presented the motions together and offered the following justifications. Academic Affairs takes very seriously student evaluation data. In her own department's Tenure and Promotion Committee, she noted, an inordinate amount of time is spent discussing course and instructor evaluations. Given their importance in tenure and promotion procedures, she argued, they are important enough to be included in the F/AM.

There have been many discussions of these evaluations in the Senate but there has never been a vote. This topic deserves a vote, she asserted.

Specifically referring to the first resolution (collecting evaluations before final exams) she argued that we cannot attached significance to the results when the students decide for themselves whether or not they will complete the evaluation: they are a self-selected sample.

This sample is also, she said, biased, and furthermore, in this sample, one cannot determine with any significance the direction of the bias. At this point, she mentioned a study sent to her by Joe Carson, Senator - School of Science and Math (SSM), which, she noted, attempts to argue motives in the case of student evaluations after exams. She denied that motives could be concluded in a self-selected sample.

She said that she appreciates the Interim Provost's plan to conduct evaluations in class, since it produces not a sample, but a population of students in class on that particular day.

It is common sense, she said, that a student doing well on a final exam is not going to complete a course and instructor evaluation. It is more likely that a student who did not do well will fill out an evaluation. In this case, evaluations tend to be worse.

Currently, many students can fill out evaluations after they have already seen their final grades on OAKS. (She noted that she posts the grades so that if there is a mistake, students will have time to call it to her attention and discuss it.) Those students with exams late in the examination period, on the other hand, may not see the final grade before submitting evaluations, if they choose to do so. Thus, there is an inconsistency: some students get to complete evaluations with full knowledge of their final grade and some do not. We should either allow all students the former case, she argued, or eliminate it altogether.

Either way, she asserted, the F/AM should have a written policy regarding when evaluations are to become available because if the administration wishes to make a change to it, they will have to notify the faculty first.
Questions / Discussion / Comments

Joe Carson, Senator- SSM, reported having not only sent Anguelova the study she mentioned, but also having, himself, looked through other published peer-reviewed literature on the effects of examinations or situational timing on evaluations. All the papers he found, he said, indicated that the effects of these conditions on evaluations is negligible. While these studies were not conducted at the College and do not represent "the last word," he said, we should take into consideration that several peer-reviewed papers contradict both the course of action suggested in the first resolution and, also very directly, Carson said, several of the statements in the "whereas" section of the resolution. Carson said that, as academics, we should have a problem with "whereas" statements that are contradicted by peer-reviewed literature. Even if we see flaws in this particular literature, it is, nonetheless, peer-reviewed and contradictory to the statements in the resolution.

Anguelova asked for an example.

Carson replied said that one statement in question had to do with the inability to attach statistical significance to a sample.

Anguelova replied, "no statistical significance can be attached to such [a] self-selected sample?"

Carson agreed that this was the statement he had in mind.

Anguelova replied, "I am sorry, but that is true."

Carson declined to argue about this particular point, but stated that it is a fact that there are at least two to four published, peer-reviewed studies that reach conclusions that directly contradict the statement. At the very least, there is controversy in the professional community over this, he said.

Anguelova replied that the conclusion of the paper Carson sent her was that the scores were lower, but not significantly lower. Either way, she asserted, "you cannot attach a probability on a non-probability sample."

Phil Jos, Senator- SHHS, asked for clarification on why the sample of students in a class is not sufficient. Are we not trying to generalize about the class from the sample?

Anguelova replied that we are trying to generalize about the population of students in a class based on the sample of those who complete the evaluations, and this is not a random sample, and because of this, we cannot derive a significance from the results of the survey.

Jos replied that the only cure for that is higher response rates.

