Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 11 November 2014

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 11 November 2014 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. **Call to Order:** 5:06 PM
2. [7 October 2014 regular meeting minutes](#) were approved as posted.
3. **Announcements and information**
   None.
4. **Reports**
   A. **The Speaker**

   **Faculty Secretariat**

   The hiring committee (Speaker McNerney, Secretary Duvall, Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker, and Ana Gilpatrick) reviewed approximately 80 applications, conducted phone interviews, selected four applicants to interview in person, and interviewed three (one having dropped out). The committee has made a hiring recommendation and hopes to have a new Secretariat in place very soon.

   **October Board of Trustees (BOT) Meeting Highlights**

   In facilities news, the speaker reported that field stations at Dixie Plantation are on schedule to be completed in January and will be available for use in the spring; renovations to the Hollings Science Center are on schedule; Physician’s Memorial Audition is slated to be demolished over the Thanksgiving break, with completion of the new building in August 2016; the Jewish Studies expansion is on track for a fall 2015 completion; the Sottile Theater retail space at King and George is now open; the Rutledge Rivers Residence Hall construction will begin in June and is scheduled for completion in August 2016; and the Simons Center project is in a design and program completion phase.

   Another point of discussion in the BOT meeting, the Speaker said, was the public launch of the Boundless campaign.

   The Speaker also dispelled a rumor that faculty have been discouraged from attending BOT meetings. He stressed that this is not the case, and strongly encouraged faculty to attend BOT meetings and meetings of BOT committees if they so desire.

   Also announced in the BOT meeting, President McConnell and SGA President Spraker met with the Mayor and city officials about converting Coming and St. Philip streets back to two-way traffic and provided them with evidence that suggested that the plan needs further consideration. As a result, the College will be allowed to conduct a traffic study, the results of which will be reviewed by the city before any changes are made to the current traffic pattern.
A search committee is in place and working, the Speaker added, to locate a new Vice President of Student Affairs.

Faculty Charleston Chamber of Congress Meeting

The Speaker reported that on October 30, there was another meeting members of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce and faculty, this time adding most of the Deans. The meeting, he said, did not produce any “grand” actions, but it did make evident that more conversation is needed as the business community may still not be fully aware of what we do on campus. The Speaker said that he hopes the meetings will continue, along with other opportunities for us to educate the public about what faculty do at the College, and that if the Charleston business community observes weaknesses in what we do, he hopes they will share them.

Other Items

SACSCOC will be meeting in December, and the Speaker said that he will be in attendance.

This spring, we will move, he noted, to having three commencement ceremonies in the Cistern Yard (one on Friday night and two on Saturday). This will allow graduate students to be included in a Cistern ceremony and will also provide more tickets for graduates and their families.

Finally, the Speaker noted that anonymous dean and department chair evaluations will be administered soon, and he strongly encouraged Senators to participate and to, in turn, encourage other faculty across campus to do so as well. The Speaker also noted that regularization of these evaluations and the survey instrument for the dean evaluation are in large part the product of many years of work by the Faculty Welfare Committee.

B. The Interim Provost (Topics – PDF | Presentation Slides)

Before beginning his report, the Interim Provost also addressed the question of whether or not faculty are welcome at BOT meetings, verifying the Speaker's take on the matter. They are public meetings, he said, and, thus, open to faculty and students. The BOT, however, the Interim Provost reported, did ask that the number of 12-month staff members who staff those meetings be reduced, allowing them to continue doing the work of the College. The vast majority of faculty are not in the 12-month staff category.

Comprehensive Fundraising Campaign

The largest comprehensive fundraising campaign at the College prior to Boundless, the Interim Provost specified, was in the 1990s and raised what by today’s standards is a modest figure: in the 30 million dollar range. The Boundless campaign goes beyond just raising funds, however. It is a "long play," the Provost said: an opportunity to instill pride in alumni, current students, faculty, and staff for all that the college does (the big picture); an opportunity to engage alumni, of whom only about
10% currently contribute to the College, as advocates for the college in ways that go beyond contributing funds; and a means to get the College and its supporters excited about the College’s future.

So far, the campaign has raised $110 million toward a goal of raising $125 million. The successful completion of the campaign will mean not only support for faculty and students in the near and far term, but will also set the conditions for future, bigger campaigns. This is important especially in the context of diminishing state funding.

Course and Instructor Evaluations

The evaluation response rate is very low. The Interim Provost outlined two large steps that could be taken to ensure a higher response rate, but pointed out significant technical, human resources, legal, and/or financial challenges for each solution: going back to paper forms or withholding grades until students complete or opt out of evaluations and/or giving out grades early to those students who do the evaluations.

The plan for Spring 2015, he said, is to set aside class time (15-20 minutes) during which students can complete evaluations on their personal devices or computers. The day for conducting evaluations could be announced in advance by the instructor. The instructor could also survey the class to see if there is a need to provide computers or devices and, if needed, schedule class in a computer classroom, check out iPads from the library, or pursue similar solutions. The goal is to raise the response rate and in-class administration, he said, is the simplest solution to attempt at present. He said he would encourage all faculty to begin this practice this semester, but that in-class administration will be as required this spring. If this doesn’t work, we may be going for “more desperate options,” all of which have some serious drawbacks. The Interim Provost emphasized that he takes the issue of course and instructor evaluations “very seriously.”

School of Professional Studies

On November 10, the Interim Provost sent a memo to the President recommending that the college go ahead with the name change from North Campus to School of Professional Studies. The case originally laid out by Dean Godfrey Gibbison, the Interim Provost said, was still a strong one in terms of answering questions of identity, properly labeling an academic program as such, and consistency with how the College operates more generally. Those ideas, he pointed out, did not come in for criticism. The main concerns, rather, centered on other issues beyond naming. A concern for these other criticisms is built in, he said, to the President's decision.