Anguelova agreed, stating that the possibility of representing the population via the sample is better with higher responses. The "real cure," however, is, she said to change the population. As an example, she pointed to the paper in-class evaluations we used to conduct. The results derived were for the
population of students in class on the day of the evaluation, as opposed to a sample that chose or didn't choose to fill out evaluations.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, noting that he had several comments to make but would parse them out over the course of the discussion, commented on the population issue by saying that some students will miss classes, but if you really want as close to a complete class population as possible, you could administer the evaluations on the final exam day, in the exam itself.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHHS, observed that we may be approaching a more workable solution to our problems with evaluations now that when Anguelova first proposed her resolutions, when we did not have evaluations being done in class. She also argued that, in addition to in-class administration, there is a value to also having the opportunity open for students to use the online evaluation system beyond the set aside class time. This would potentially capture more responses, or allow students the opportunity to add to their responses.

This leaves open the question, she noted, of when the evaluation period should end, and she argued that it should end when the semester does to afford students as much opportunity as possible to respond. As to the concern about students seeing their final grade on OAKS prior to completing an evaluation, Eichelberger suggested using OAKS’s functionality to suppress the grade during the evaluation period.

Anguelova replied that after final exams have been graded, student should be able to see their grades.

Shaver replied “yes, but that's your choice,” with which Aguelova agreed. She asserted that this is also best practice.

**Shaver** asserted that the first resolution would seem to deny the choice of other instructors to administer evaluations after students have completed the course.

Anguelova stated that she doesn't find compelling the idea that students would wait to fill out evaluations after a final exam because they didn't have time prior to exams. She said that the period for evaluation needs to closed before examinations because post-examination course evaluation results tend to be lower.

She added that whatever the Faculty Senate decides, it should be in the form of a vote.

**Shaver**, citing prior experiences in teaching at the College and elsewhere, argued that students in project-based courses in which all the course's work and learning comes down to a group project that is due in the exam period cannot “look back over the course of the semester to compare what they knew on day one and what they knew after the project is finished until the project is finished.” They aren't finished by Reading Day, and thus they are not in a po-
sition to fully evaluate what they have learned from an instructor at that time. We should give them until the end.

An instructor may choose, he also added, not to post final grades before the College does, and he asserted that a requirement that students complete evaluations by Reading Day is, essentially, a disenfranchisement of instructors who teach the kind of project-based courses he described above.

Adam Ali, Senator – Geology, agreed that an in-class administration of the evaluation would essentially randomize the sample, which would resolve the problem of a self-selecting sample. Allowing additional time into the exam period for the few, though self-selecting, students who are not in class should not affect the random in-class sample adversely.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, said that she supports the proposal, but offered a caveat. She reported administering the evaluations on the last day of class, when the students had high motivation to show up, since there was a review for the final on that day. She said, however, that it took about an hour to do so, noting that she informed her students in advance that she wasn't concerned with the numbers, but she would read everything they wrote.

In reply to Shaver, she said that a Reading Day deadline would still provide students with three-months worth of experience on which to base their evaluations.

She advocated for the Reading Day deadline, allied with in-class administration and an announcement on the syllabus of when evaluations will be administered. The students motivated in a positive or negative way and who may, as a result create, a self-selecting sample problem, she further stipulated are students an instructor already knows about: it's the other students, the majority in the middle, from whom we wish to hear. Those are the students we will hear from in the in-class administration of evaluations.

Jason Coy, Senator – SHHS, called the question and it was seconded.

Lary Krasnoff queried a point of order: was the question being called on the first resolution or the two resolutions as a package?

The Speaker replied that they are two separate items, so the first is the one on which the question was called, which passed with the required 2/3 vote by voice.

The first resolution, “Resolution to Set the Deadline for Collecting Course-Instructor Evaluations at the End of Reading Day for Each Semester,” was then voted on. A voice vote was inconclusive. On a show of hands, the resolution failed, 17 to 15.

Discussion now turned to the second resolution, “Resolution to Set the Deadline for Collecting Course-Instructor Evaluations at the End of Reading Day for Each Semester.”
The Speaker observed that the final sentence of the resolution – “In particular we request that a deadline for collecting student evaluations be set no later than the end of Reading Day each semester.” – would need to be stricken, given the prior vote.