The new school name is effective January 1, 2015. Based on faculty feedback, and here the interim provost singled out comments by Senators Krasnoff and Cory, the decision includes a guarantee that the school will remain a non-line school until 2017, at the very earliest. The original decision by prior-President Benson included a lead time for any decisions about line status of six months: the new decision includes an 18-month minimum lead time. Additionally, there is a guaranteed discussion in the
Faculty Welfare Committee and the Faculty Senate before any decisions can be made about line status. As it now stands, he reiterated, the School of Professional Studies has no faculty lines, a status not unlike that of the Honors College and the Graduate School.

Another concern raised in discussions leading up to the recent decision regarded the financial strength of the school. Financial viability is a concern that, in fairness, we can raise about all programs and all schools, and the Interim Provost said that he has recommended budget transparency and revenue transparency for all schools.

These concerns are outlined in the memo that he sent to the President and also in the President’s response, which the Interim Provost said he would be happy to share with Faculty Senate.

Budget Proposals for Academic Affairs

A memo will soon be released, the Interim Provost reported, outlining the budget process in Academic Affairs for this year. Budget proposals will be developed in November and December, with the first hearing of those proposals in Academic Affairs in December. A second hearing, in which the Interim Provost said he will present budget priorities to the Faculty Budget Committee and to anyone else who wishes to attend, will come in January, and at the end of that, recommendations will go to the Office of the President.

Faculty and Administrator Evaluations

The Interim Provost stressed the importance of roster faculty using the Faculty Activity System (FAS) to record professional activities. The FAS was purchased in 2005 and has been used steadily by some schools since then, with some departments, such as the Department of Communication, adopting its for use in faculty evaluation procedures. He pointed out that the College pays the same amount for the system annually, regardless of how much it is used.

When the President, the Board of Trustees, Deans, and so forth want to ask questions about research and service activities within or across schools and departments, within or across years, because the FAS is not used uniformly, these questions are only answerable by time-intensive and wasteful processes of manually compiling and tabulating data from individual faculty members CVs. Systems like the FAS are common at many universities, where their use long proceeds ours. The Interim Provost conceded that the earlier versions of the FAS featured a "clunky" interface and were not easy to use. However, we need to use the FAS for the kinds of data on research and service (teaching data, for the most part, is captured automatically) we need to access for various purposes.

Therefore, he said, by May 2016, every roster faculty member at the College will be required to have a FAS record of activity for that year (2015-16). Not to do so will result in "real consequences." That timeline provides 17 months for faculty to get used to the system. He recommended that department chairs and program directors
start asking their faculty to use FAS for faculty evaluation processes, so they won't have to do things twice.

Concerning adjunct faculty evaluation, the Interim Provost pointed out that our regional accreditors require evaluation of faculty without regard to rank; thus, we have to include adjunct faculty. Many deans and department chairs already evaluate adjunct faculty regularly and rigorously for the purposes of employment decisions. But we do not document that evaluation and systematically give formative feedback to adjunct faculty. For departments with high adjunct faculty dependency, he said, this will, unfortunately, be a significant additional burden added on top of roster faculty evaluation. Academic Affairs is working on processes to help chairs manage this kind of evaluation. A number of schools in the Southeast have been doing this for some time, and we might look to them for models.

On the topic of chair evaluations, the Interim Provost observed that the F/AM requires that such evaluations occur annually, a requirement that Academic Affairs is committed to fulfilling.

For Deans, evaluations are required "periodically" in the F/AM, and there has been some debate over what is meant by that term. Our regional accreditor, he said, provides some guidance on this, stipulating that senior administrators should be at least minimally evaluated once every three years. The Faculty Welfare committee has suggested a biennial calendar. We will do written Dean evaluations this spring, he said, as we did last spring, early in the semester and anonymously, with a push to get as many faculty to complete the evaluations as we can so that we have a sufficient sample.

The Interim Provost closed by stressing how seriously he and the administration take all the processes of evaluation he discussed, not just as a means of fulfilling accreditation obligations, but also because “we are trying to be a good and professional institution that documents, evaluates, and provides feedback for improvement.”

Questions / Discussion / Comments

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, asked if adjuncts are also using FAS.

The Interim Provost replied that our adjunct colleagues have not previously been part of FAS due to the different expectations we have of them. He said that if Cormack was suggesting that adjuncts use FAS, he would take that under advisement.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, said that a problem he is having with course and instructor evaluations is that, while he used to get substantial and useful qualitative written feedback from students, he is now getting "Twitter-length" feedback. Is there a means by which, he asked,
we can gather qualitative feedback as well, even if it is not electronic? Perhaps, the student moderator could gather such feedback in a sealed envelope.

Yes, the Interim Provost replied, there are a couple ways more qualitative data could be gathered. The window for filling out the forms electronically is open for a couple weeks, and students might be encouraged to complete the online evaluation before the class period set aside for it. Also, students who decide after the fact that they wish to provide more written feedback may take advantage of the option during the evaluation period, though few do, to "kill" their previous evaluation of the class and do a new one, adding more in the way of qualitative feedback.

A third option is to provide a paper form for your own use in formative evaluation so long as you are out of the room.

The reality, the Interim Provost added, is that the majority of students, even in the days of paper forms, left "Twitter-length" feedback; however, a small set of students will leave fairly substantial feedback on the electronic evaluation because, in part, such feedback does not identify them by their handwriting.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if in the first 12 months of the 17-month lead time before the required use of FAS by faculty the FAS could be programmed to import lists of faculty publications from EndNote and other applications so that faculty do not have to enter all their information one publication at a time.

The Interim Provost replied that he certainly understands the concern and he would be happy to consult with Shaver and the programming staff to see if there's anything that be can be done. He also reiterated that all that will be asked of faculty by May of 2016 is that they have entered that academic year's worth of data.

Shaver responded that if we are serious about having this data, there ought to be a way of entering an entire CV's worth. He added that his data is now entered, but only through the efforts of a departmental administrative worker.

The Interim Provost observed that departments and programs might discuss means of entering backlogs of data, but even a faculty member's entering a year's worth of data by the end of every year would make a big difference.

Michael Gomez, Hispanic Studies, at the meeting to represent the Faculty Welfare Committee, asked for a clarification on whether or not the course and instructor evaluation period would go into the final exam period.