Lary Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, pointed out that in the discussion of the first resolution, many seemed to feel that the in-class administration of the evaluations essentially obviated the need for a Reading Day deadline. He suggested that if Senators wish to enshrine this policy, they may wish to vote for the resolution at hand so that we stick with the policy of in-class administration. On the other hand, he sounded a skeptical note on whether or not such a policy should go in the F/AM. One argument in favor is that evaluations are referred to in a number of other places in the document, and, therefore, a policy should be there, as well. But, he observed, those references have to do with what is done with evaluation data, and the resolution at hand does not say what the policy should go in the F/AM but only that a policy should be there.

Jason Coy, Senator – SHHS, agreed that there might be an argument against putting a policy in the F/AM. Evaluation procedures have changed, and they may well change again. Additionally, we've had different Presidents and different Provosts over the past few years. We may come up with a new processes, creating a need to change F/AM language each time.

Krasnoff replied that a counter argument to Coy's would be that, as mentioned earlier in the debate on the first resolution, with a policy resident in the F/AM, each time the policy is changed, the faculty would have to be notified in advance. Therefore, having a policy in the F/AM would ensure faculty input in the case of a proposed change.

Kelly Shaver moved that the final sentence of the resolution be deleted, and the motion was seconded, rendering the resolved section as follows.

be it RESOLVED that we, the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston, request that the policy for administering and collecting Course-Instructor evaluations (student evaluations) of teaching be delineated in the Faculty/Administration Manual. In particular we request that a deadline for collecting student evaluations be set no later than the end of Reading Day each semester.

Discussion of the motion strike the final sentence of the resolution.

Phil Jos, Senator – SHHS, offered several comments on the motion. To the extent that he did not feel that the Reading Day deadline would reduce extreme responses or necessarily secure better information via a higher response rate, he said he could support the motion to strike the last sentence.

However, as a counterpoint to Shaver's arguments, having evaluations to go past Reading Day is problematic, he said, not because students may punish professors for bad grades but because it is just generally a bad time to get responses of any sort from students. It's just an incredibly busy time for them.
In addition, he said he could actually support the sentence that is being deleted through the motion if the length of the evaluation period remained unchanged, possibly by starting the evaluations earlier. Assessments of effective teaching that could show us a picture of the teacher in the classroom, he asserted, don't change within the last 3 to 4 weeks of class. Students would be able to say a good deal about a teacher at this point: whether expectations were clear, whether the instructor answered questions, was accessible, whether the syllabus was clear, and so forth. Therefore, an earlier starting date for the evaluations would not necessarily be a problem.

Furthermore, Jos said, he does not think that the moment of completing a final project puts students in any better position to make such judgments, and in fact, as far as what they have learned, the instructor may be in a better position to assess this than they, themselves, are.

**Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker** said, in reply to Jos, that some of the most frequent feedback from students prior to when we began to run the evaluation period into the final examination period was that they wanted a longer time period to complete the evaluations at the end of the semester. Prior to the extension into the exam period, the students were, in fact, given the same amount of time: the period just began sooner. Students, however, were not doing the evaluations early in the administration period; they didn't want to or feel ready to do them earlier. We asked for student feedback on these matters, and, she said, it is important that we respect their perspective on when they feel they can best give us feedback.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator – SSM, asked for a clarification as to the nature of the resolution. Is it not solely about whether or not there should be a policy in the F/AM (and not about when evaluations are administered)?

The Speaker said, yes, that is correct, but that at present the Senate is discussing the motion to amend the resolution by striking the last sentence.

Kunkle then called the question on the motion to amend, which was seconded, and passed on a voice vote with the required 2/3 majority.

**The Speaker called for a vote on the motion to amend the resolution, which passed on voice vote.**

The “resolved” section now read as follows.

```text
be it RESOLVED that we, the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston, request that the policy for administering and collecting Course-Instructor evaluations (student evaluations) of teaching be delineated in the Faculty/Administration Manual.
```

**Discussion on the resolution, now amended, continued.**

**Kunkle** asked if anyone knew of a better place to put evaluation policy than in the F/AM.
Scott Peeples, Senator – SHHS, expressed reticence to vote in favor the resolution without knowing what language might actually make it into the F/AM as a result of the resolution. He said that so long as the faculty has a chance to review and weigh in on changes to the evaluation process, there is no need for policy to be specifically articulated in the F/AM.

Rick Heldrich, Senator – SSM, said that he doesn't particularly want the language in the F/AM, but if the Senate wants the language in the F/AM, then it needs to see what the language is before voting on it.

Anguelova replied that the resolution is to include language, but the actual language would need to be determined. What would be included in the F/AM, for instance, she said, is the in-class administration policy that requires all instructors to set aside class time to administer the evaluations.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, said that including in the F/AM, the policy for administering and collecting student evaluations of teaching is a way of ensuring fairness, a way of stating the rules clearly so that all faculty can be held to the same standard. This is especially important for merit raises, where faculty are being compared, but is also significant in tenure and promotion processes, where faculty teaching evaluations are compared to departmental means and school means. There needs to be general policies written into the F/AM, and it is up to the Senate to ask for them.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, said that the policy is fairly clear right now: in-class administration with an opportunity for students not in class at the time to complete evaluations throughout the exam period. If the policy where to be written into the F/AM that evaluations must be conducted in class, he argued, that is just a “back door” way of saying that they have to be completed before Reading Day.

Rick Heldrich, Senator – SSM and Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, suggested that the discussion might be tabled, allowing the committee to work up some language to bring back to the Senate for consideration and, if it is the will of the Senate, a vote.

Anguelova responded by saying that a vote on the resolution would be a “philosophical” one. But if we can't have a successful vote on that first, then it doesn't make sense for the by-laws and F/AM to come back to the Senate with specific language for a vote.

Hollis France, Senator – Political Science, asked what should be done if a student does not have a laptop to bring to class for an in-class administration of the evaluation.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker replied that students can also complete the evaluation on other devices, such as smart phones. Also, the in-class administration instructions produced by Academic Affairs suggest notifying the students in advance of the date. A student who does not have a laptop, with this advance notification, might arrange, instead, to do the evaluation in ad-
vance of the class and to simply notify the instructor on the day that she has already done it. We recognize, she said, that not all students will have equipment to complete the evaluations in class, but that there are also ways that are not awkward for the student of addressing this problem.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator – SHHS, expressed support for the resolution on the grounds that we have had different policies in recent years and that not everyone follows the rules every year. A consistent policy would be good for tenure and promotion, since such decisions involve comparisons.

**Phil Jos**, Senator – SHHS, stipulated that, as it relates to the F/AM there is a distinction between policy and procedure, and that mostly what the Senate has been discussing falls into the territory of procedure. However, a real policy issue question is “what do you do in a T&P situation where you have somebody who has 20% response rates on most of their evaluations? What do you make of that when you know they’re also being compared ... to somebody who consistently has 80%? What do you do with those results if there’s any kind of comparison to be made?” These are policy concerns that are important and that the F/AM should address, but, Jos asserted, the procedure of how to get higher response rates and so forth is better left in Academic Affairs in consultation with the Senate.

**Andrew Shedlock**, Senator – Biology, expressed a concern that we attend to “signal vs. noise ratio” in whatever procedures we develop for administering evaluations and in the interpretation for T&P purposes of student evaluation data. He stressed that increasing the number of responses may not also ensure a good signal to noise ratio, and that if our procedure for getting a higher response rate is not also significantly improving our signal to noise ratio, then “we are trying to fix something that is not broken.”

**Janette Finch**, Senator – Library, observed that the discussion is turning away from the resolution and toward matters of how evaluations are used in the tenure and promotion process. Some classes, she observed, may never get positive evaluations due to the difficulty of the material. Faculty who teach these classes may be at a disadvantage in the T&P process if the department highly values evaluations. Therefore, she said, we need to have some consistency in how we weigh student evaluations in each department.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator – SHHS, replied to Shedlock's comments on the signal to noise ratio in evaluations, saying that in the College T&P committee last year there were candidates whose evaluation return rates were not very high, so the focus turned from those measures to the graduate surveys. For low return rates on evaluation, signal does, indeed, tend to disappear.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator – Mathematics, said that in her department, they do not take student evaluations at face value, but the problem is, she said, at
the level of the College T&P committee, where apples may be compared to oranges. A F/AM-resident and consistent policy could speak to how much weight should be assigned to student evaluations.