The Interim Provost replied that he was waiting to hear the faculty's discussion and decision on a resolution to be discussed later in the present meeting [New Business, D. 1.] on ending the evaluation period before final exams. He said that he is sympathetic to the position holding that the course experience for a student can change markedly in the final examination period, but he wants to hear from faculty colleagues on this, and he also noted that students themselves
asked to have more time to complete evaluations. His main concern, however, is that we get more evaluation data from our students, he said.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - SSM, confirmed that two motions on course and instructor evaluations were to be considered later in the meeting, and added that we might consider extending the evaluation period by beginning it sooner, closer to the midterm.

She also agreed that the FAS is clunky, citing specific problems she has had in entering information pertaining to journals. She asked to whom faculty might address feedback for improvement of the system.

The Interim Provost said that he “would be delighted” to sit down with Anguelova to talk with Academic Affairs staff and Digital Measures.

Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker added that she and Sandy Hall in the Provost’s office are happy to take requests to modify the FAS.

Irina Gigova, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, asked about the $110 million already raised in the Boundless campaign: is it money promised or money already donated?

The Interim Provost explained that the college is following a rigorous methodology from the fundraising world for counting money raised in the Boundless campaign. At the risk of oversimplifying, he said, there are two kinds of gifts: 1. those for which the money is now in the bank and earning interest or, in the case of some endowed funds, is in the bank but may not earn interest for a number of years, and 2. the larger sum, in the form of irrevocable gifts. We already have from the campaign millions in the first category. We have some commitments from donors, he also noted, that we are not counting in the campaign because they have not been made in a way that the funds cannot be pulled back. To sum up, he said, some of the money raised in the campaign will do us good right now, some later, and still more not for many years.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, suggested that, in addition to communicating with the faculty, Academic Affairs also communicate to students the plan to administer online evaluations in class, in part, so that they know they have a right to the in-class administration of evaluations. Krasnoff also added that such a communication might also afford an opportunity to inform students about the exam schedule and their right to take final exams in the periods specified in the exam calendar.

The Interim Provost agreed that we need to clearly communicate with students that it’s an expectation of faculty to provide time for in-class administration of the evaluations, and that if such time is not provided, students need to talk to the faculty’s supervisor (program director, department chair).

Tom Kunkle, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics, asked if we actually know that setting aside time in class for online evaluations will lead to higher response rates, considering the number of other things the students might do on their devices instead.
The Interim Provost replied that there are a number of faculty in the room who have raised response rates with in-class administration of evaluations and that he would defer to them.

Emily Rosko, Department of English, suggested that faculty might ask students to take a screenshot that shows that they completed the evaluation without showing what they said.

Kunkle raised a concern that this would require students give up some of their anonymity.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker agreed that not all students will complete online evaluations in an in-class administration, even when they appear to be doing so, but she emphasized, based on evidence from a survey conducted last year and response rates in classes that did in-class administration faculty engagement has a dramatic positive effect on response rates.

The Interim Provost expressed appreciation for the efforts of Associate Provosts Caveny-Noecker and Diamond for all their work over the years on the online evaluation system.

There were no more questions.

5. Old Business

RESOLUTION to support Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 and call upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and appeal for the SC Legislature to create a position within the Board of Trustees to be held by the President of the Student Government Association.

Discussion resumed from the October Senate meeting on the following resolution, with Joe Carson, Senator – School of Science and Mathematics, who introduced the resolution, recapping prior discussion and answering questions.

Resolution to Support Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 and Call upon the Board of Trustees to Publicly Support and Appeal for the SC Legislature to Create a Position within the Board of Trustees to be held by the President of the Student Government Association

WHEREAS, on April 8, 2014, the Student Government Association unanimously passed SR-10-2014, calling for a position to be created within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the President of the Student Government Association;

WHEREAS, according to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, “more than 70 percent of public institution boards include one or more students”;}

WHEREAS, the inclusion of a representative of the student body as a part of the final authority and governance of the College of Charleston is a logically tenable way to better
satisfy the goals set forth by the respective governing documents of the Student Government Association and the Board of Trustees;

WHEREAS, the inclusion of the Student Government Association President as an official member of the Board would help ensure mutual respect between Undergraduate students and the Board of Trustees;

THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the student body president.

Carson explained that the resolution offers support for a Student Government Association (SGA) resolution, penned by SGA Senator Zachery Sturman and passed unanimously, for a position to be created on the Board of Trustees (BOT) to be held by the President of the SGA. The Faculty Senate (FS) resolution also calls for the BOT to support the student resolution. The resolution, he said, makes a reasonable request for student representation and provides the FS with an opportunity to support student involvement in school governance. Both the BOT and SGA have expressed a desire for better communication between the two groups. This resolution, Carson asserted, can be supported by the BOT, students, and faculty to ensure dialogue between the BOT and students and to avoid any appearance of a lack of transparency.

The majority of institutions in the US, he noted, have a student on their governing boards. There are, he said, no compelling arguments for the College to go against the grain in this respect.

To address concerns raised in the prior FS meeting about whether or not the student representative would be a voting or nonvoting member of the BOT, Carson said the FS resolution does not broach that issue: the main purpose is to support the student effort. He also observed that there may be significant legal bars to cross to make the position voting, as opposed to a non-voting. A concern was also raised in the last FS meeting, Carson noted, that a non-voting membership on the BOT might be nothing more than a privilege already afforded students to attend open meetings. He pointed out, however, that the BOT frequently has closed meetings, executive sessions that are not open to the public. A student representative would be present in these sessions as well.

To ensure this, Carson asked and received unanimous consent to add to the "Resolved" section of the document the following sentence: "The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all board of
trustee members.” [See below for the entire resolved clause with the added language represented in underlined text.]

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the student body president. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

Discussion now continued on the resolution as amended.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if the Speaker of the Faculty has the privilege of attending closed sessions of the BOT.

On the Speaker’s reply of “no,” Shaver followed up by questioning why we would support a student privilege that our own Faculty Speaker does not have.