The Interim Provost weighed in at this point. There has been much research on student evaluations for many, many years, and there is a great deal of experience in higher education in how to use student evaluations. There is also ample evidence that they are an imperfect indicator (one of many) of effective instruction, and he said it is his belief that faculty colleagues at the department level and in the college-wide T&P committee, as well as the deans and even the Provost, all understand the need to take student evaluations with a “substantial grain of salt.” He said, “I know that faculty fear that others will make unsophisticated use of these indicators. That is not my personal experience in my academic career. I hope it is not the experience of most of you who have been in the role of evaluating faculty in one fashion or another, and I guess I just have to ask you to take my word for it that we are not naïve consumers of these data.”

Jon Hakkila, Chair - Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs Committee, expressed concern about the actual questions being asked of students in the evaluations. The questions, he asserted, are more important than the sample size.

Tom Kunkle, Senator – SSM, noted that the discussion has not really been addressing the motion but ranging widely on the general issue of student course and instructor evaluations. He said that he would be hesitant to ask language be added to the F/AM when we, ourselves, cannot even decide what we would like it to say.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, requested that the Provost's office, well in advance of the each coming semester, inform the faculty of the procedure for administering evaluations so that faculty can work it into their syllabuses.

“Agreed,” replied the Interim Provost.

The Speaker asked for any further discussion.

The question was called and seconded, and passed on a voice vote.

A vote was taken on the resolution.

The second resolution, “Resolution to Set the Deadline for Collecting Course-Instructor Evaluations at the End of Reading Day for Each Semester,” as amended, failed on a voice vote.

6. New Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee (webpage)

The proposals below were opened for discussion by Bonnie Springer, Chair-Faculty Curriculum Committee, by department/program (1-6 below), with
the stipulation that if any Senator wished to do so, specific proposals could be isolated for separate discussion and vote.

None of the proposals were separated and all were approved on voice votes.

1. **Psychology** ([PDF](#)): all PSYC proposals. Overview, PDF p. 1
   a. Change of major (BS) (PDF p. 5)
   b. Change of major (BA) (PDF p. 14)
   c. New Course Proposals
      (1) PSYC 359 - Study Abroad in Neuroscience (PDF p. 23)
      (2) PSYC 413 - Conditioning and Learning: Advanced Topics (PDF p. 44)
      (3) PSYC 422 - Personality Psychology: Advanced Topics (PDF p. 55)
      (4) PSYC 423 - Social Psychology: Advanced Topics (PDF p. 67)

2. **Japanese** ([PDF](#))
   Change of minor – adding a clarifying clause to course listings

3. **Chemistry** ([PDF](#))
   Course change proposals: HONS 191/191L; 192/192L; 293/293L; 294/294L (Proposed Honors sequence)

4. **Finance** ([PDF](#)): all FINC proposals. Overview, PDF p. 1
   a. Change of major (BS) (PDF p. 4)
   b. Change of minor (PDF p. 11)
   c. Course change: FINC 418 - Advanced Valuation and Corporate Financial Analysis (PDF p. 40)
   d. New Courses
      (1) FINC 450 - Applied Portfolio Management I (PDF p. 16)
      (2) FINC 451 - Applied Portfolio Management II (PDF p. 27)

5. **Geology** ([PDF](#)): all GEOL proposals. Overview, PDF p. 1
   a. Change of Major (BA) (PDF p. 87)
   b. Change of Major (BS) (PDF p. 93)
   c. Course Changes
      (1) GEOL 103 - Environmental Geology (PDF p. 13)
      (2) GEOL 250 - Introduction to Geochemistry (PDF p. 29)
      (3) GEOL 257 - Marine Geology (PDF p. 33)
      (4) GEOL 320 - Earth Resources (PDF p. 79)
      (5) GEOL 441 - Pollution in the Environment (PDF p. 83)
   d. Course Deactivations
      (1) GEOL101/101L - Dynamic Earth & Dynamic Earth Laboratory (PDF p. 9)
      (2) GEOL 238 - Water Resources (PDF p. 25)
      (3) GEOL 252/252L - Mineralogy & Mineralogy Laboratory (PDF p. 51)
(4) GEOL 269/269L - Introduction to Petrology & Introduction to Petrology Laboratory (PDF p. 57)
(5) GEOL 300 - Independent Study in Geology (PDF p. 37)
e. New Courses
   (1) GEOL 256/256L - Mineralogy and Petrology & Mineralogy and Petrology Laboratory (PDF p. 61)
   (2) GEOL 291/291L - Water Resources & Water Resources Laboratory (PDF p. 69)

6. Entrepreneurship (PDF: all PSYC proposals. Overview, PDF p. 1)
   a. Change in Minor (PDF p. 26)
   b. Change in Concentration (PDF p. 18)
   c. Course Changes
      (1) ENTR 320 - New Venture Modeling (PDF p. 30)
      (2) ENTR 321 - New Venture Planning (PDF p. 35)
      (3) ENTR 335 - Financing New Ventures (PDF p. 41)
      (4) ENTR 375 - Research in Entrepreneurship (PDF p. 47)
      (5) ENTR 403 - Entrepreneurial Leadership (PDF p. 76)
      (6) ENTR 406 - Social Entrepreneurship (PDF p. 53)
      (7) ENTR 407 - Ecopreneurship (PDF p. 59)
      (8) ENTR 445 - Seminar in Entrepreneurship (PDF p. 64)
      (9) ENTR 451 - Health Sciences Entrepreneurship (PDF p. 70)
   d. New Courses
      (1) HONS 205 - Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice (PDF p. 5)
      (2) ENTR 260 - Special Topics in Entrepreneurship (PDF p. 81)
      (3) ENTR 360 - Special Topics in Entrepreneurship (PDF p. 87)
      (4) ENTR 420 - Independent Study in Entrepreneurship (PDF p. 94)
      (5) ENTR 499 - Bachelor's Essay in Entrepreneurship (PDF p. 101)

B. Academic Planning Committee

Proposal to change the Coursework Elsewhere during Senior Year Petition policy (PDF)

Note: there were two proposals under consideration, a proposal to change the “Courses Taken Elsewhere during Senior Year Petition” policy and a request to change the “Coursework Elsewhere during Senior Year Petition” policy for students who hold a baccalaureate degree from another institution.

George Pothering stepped down from his role as Parliamentarian, handing those duties temporarily over to Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, in order to present the proposal in his role as Chair of the Academic Planning Committee.

In order to put the first proposal into perspective, he said that currently, a student can transfer in with 92 hours of credit, complete 30 hours in the senior year, and graduate with a degree from the College of Charleston. On the other hand, once more typical students approach the senior year and they
are interested in taking coursework elsewhere, a rule that students complete 60 hours at the College becomes important, as in the following language: “candidates who have earned more than 60 credit hours at the College of Charleston may petition to complete up to 7 of their final 37 credit hours at another institution.” So, Pothering, observed, we will let a student graduate from the College with 30 hours of credit taken at the College, but once students approach 60 hours at the College, we look at things differently. The proposed language tries to address the disparity by changing that “more than 60” requirement to “a minimum of 30.”

We have had some issues with the current policy, he said, such as cases in which students wish to take a prerequisite course elsewhere in the summer before they come into their senior year. It also affects students who want to study abroad, since that means taking courses elsewhere. Here he noted further examples provided in the rationale section on the first page of the document provided.

**Questions / Discussion / Comments on the first proposal**

Scott Peeples, Senator – SHHS, said that he supports the change, but asked if the committee uncovered any rationale for the 60-credit hour rule.

Pothering explained that the issue was brought to the committee by the office of Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience Lynne Ford via the Registrar’s office.

Dawn Bare, Associate Registrar for Transfer Evaluation, said that they looked at the policy in the catalog, and that she has no idea what the original rationale for the policy was.