Carson replied that if this is a concern, he would recommend that a separate resolution be submitted to add a faculty member to the BOT.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics, reminded the Senate that in the October discussion, a student raised some concerns about the SGA President being the student representative on the BOT. There is support for a student representative, she observed, but not necessarily for the SGA President as that representative.

Zachary Sturman, SGA Senator and author of SR 10-2014, expressed appreciation for the concern and said that support for the position to be held by the SGA President might be attributable to the statement in the SC Code of Laws that specifies that “presidents of student bodies may be ex officio members of boards of trustees.” He asserted that, legally, this is the only option for representation, as arbitrary as it is. The SGA President also already has channels that connect the position to the BOT, and so that adds another reason why the SGA President might be a good fit for the position.

Anguelova replied that since the law specifies ex officio status, then “ex officio” should be added to the resolution, which, she added, means “non-voting member.”

Sturman replied that “ex officio” means “by your position,” and it can be voting or non-voting.

Adrian Barry, a representative of Fight for CofC, said that they take issue with both the SGA resolution and the FS resolution. They do, however, support their own version of a bill to change the SC Code of Law proposed by SC State Representative by Bakari Sellers. Sellers’s bill, Barry pointed out, was introduced at the end of the last legislative session and did not come up for consideration. A new legislative session opens in January, at which time the bill can be considered. Fight for CofC, Barry said, spent the last couple months researching and reaching out to students
and on the basis of their research, has written their own legislation, based on Sellers’s bill and called the “Student Agency in College Governance Act.” They had hoped that the FC could change its resolution to support their proposed legislation, rather than SGA SR 10-2014.

The Sellers bill would have provided for two voting student seats on the BOT, one to be held by the SGA President, the other to be elected by the student body in the same manner as the SGA President. Fight for CofC proposes a similar plan, except the SGA President would not automatically become a Trustee, but would have to run for the position of Trustee in a general student body election. The other seat would be filled by a student elected by the FS. This addresses, he said, some flaws in the SGA election system (such as 10% voter turnout and self-promotion within the ranks of student body representatives). Faculty, he asserted, also know the students best and would be inclined to select on merits rather than popularity in selecting the student for the second seat. He closed by saying that Fight for CofC has come before the FS with a fully written piece of legislation for which they would like FS support.

Anguelova replied that the Senate has not seen this bill.

Barry replied by saying that “we actually emailed it” via Hollis France, Political Science, “with a three-page statement,” but it didn’t go out to the Senate.

Anguelova responded by pointing out that the resolution on the floor is not the resolution Barry seemed to be asking for.

Barry suggested that the resolution on the floor could be easily amended by substituting “Student Government Resolution SR 10-2014” with “the Student Agency in College Governance Act.” “But because you haven’t actually read it,” he conceded, “that’s kind of a reach.”

Anguelova said, in that light, that we should either vote on the resolution on the floor or table discussion until the “other resolution is available.”

The Speaker noted that the materials sent via Hollis France were not presented as a resolution by a faculty member, and that’s why it was not an agenda item.

Barry confirmed that they did not send a resolution, just their legislation and an explanation.

The Speaker noted that it is possible the Fight for CofC initiative might generate a resolution at some point, but it is not one at this point.

Andrew Shedlock, Senator - Department of Biology, asked if the College is also a statistical outlier among public institutions with regard to faculty speakers’ representation on governing boards.

The Speaker noted that there could be ethical conflicts with faculty serving on BOTs, along the lines, for instance, of an employee of an institution making decisions about how money is spent.
Bob Mignone, Department of Mathematics, said that there are many precedents for faculty representatives (speakers of faculty, for instance) serving on governing boards. He believes that we are behind the curve.

The Interim Provost pointed out that Title 59, Chapter 101 of the SC Code of Laws quoted earlier in the discussion was quoted accurately in reference to the President of the student body. However, a CofC complication to be aware of in this connection is that we have two student body organizations with Presidents, the SGA, representing undergraduate students and the Graduate Student Association (GSA), representing graduate students. Thus, there may be no student at the College who can claim to be the President of the student body from a legal point of view. The Interim Provost invited comment from Zachary Sturman.

Sturman reported that he spoke two weeks prior to Vice Chair of the BOT Lee Michael, who informed him that in 2010-11 there was a similar initiative spearheaded by SGA President Isaiah Nelson, which was supported by the BOT 9-6, but this did not reach the 2/3 majority needed for a by-laws change. The BOT was not concerned about the issue just raised by the Interim Provost, Sturman said, considering representation by the CofC President of the SGA to still be in line with the law’s ethos.

Joe Carson pointed out that the text of the FS resolution renders in lowercase “student body president,” leaving the resolution of that issue, if needed, for later. Tom Kunkle said that the resolution would have a better chance of passing if it left more up the BOT to decide as to the role the student would play. He suggested replacing “supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014” with “supports student representation on the Board of Trustees.” Also, he suggested replacing “the student body president” with “a student body representative.” Finally, he stated that the final line (added earlier by Carson with unanimous consent) should be stricken, leaving it to the BOT to decide what sort of attendance and voting rights the student representative would have.

He also reported that the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges website reports some interesting results of a 2010 survey: more than 70% of universities, private and public, have some form of student representation on the boards, around 50% of whom are non-voting members. If we had a non-voting student member of the BOT, then, we would not necessarily be behind the curve.

The Speaker asked if Kunkle was proposing an amendment to the resolution. Kunkle said, yes, and proposed the changes he outlined above as an amendment. Shaver asked if the changes should be taken separately, as separate amendments, since people seemed to be comfortable with the first two suggestions but not the last. Krasnoff agreed that there do seem to be some separable issues. The Speaker noted that the amendment could be moved “as one” and that it might be divided during debate.

The amendment was seconded by Krasnoff, who also pointed out that “whereas” statements above the “resolved” clause would need to be altered as well, in parallel.
The Speaker advised that the Senate attend first to the “resolved” clause and change the “whereas” statements as needed later.

[See below for an edited text and a clean copy, both showing Kunkle’s amendments. In the first, deleted language is represented by strike-through font, added language by underlined font.]

[reflecting edits]
RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 student representation on the Board of Trustees, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the student body president a student body representative. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

[clean copy]
RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports student representation on the Board of Trustees, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by a student body representative.

Questions / Discussion / Comments on the Amendment by Kunkle

Adrian Barry asserted that initiative of SGA President Nelson was weaker than SR 10-2014: it only accorded a right to speak “when recognized.” Though this initiative had support, it was still voted down, a sign, he said, of the BOT’s unwillingness to cede power. Whatever is done, he asserted, it will be a reach, and, therefore, he urged the Senate to “reach for something significant.” Fight for CofC would like to see a more “hard line” resolution, with more specificity, rather than “low-balling ourselves” in the way we ask for a student representative on the BOT, he said.

Iana Anguelova called the question on the amendment, which was seconded, and was agreed to by voice vote with no opposition.

The Speaker then called for a vote on the amendment, reading the amended language.

Scott Peeples, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, asked if the Senate had not divided the amendment. The Speaker replied in the negative. Shaver asked for advice: should those wishing to have the language divided strike down the amendment and re-propose it in a different form? Parliamentarian George Pothering agreed that this would work.

A inconclusive voice vote was taken, followed by a vote by show of hands.
The amendment failed, returning the Senate to discussion of the resolution with the “resolved” clause as follows.

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the student body president. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

Questions / Discussion / Comments on the resolution

Larry Krasnoff moved the same amendment as Kunkle’s, but with the sentence at the end of the resolution stricken by Kunkle now remaining. The motion was seconded.

[See below for an edited text and a clean copy, both showing Krasnoff’s amendments. In the first, deleted language is represented by strike-through font, added language by underlined font.]

[reflecting edits]

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 student representation on the Board of Trustees, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the student body president student body representative. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

—

[clean copy]

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports student representation on the Board of Trustees, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by a student body representative. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

Questions / Discussion / Comments on the Amendment by Krasnoff

Sturman said that he was fine with the amendment, the main goal being to support the idea of having a student on the BOT.

There was no more discussion.
The Speaker, first reading the amended language, called for a vote.
The amendment passed on a voice vote, the language now reading:

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports student representation on the Board of Trustees, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by a student body representative. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

Discussion continued on the resolution, with the Speaker calling for any more changes to or discussion of the “resolved” statement.

Seeing none, the Speaker opened the floor for discussion of and/or amendments to the “whereas” statements.

Iana Anguelova asked if she could call the question on the resolution.
Pothering suggested that before doing so, it would be best to make sure the “whereas” statements support the “resolved” statement.

Anguelova moved to strike the first “whereas” statement, which reads “WHEREAS, on April 8, 2014, the Student Government Association unanimously passed SR-10-2014, calling for a position to be created within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the President of the Student Government Association.” There was, however, no second.

Krasnoff said that there is no reason to strike the first “whereas” statement as it presents a matter of fact. Nor, he said, are there other entire “whereas” statements that should be stricken. In the fourth “whereas,” however, “the Student Government Association President” should be replaced with “a student representative.” He asked for and received unanimous consent for the change.

The title was changed as well to reflect the other changes.
The Speaker called for further discussion, this time of the resolution as a whole.

Jason Coy, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, cautioning that he doesn’t wish to come across as against student participation in school governance, advised Senators to vote against the resolution. It would create a problematic situation, should the BOT agree to adding a student representative, that would allow a student to be present to discuss and, perhaps, vote on matters of great import, while the Speaker of the Faculty is asked to leave the room. The faculty would have no say, while the students would.

He noted that one might object to his position by saying the faculty could agitate separately for a position on the BOT, but he said, for whatever reason, the BOT might find it more to their goals or liking to admit a student representative alone.
Carson replied that voting down the resolution would not in any way make it more likely that a faculty position on the BOT could be created. Conversely, he argued, having a student on the BOT, might make it more likely that there would be reasonable arguments to put a faculty member on the board, as well.

Jon Hakkila, Department of Physics and Astronomy, asked if it would be possible to table or postpone action on this resolution until a resolution supporting faculty membership on the BOT could be written, the two resolutions to be considered and voted on in the same meeting.

Krasnoff said that he agreed with Carson. The students “got out in front” of the faculty on this one: the Senate should pass the resolution now.

Barry said anything is a big step forward, so if the resolution passes, it is a good thing. But, he specified, as written now, the resolution is actually weaker than the SGA resolution, only asking for the bare minimum.

Irina Gigova, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, stated that the resolution supports the efforts of the SGA and Fight for CofC and should not be seen as a weaker version of those.

Sturman thanked Faculty Senate for the discussion, and noted that the SGA continues to work in their own committees and through conversation with the BOT, which has five new members in this term. He said he is less concerned about the language than the process.

Andrew Shedlock, Department of Biology, stated that it might be informative to look at patterns of other institutions. Do those who have student representatives on governing boards also have faculty representation? Is it common to have the first and not the second? And so forth.

Bob Mignone, Department of Mathematics, noted that there is a great deal of variability in governing boards in relation to these questions.

Phil Jos, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, reported, based on a google search, that a 2010 study found that 15% of private and 14% of public higher education institutions have voting faculty members on their governing boards.

Discussion ended here, and a vote was taken on the complete resolution as represented below.

The resolution passed on a voice vote.

Resolution to Support Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 and Call upon the Board of Trustees to Publicly Support and Appeal for the SC Legislature to Create a Position within the Board of Trustees

WHEREAS, on April 8, 2014, the Student Government Association unanimously passed SR-10-2014, calling for a position to be created within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the President of the Student Government Association;
WHEREAS, according to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, “more than 70 percent of public institution boards include one or more students”;

WHEREAS, the inclusion of a representative of the student body as a part of the final authority and governance of the College of Charleston is a logically tenable way to better satisfy the goals set forth by the respective governing documents of the Student Government Association and the Board of Trustees;

WHEREAS, the inclusion of a student representative as an official member of the Board would help ensure mutual respect between students and the Board of Trustees;

THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports student representation on the Board of Trustees, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by a student body representative. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

New Business

A. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs (webpage)
   Jon Hakkila, Chair of the committee, noted that last year the committee developed a batch-voting procedure to speed the work of the committee in Senate meetings, where there are no concerns about specific course proposals. Program proposals, on the other hand, get a separate vote. At this meeting, however, since there is a separate concern about the MBA program proposal, voting will be separate on the course proposals.