The Interim Provost added that, as discussed in the Academic Planning Committee, minutes from faculty meetings in the 1970s almost never explain the rationale for rules, only providing the proposal and the vote. Research, thus, often yields no insight into rationale. As an example, he pointed out that in 1972 the College took the required hours for graduation from 126 hours down to the current number of 122 as the result of a special faculty committee recommendation, and “we have no idea why.”

Irina Gigova, Senator – SHHS, noting that she had no idea that a College of Charleston degree could be granted with 92 hours of credit transferred in from elsewhere, asked what the rationale for that might be.

The Interim Provost speculated that this particular rule encapsulates an institutional history at the College characterized by two somewhat opposed impulses. On the one hand, in the 1970s the College sought to be an open and welcome place for transfer students, particularly students from other public institutions. At other times, we have shown a more protective attitude toward courses taught at the College. There’s “a back-and-forth in our rules which suggests different faculty attitudes toward rule-making over the decades,” he said.
Rick Heldrich, Senator – SSM, asked, given the Interim Provost’s comments about our inability to ascertain rationales for some rules instituted in the past, how we will make sure that the rationale for our rule-making will be preserved for future reference.

Several Senators in reply pointed to the stated rationale in the document itself. Pothering added that the rationale for this particular proposal is born out in the examples.

Lynne Ford added that the rationale is also that the residency requirement for a degree is 30 hours, and it is inconsistent to prevent students who are going to meet this requirement from doing what we allow all other students to do.

Dawn Bare, adding that the proposal on the floor results from a proposal sent by the Registrar’s office to the committee, emphasized that there is no request to change residency requirements in the proposal: students still need to meet all those requirements. It is really a matter of affording all students who meet the requirements the same opportunities.

The Speaker asked for further discussion, and seeing none, asked for a vote on the proposal.

The proposal to change the “Coursework Elsewhere during Senior Year Petition” policy was approved by voice vote.

Pothering now introduced the request to change the “Coursework Elsewhere during Senior Year Petition” policy for students who hold a baccalaureate degree from another institution.

He cited this particular language from the current policy:

The maximum number of transfer credits acceptable toward a College of Charleston degree is ninety-two (92) credit hours total from all institutions. Sixty (60) credit hours total are the maximum from two-year institutions. Students may decline transfer credit, prior to enrolling at the College of Charleston, in order to add another transfer course(s) without going over the maximum hours of transfer credit allowed. Students may not decline transfer credit after enrolling at the College of Charleston in order to take a course at another institution as a transient or cross-registered student.

This requires, Pothering pointed out, that these students know well in advance of transferring to the College that they may be taking a transfer course down the line at some point while at the College and, thus, make a decision to transfer fewer hours from the institution from which they are transferring. They would need remarkable foresight to pull this off.
The proposal, then, allows these students to petition to complete up to 7 of their final 37 credit hours elsewhere after they get to the College. They can decline up to seven transfer hours in order to do so.

Dawn Bare specified that the difference between this proposal and the one voted on prior is that this one applies to students who hold a baccalaureate degree from another institution. When they come here, they will bring in 92 hours, and for those students, working on their second bachelors degree, we would allow them after a semester or two at the College to decline up to seven hours of transfer credit in order to petition to complete up to seven hours elsewhere. They would not be limited to doing this only in their first semester.

Pothering cited the example in the rationale in the document of an active Air Force Reservist that he argued speaks clearly to the problem with the current policy and argues for the solution proposed.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

None.

The request to change the “Coursework Elsewhere during Senior Year Petition” policy for students who hold a baccalaureate degree from another institution was approved by voice vote.

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

The Speaker noted that is our practice in December and April in the Senate to accept from the Provost a resolution to the Board of Trustees to recommend that certified candidates be awarded degrees.

The Interim Provost asked for a motion from the floor and received one and a second for the following resolution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution to Award Degrees - December 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved: the Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Trustees that candidates certified by the Registrar's Office as having completed all requirements be awarded degrees at graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resolution was approved by voice vote.

6. Constituent’s Concerns

None.

7. Adjournment: 7:19 PM