1. CSIS 631 – Privacy and Security Issues: Change course title (PDF)
   Questions / Discussion / Comments: none.
   The proposal passed on a voice vote.

2. Master of Business Administration: Add new course(s) to requirements or electives (PDF)
   Questions / Discussion / Comments
   Hakkila asked James Kindley, MBA Program Director, to speak to the proposal, given that some concerns have been expressed about it.
Kindley explained that there is a special topics course (560) listed in the catalog, but inadvertently, he said, it was not specified in the various electives, three elective tracks, as an option for whoever is teaching the elective courses. So now that they are listed as three elective courses, the program wants to add the 560 course and let the department or group that is in charge of the elective decide whether or not to use 560 - Special Topics as appropriate but still require the three courses for students. The students would not get a choice in this, but the 560 course could be used for a variety of things, as it is intended to do. That's the only change the program is asking for.

Hakkila noted that Kelly Shaver had concerns about the course.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, noted that one concern he had was removed by Kindley’s discussion above: if there had been choice for the students among courses they could take, then, of necessity, all four of the courses would need to be offered, which would eliminate three courses from the undergraduate program. He no longer, he said, has this particular objection.

However, he did express concern about the method of the evaluation of the success of the course. He asked that item 2 under “Assessment Method and Performance Expected” on page three of the course form be stricken. It reads, “Course(s) will be judged by employer reaction to student capabilities. This should result in increased hiring. Employers will be surveyed for their feedback regarding the students’ skills.”

Shaver asserted that it will be “exceedingly difficult” to differentiate whether increased hiring derives from the course or courses or from the growing reputation of the program itself.

Kindley replied that he has no problem striking that item, but in response to it, he noted that there is a close relationship between the program and the speakers it brings in to work with the students, and there is continuous feedback about the relevance of such interactions. The language was intended to tap into that.

Shaver said that in addition to the problem of teasing out the cause of increased hiring, the language would also obligate the program to do annual surveys.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, added that the factual statement in the language opens the program to a later challenge by a student on a claim that the course did not live up to its stated goals. This could create a vulnerability, in other words.

Shaver replied by asking if DeLaurell was seconding his motion to strike the language, to which she agreed.

The Speaker recognized it as a motion.
Phil Jos, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, asked if the objectionable part is only the first two sentences and not the final one. Employers, he said, are certainly competent to make a judgment about students’ skills. Also, it’s not an onerous task and doesn’t open the program to any particular vulnerabilities.

Shaver replied that his concern is all of it. The last sentence obligates employers to do a survey.

Discussion of Shaver’s amendment concluded here.

The amendment passed on a voice vote.

Hakkila noted at this point that his committee has not fully figured out how to handle the section of the form dealing with assessment.

Krasnoff added that the assessment section of the form, required not simply for course proposals, but in many other situations as well, is a burden.

The Speaker asked for any additional comments or concerns about the MBA course proposal.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, added that the proposal represents a fairly typical change.

The proposal passed as amended on a voice vote.

3. Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing: New degree proposal (PDF)

Hakkila noted that, from the perspective of the committee, the program is interesting and innovative. It is a program that offers something new to the curriculum and takes advantage of being in the Lowcountry. He pointed out that Academic Affairs helped a great deal in working out the financial support. He suggested that the proposal might be seen as a model for new curriculum proposals in the future. He turned the floor over to Bret Lott.

Bret Lott, Department of English, pointed out that a great deal of work went into developing the proposal, with a good number of people involved. He singled out Emily Rosko, Department of English, in this connection.

He said that the MFA in Creative Writing has been a long time coming. There are 25 programs in the Southeast, he said, but there is only one program in South Carolina, at the University of South Carolina. He pointed to the College’s assets: our faculty, support of the Department of English, the highly-respected Crazyhorse literary journal.

The program has two tracks: a studio track and an Arts Management track. It will finally bring to South Carolina a second program, he said, that has been long needed.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, asked if there are other MFAs, besides Creative Writing, and if so asked Lott to talk about those a bit.
Lott replied that, yes, there are: Painting, Arts, Drama, Music. The MFA is a terminal degree, but it is two years of studying with writers, two years of studying writing/literature, two years, in this case, of studying publication and working with an internationally-known journal. “The only reason you get an MFA is because you love the subject that you study,” he said. “That’s the truth of Humanities: there’s no [utilitarian way to] defend this thing.” The Arts Management track, he said, however, does train people to work in the multi-billion dollar arts economy. This track will help ready them for jobs in editing, publishing, working for different arts councils, and so on. We don’t want to “spit out adjunct professors to teach English 110,” he asserted.

Krasnoff followed up by saying that he was looking in the proposal for some synergy between the two tracks, but noted that “really, there isn’t.” There is no real crossover course to make the case that the two fields, writing and arts management, go together. His concern is that with the track, students might be getting a little less of each side.

Lott asked if Krasnoff was saying that students in the track would not actually be earning the certificate in Arts Management.

Krasnoff clarified: his concern, he stated, is that they might get “half of a each degree.”

Emily Rosko noted that the internship class was supposed to offer the synergy, allowing students to connect practical business skills or editorial training with community connections in the arts world. It has been left open in the Arts Management track, she noted, signified by an asterisk signaling that additional courses may count. The next step, she said, is to sit down with people in Arts Management and the Masters of Public Administration to develop classes geared toward MFA students in Creative Writing.

Phil Jos, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, agreed that the proposal is strong, but raised a concern about Arts Management courses, which will now have students from Arts Management, Public Administration, and the MFA in Creative Writing. He said that this may require some very particular and special course development and, maybe, down the road additional staffing. This should be part of the plan, he said.

He also said that he was looking for, as an interim strategy, a capstone or some experience that brings together all the courses in Arts Management and Creative Writing. That could happen, he agreed, in an internship.

In addition, he asked about the admission standards, particularly the GPA, which Jos observed, is very low “for any program.”

Lott asserted that grades don’t necessarily reflect skill in writing.

Rosko, though she said she could not verify online at present due to a connection problem, said that the proposal pulls much of its admission standards from our
MA in English, which would put the MFA, in this respect, in line with current graduate level practice at the College in English.

Lott also pointed out that the portfolio of original work will make the case for admission.

There was no further discussion.

The proposal was approved on a voice vote.

B. Faculty Curriculum Committee (webpage)

Artium Bacchalaureatus (AB): Revise catalog statement on requirement for AB degree (PDF)

Bonnie Springer, Chair of the committee, introduced the motion by saying that there is no form for use with a motion like this. It is a clarification of catalog language.

The Speaker invited Tim Johnson, Chair of the Department of Classics, to contextualize the proposal.

Johnson pointed out that the current catalog language is based on an hours requirement, and with language placement this can result in a number of exceptions. The new language is intended to line up with the languages in general in terms of proficiency at an advanced level. There is no change here in practice: the language is just adding specificity.

Krasnoff asked for a clarification: does this mean that if a student gets placed into the high level, they get to exempt some of the 18 hours now?

Johnson replied that there are two answers: hardly anybody does place into the 300-level and if a student did, there are still multiple 300-level hours required. Most of of the placements that cause problems come in at the 102 or 201-level, he specified.

Krasnoff asked if a current student does place at 300-level, do they still have to take six courses or do they get credit for any of the things they placed out of?

Johnson said, under the new language, they would then qualify by taking two courses at the 300 level if they come in with that skill level. The current practice in a case like this, he said, is to apply for an exception.

There was no further discussion.

The proposal passed on a voice vote.

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

1. Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Manual to Remove Requirement of Distribution of Meeting Agenda in Printed Form (Word | PDF)

   Rick Heldrich, Chair of the committee, explained that this motion would only remove reference to “print.”

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

2. NOTICE OF INTENT: To Change Faculty Administrative Manual to More Clearly Define Faculty Responsibilities with Regard to Students with Disabilities Policy (PDF)

Heldrich explained that these language changes are in response, in part, to a request from Deborah Mihal, Director - Center for Disability Services (CDS), for a clarified F/AM statement on the responsibilities of the College, faculty, and students regarding instructional accommodations for students with disabilities. The language, he also pointed out, has been vetted also by a number of other parties.

Discussion/Comments

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, noting that she has spent two years dealing with CDS on what constitutes reasonable accommodations, asked “why we are completely gutting faculty from the process?”

Heldrich replied that the College has a federal legal obligation to provide reasonable accommodations for students, and the proposed language accounts for that.

DeLaurell said she is not denying that obligation. She specified that the rule is that it is the faculty member has to provide the accommodation. What she sees in the proposed changes, she said, is that faculty are removed from dialogue with the student and that faculty are only dialoguing with CDS staff.

She also reported personal experiences with CDS that also inform her response to the proposed language changes. She said that she has “found the staff to be uninformed about what constitutes a reasonable accommodation” and “fairly hostile, in that they are not communicative.”

She said that she thinks the proposed language will create problems due to the vagueness of terms such as “reasonable” and “properly raised.” The staff at CDS, she asserted, should not be put in a position where they are making legal determinations, of which they are not capable. She added that the CDS staff have “some basic misunderstandings of how things work and don’t even follow their own process.” She closed by saying that the proposed change is “really dangerous” and that faculty in the classroom should not be preempted by a staff characterized as they are above.

Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker stated that the intent of the language change is not to give CDS sole authority or any authority they do not already have; rather, it is to clarify specific groups’ responsibilities, including faculty’s responsibilities. Faculty do not, she said, have the authority as individuals to define what the accommodation is. They have the responsibility to work with CDS and the academic authority—their department chair, the Dean, the Provost—to determine a reasonable accommodation. Another section specifies the College’s responsibility, not
CDS’s, which was an intentional decision by the by-laws committee. The language’s goal is to clarify the student’s responsibilities and the faculty’s responsibilities, and what our institutional obligation is.

**Judith Steele**, Assistant Director - CDS, noting that Deborah Mihal could not be in attendance, pointed out that the laws themselves are vague. Decisions about accommodations come down, she said, to the individual student, the student’s disability, and what is most likely to give the student equal access.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, pointed out that the section of the new language beginning with “it is the responsibility of the instructor to” makes no references to the department chair, academic affairs, or any academic officers, or even the instructor’s having a discussion with the student. A student, he asserted, is probably in a better position to determine what accommodation might be most effective in a particular course whose content the student understands than would be CDS, who have no real understanding of the course and should not be expected to have such an understanding.

**Caveny-Noecker** replied that when she was talking about the chain of command or authority, she wasn’t being specific about what the proposed language says. The intent of the language is to clarify responsibilities in the F/AM, and with respect to faculty responsibilities in the proposed language, those who worked on it wanted the faculty to be aware that they are to be the ones to administer accommodations, but also that they should raise concerns if they think the accommodations aren’t reasonable or appropriate to the nature of the class. They are also responsible for working with the CDS to resolve the issues.

A larger issue has been raised in the discussion, she observed, that neither the current language nor the proposed language addresses: what happens when there is a disagreement between faculty and CDS as to what is a reasonable accommodation? It is, she stressed, inappropriate for such a dispute to be carried out in a dialogue between the faculty member and the student.

CDS evaluates students for disability, makes initial recommendations for accommodations, and provides some accommodations themselves, such as space for testing, but CDS does not have the sole authority to say what is or is not reasonable, and neither does the faculty member. Academic affairs deems these accommodation decisions academic ones as they are ultimately decisions about credit for academic coursework. The Provost and Academic Affairs will accept responsibility for a role in those decisions, but the proposed language does not address that because it is a larger-scale issue that needs more work.

What the proposed language does do, however, is clean up the current language and clarify things, and those who worked on it—CDS, Academic Affairs, the faculty Committee on By-laws and the F/AM—believe it is better
than the current language. However, with the Senate’s serious consideration and with the concerns raised, she said, we can keep working on the larger issues.

**DeLaurell** reiterated her earlier observation that the proposed language creates confusion, adducing “reasonable time” and “properly raise” as examples of vague phrases. She also asserted that in the instructor responsibilities section, the proposed language "remove[s] everything except answering to CDS and providing the accommodation." As evidence from her own experience, she said that, in order to so protect other students whose privacy might have otherwise been violated by a recommended accommodation of audio recording, she spent hours retyping class notes in order to give them to a student who needed an accommodation. She said that while she’s willing to do this kind of work, she gets the impression that CDS is not. If the proposed language included the element of academic officers’ oversight (the Chair, the Dean, the Provost), she argued, she might be able to support it.

Furthermore, she asserted that CDS is "actually the problem," as evidenced, she asserted, by their telling students that they need not seek an instructor’s permission to audio record classes, whereas, in direct conflict with this, SNAP letters specify "with permission of instructor." She thus cautioned against giving CDS broad decision-making power. Furthermore, she noted that the lack of language about appeals makes matters worse.

She concluded by saying that the proposed language represented a "hastily done job" that will cause more problems than "working through" the issues in a "methodical manner" would cause, urging those working on the language to keep foremost in their minds that faculty will be the ones who administer accommodations and that the faculty want to accommodate students in a reasonable way.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator - SSM, said that she agrees that the proposed language represents a clarification. For example, one sentence stricken in the new language in the “responsibility of the instructor” section is “justify the proposed accommodation [(or the denial of an accommodation) if appealed by the student].” Anguelova asserted that she, as faculty member, does not feel qualified to make a justification of that sort, but this is what the SNAP office is for: there should be a separate body for such decisions. We are, she noted, raising bigger issues, but as far as the proposed language goes, it is better than what is currently in the F/AM.

Anguelova at this point asked for a quorum call, which revealed that, with 26 senators in the room, there was a quorum. Discussion continued.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator – Philosophy, agreed with Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker that the proposed language does not make CDS the final authority. He also agreed that the faculty have to determine what a reasonable accommodation is in relation to the particular class and its learning
objectives and the student’s particular disability (in part, Shaver’s point). He suggested a small change to the proposed language. In item 4 under “it is the responsibility of the student to,” which reads “request an accommodation within a reasonable time in advance of situations for which it is necessary,” Krasnoff suggested adding “from the instructor” after “accommodation.” This would clarify the faculty role: the student is supposed to work with the faculty member, they would try to work things out together, and in the case of a problem, CDS would assist.

As for vagueness in the proposed language, Kranoff pointed out, much of that is already “baked into the law.” Standards of reasonability are common in the law, and “we are stuck with them” and, thus, “we have to work together” to come to a sense of “reasonable.”

**Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker** reiterated that the intent of the proposed language was clarification. There was no intent and there is no action in the proposed language, she asserted, that takes away rights of the faculty member or gives rights or authority to CDS beyond the authority they already have.

**Shaver** noted that the clarification has raised problems that we need to deal with, and he thanked those who worked on the proposed language for the clarification that has made the problems obvious.

At this point, **Larry Krasnoff** asked for clarification as to whether or not the Senate was voting on the language, which would seem out of place given that it would reside in a portion of the F/AM over which the Senate has no control. Speaker McNerney replied that the Senate will take a vote, but mainly in order to indicate the position of the Senate in regard to the language.

**Rick Heldrich** explained that the reason the Senate is considering language that it does not have direct control over is that for many years the administration promulgated policy that affected faculty, yet faculty were not necessarily informed of policy changes and had little role, if any, in shaping them in the first place. A discussion between faculty and Brian McGee, who was then working as Chief of Staff in the President’s office, resulted in the faculty consultation process now on display in the current discussion. Faculty are presented with policy and given a chance to debate and help to develop it before it goes into the F/AM. The by-laws committee in this case tried to clarify the language currently in the F/AM and brought it to the Senate for discussion and further input as needed. Having the current debate is a good thing, he said, and validates McGee’s original position that this is the way that policy changes should be enacted at the College.

**DeLaurell** took issue with Krasnoff’s suggestion that his proposed revision (see above) would address concerns about the faculty being cut out of the process of deciding on accommodations. She pointed out stricken item 3 under instructor responsibilities, which reads “suggest alternative or
negotiate accommodations with the student and/or SNAP coordinator if the recommended accommodations are unacceptable." This is a removal of faculty input, she said.

Many in the room replied that the revised item 3 (just below stricken item 3) answers those objections: the instructor should "promptly raise concerns and recommend alternative accommodations to a CDS administrator if the accommodations recommended by CDS are incompatible with the format or nature of the course."

DeLaurell countered that the proposed language "does not allow you to talk to the student." Why can't you talk to the student?, she asked.

**Interim Provost McGee** thanked Heldrich for recapping the issues and conversations around past development and promulgation of policy, which did not substantively involve faculty input. He thanked the Committee on By-laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual for their work to insure thoughtful faculty discussion of policy. There has, he said, been a significant amount of work done on this particular policy redevelopment and improvement. The Senate’s helpful discussion "will cause us to go back and look again" at the disability language. He assured the Senate that there is still time left for considering the issues raised, and he thanked the Senate and all those who worked on the policy, across the board. He expressed his office's intent to work through the language line by line to incorporate, where possible, the concerns raised in the debate.

**Shaver** asked "how many of us does it take to leave before we no longer have a quorum?" On the Speaker’s reply, "one," Shaver quickly riposted, "I am leaving."

At this point the Speaker asked for a motion to adjourn, which was offered instantaneously, seconded, and voted on in the affirmative.

7. Adjournment: 7:29

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary