Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 5 & 12 April 2016

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 5 April 2016 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115). The meeting continued on Tuesday 12 April 2016 at 5 P.M., same location.

Agenda

1. Call to Order: 5:06 PM
2. The minutes for the March 2016 regular meeting were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and Information: none
4. Reports
   A. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney
      The Speaker forwent a report in order to allow as much time as possible for discussion and deliberation on the meeting’s reports and business. He emphasized the significance and value of full deliberations and discussion because these become part of our record of shared governance.
      He specified that, if needed, he will report or make announcements at the beginning of the next session of the meeting.
   B. President McConnell
      President McConnell delivered prepared remarks, a transcript of which, as delivered, is presented below.

      Good afternoon.

      Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak to you.

      It's been over 20 months since I became President of the College of Charleston. In what is approaching nearly two years, we’ve accomplished a lot together such as:

      First, shutting the door on the idea of a merger with MUSC. Our future is now ours to control and shape, and does not rest with the authority of others outside of this institution.

      Then, securing research status for our component institution, the University of Charleston, South Carolina.

      Next, we received $2 million from the state to turn around and buy from the state the DEW Building on Lockwood Blvd., which will house administrative offices not needed physically on our core campus, thus opening up in the future new space at a minimum cost on our campus.

      We launched our Top 10% Program and the first students into the program will be on our campus this fall.

      Academically speaking, we secured additional state monies to expand our footprint in computer science and supply chain and information management.

      We also passed and are implementing reforms to our Bachelor of Professional Studies program and working to grow our School of Professional Studies in North Charleston.

      And recently, we have been more visible in Columbia, which has allowed us to champion our remarkable institution and call for an increased investment in higher
education from the State of South Carolina. And it appears that our message is being heard loud and clear because for the first time in many years, the College has received, over on the House side, an increase in state monies to our E&G budget. In the current version of the House budget, there is an appropriation for an additional recurring $2 million to the College.

Let me put that in context for you. If the College were to pull $2 million a year from our endowment in a sustainable way, we would approximately need about a $40 million unrestricted cash gift to earn the $2 million we would need in interest.

So you can see why the added investment from the state is terrific news. It will surely be a big step and help to the College as we work to implement a more sustainable budget.

Now, much change can occur by the time the budget is finalized in a couple of months, but we are cautiously optimistic that we will make it through to the final budget.

The progress we have made in the last 20 plus months are steps in the right direction for the College. We are now a stronger university, and we can move forward with confidence with our plans for the future.

We have put many critical pieces in place for our boundless future, and that includes adhering to the current College of Charleston Strategic Plan. The College continues to work from the aforementioned comprehensive document that is the result of a highly inclusive planning process.

I am extremely thankful to the members of our campus community who played a role in helping shape and lift up this plan, which was approved in 2009 and revised and approved again in 2013.

I have reviewed our Strategic Plan, and I support and I embrace it. I see no need to create a new one and be slowed down by perhaps another year or two of long planning. It’s time for action and implementation. And sure some updating will have to be done to this plan in the next 24 months with appropriate constituent input, but, overall, our Strategic Plan is directly in line with my vision and the vision of others for the College’s future of being an affordable, accessible, and inclusive institution.

That being said, the Strategic Plan was predicated on the idea that there would be substantial, consistent new monies for the implementation of the plan. As we all know, our current fiscal reality does not support that previous thinking. And efficiencies, internal reallocations, entrepreneurial initiatives, and fundraising are not enough by themselves.

So I’ve chosen to highlight five priorities that fit into the Plan, which the College will focus on as we approach our 250th anniversary in 2020.

These five priorities are deceptively simple, but, as we all know, can be complex in their execution.

1. Become a nationally preeminent undergraduate-centered, student-focused liberal arts and sciences university with outstanding professional programs in business and education;
2. Addressing ongoing enrollment trends and broaden recruitment;
3. Successfully pass our 10-year reaccreditation;
4. Increase diversity on the campus; and
5. Embrace sustainability in all forms on campus.

Within these priorities, we will we will retain our teacher-scholar model that has been the foundation of the College since we first began instruction in the late 1700s. At the same time, we will offer some advanced degrees in targeted areas for which there is student and market demand in our local, state, and regional communities. We will never be or want to be a full-fledged research university.

In regards to addressing ongoing national enrollment trends and broadening our recruitment strategies, the College will continue to admit and retain the best and brightest students from around South Carolina and the country and the world. We will continue to seek out and add nonresident students in a way that is smart and strategic and does not erode our ability to carry out our public mission of serving the needs of our community and state. In line with that, we also will seek to grow our graduate enrollment in our current programs, and others that may be added if the need arises.

Further, we will recruit more international students to campus and nontraditional students to our North Campus as well as potential satellite campuses East of the Cooper and by the Nexton Development.

These additions to our student demographics will help us adapt to the changing landscape of higher education today and in the future.

Of course, growing our enrollment will also mean expanding our campus outside of our historic core. We will continue to seek out properties that are a smart investment for future growth of the College, whether for classrooms, office spaces, or recreational activities.

As you know, we have under contract an inn, right down here on George St.: that is a 100-year purchase for the College of Charelston in terms of the strategic piece of property that is is.

To be attractive to all these different student groups we want to recruit, we would, of course, need to be reaccredited.

As we all know, we are currently in the midst of our 10-year SACS reaffirmation process. I know this is a large undertaking and a top priority not only for this administration, but for the entire campus. We can only achieve our reaccreditation by working together. And I greatly appreciate the additional time and attention that all of you are putting into our 10-year reaffirmation effort. It is not lost on me the amount of work that is being done by all of us and the toll it is taking on our entire campus community. And let me just say the work ends up, too, in my office, in meetings and everything else, as we all have to go through this reaffirmation process. So please know you have my most sincere and very appreciative thanks for any- and everything that you’re doing in that regard.

And in moments of frustration, and I know you’ve had a few, I ask that you remember that while the College has been accredited by SACS for exactly 100 years, there have been other instances when we were not as prepared for reaffirmation of accreditation as we should be, but we survived. We all know accreditation standards are becoming more and more rigorous in response to pressure from the federal government.

That is why this process is so important and why we must build at the College of Charleston a culture of assessment at moving forward. Accreditation ensures that an institution’s academic program meets acceptable levels of quality, in addition to
ensuring the value of a College of Charleston degree by other universities and by many public and private employers.

Honestly, much of the work being done is because we are behind the eight ball. But once we have the proper process and measurements in place, it should, and will, be easier moving forward.

Now, let me talk about another priority: diversity. As a diverse national university, we will foster a deeper appreciation for people of all races, ages, genders, religions, sexual affiliations and orientations, and levels of ability. We will increase the number of minority students and faculty and staff on campus. In line with that, we will offer the appropriate support services to ensure we are retaining these diverse groups of people. This can’t, and won’t, be just lip service. We will walk the walk, and we will talk the talk.

In addition, we will create and award more scholarships to diverse students and increase our diversity training efforts across campus.

It’s no secret that there is still much work to be done regarding diversity and inclusion at the College, but I am proud to say that we are headed in the right direction.

The last priority I want to discuss is sustainability. We must embrace sustainability. We talk about the triple bottom line, the everyday and institutional choices we make that have a social, financial, and environmental impact. By applying these tenets of sustainability, we will be a stronger university.

And you’ve heard me talk about sustainability in the sense of developing a more sustainable financial model. And yes, that means at times, we will have to make hard financial decisions. But these choices will ultimately strengthen our financial position with funds to invest in our faculty and staff and initiatives to make our College of Charleston stronger. Further, measures will be put in place that allows us to be a more affordable and accessible institution for ALL of our students.

Lastly, as we work through the implementation of our Strategic Plan, we will not decrease the quality of our academics. On the contrary, we will invest in the enhancement of renowned programs at the College and top-notch faculty and staff who are shaping the minds of tomorrow.

It’s all about implementation and execution...of new systems thinking...here at the College. Opportunities abound to change the way we think about the services we deliver, how those same services impact our bottom line, and how those same services enhance the academic achievement of the students we serve.

Focusing on these five priorities supports the goals and strategies outlined in our shared Strategic Plan. We are simply focusing on areas where we can take action now and have a lasting positive impact on the campus.

As I mentioned earlier, our Strategic Plan is quite broad, quite broad, and we need to have a more laser-like focus on a few key priorities, which we can target with the current resources we have.

Because our plan is a living document, we will review it as necessary and make revisions as circumstances and funding-- and unforeseen opportunities--may warrant. Along with that, we’ll also develop measurements to confirm we are effectively and efficiently achieving these priorities.

So much of what we do points to our bright and limitless future, including the very nature of our mission of education and service. We seek to prepare our students for
the careers of today and tomorrow. There is still more work to be done, but we are headed in the right direction.

Soon, we will hopefully announce a new collaborative institutional partnership that will improve our College by enabling us to enhance teaching, research, and service to our region and the world.

With these potential partnerships, our College will grow larger and more impactful, becoming the world-class institution our region and nation needs us to be and that we aspire to be.

Although we still have a lot to accomplish in the coming years, as we head toward our 250th anniversary, our momentum is strong. We have a great strategic plan, our BOUNDLESS campaign is the most successful campaign in our history, and we’ve started or completed construction of signature facilities to benefit our teaching and scholarly work.

What the College is and can be would not be possible without all of you. Because of our work together, we are stronger than we were 20-plus months ago. And this time next year, I hope we will be even stronger. In that, I am confident and committed.

I want to thank you for helping this college, what you do for the students. I talk to parents and hear what they say about their children's experience here at the College of Charleston is really something. I had a chance this weekend to sit with some of them, and they told me about the impact of their children being here, the great academic experience they're having at a great institution.

We are out trying not only to get students but to get additional funds and donations here to the College.

So, Mr. Speaker, [I close] with that: I said I would be brief, and that is brief to me.

Questions / Discussion

Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), thanked the President for not pursuing a new strategic plan and for making diversity a priority. He asked if the President had in mind benchmarks for judging success or failure in diversity initiatives relating to students and faculty.

The President said he looks forward to a report to the Board of Trustees (BOT) of the diversity review committee, and that report may include benchmarks. He stated that his understanding is that some benchmarks were put in place with a prior diversity effort, but not fully adopted. He said that numbers, of course, will help us, and he pointed to encouraging numbers of the Top 10% program: 236 applications, 236 admissions, and 60 confirmations so far for fall enrollment.

We have made strides, he said, with diverse administrative hires. He added that we need to add diverse faculty, staff, and students: "the College of Charleston needs to look more like the society" in which it exists. He said this is "a good measurement for us," and he said that he hopes the diversity review committee will come back with good recommendations for matching resources to our desired results and measurements to help us see how we are doing, in addition to any recommendations they may have for changes in our organization itself to help us achieve our diversity goals.

Irina Gigova, Department of History, followed up on the President’s saying that we will not create a new strategic plan by pointing out that a positive outcome of our shared work on the current plan was to develop a common faculty idea of
institutional identity and mission. In the last couple of years, she suggested, our sense of identity and mission has "lost some focus," notably due to MUSC merger discussions, budget cuts, and expansion. She said that while she would not advocate for another two-year strategic planning process, she did encourage the President to think about initiating discussion with faculty and staff on institutional identity, what we want to accomplish, what students we hope to serve, what programs we want to offer, and "ultimately, what it means to be a liberal arts and sciences institution."

The President said Senator Gigova's suggestion was a good one. He added that he focuses on the liberal arts, wholistic education, and the value of training the whole mind when he speaks to various organizations about the College. He gave an example of the success of an alumnus whom he had lunch with recently and who is involved in a multi-million dollar organic cleansing agent company, a success the former student attributed to his College of Charleston education. The President said that "we need to be mindful of who we are," even as we make adjustments for unanticipated challenges.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, came back to the President's mention of the College's potential expansion east of the Cooper and at the Nexton development and the acquisition of additional properties. He urged more advanced discussion on how we make such decisions. He said that we should not be in a position in which we buy property and facilities and then after the fact have to build programs to make use of the acquisitions, which Senator Krasnoff asserted has happened with Dixie Plantation and, in a way, with the North Campus. He also stipulated that there need to be clear models for how faculty and academic programs are to be expanded in relation to acquired properties and facilities. We need to have plans in advance for who will teach where and why, whether they will be regular faculty or adjuncts, and so forth.

He argued that we need to have advanced planning, as opposed to making acquisitions based on the threat of another institution encroaching on our territory and our opportunities within it. If we respond in the latter fashion, we may be leaving unsettled the question of our own identity and mission. We have a particular model and are not in a general competition against all comers, and we should, he asserted, be expanding only in ways that support and extend our model. He pointed out that the President did not speak about how branch campuses will be evaluated and what will drive our acquisition of them, and he asked for the President's thoughts on these matters.

The President replied that location, need, and demand are key concerns relating to acquiring property and facilities, and he said any acquisition needs to make financial sense, or else it will be, he analogized, a "tick, drawing blood out of the core." He specified that he is concerned about competition for our typical students. He added here that, "without going into detail, a collaborative agreement [in the works] could open quite a few doors."

He also added that if the College is approached with opportunities for expansion and/or acquisitions that fit our needs and conform to our own prior discussions, then he will certainly look into their financial feasibility.

On the matter of Dixie Plantation, he said that the College has submitted a grant application and is trying to make that property "cash positive."

**There were no more questions.**
C. Provost McGee (Presentation Slides: PPT | PDF)

Provost McGee thanked the Senate for its work and acknowledged that there is still a good deal of work left for faculty to complete the semester, and he thanked the faculty for their ongoing efforts. He also reinforced the President’s stated commitment to our goal of becoming a nationally preeminent institution, a "running theme," he said, in our discussions of our institutional identity and aspirations. He expressed gratitude for the President's limited list of strategic plan-reinforcing priorities to work on within our current financial means. He also said he is looking forward to the College’s sesquicentennial celebration.

Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

The Provost reviewed the numerical results for tenure, promotion, and third-year review and thanked the faculty Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review and the faculty Post-Tenure Review Committee for their work. It is often onerous and challenging, he observed, but he added, for his part, it is also inspiring to read of the faculty's achievements in the classroom and out.

Results for the year's cases were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Pos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third-Year Review</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/Promotion to Assoc.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Professor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Sr. Instructor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention as Sr. Instructor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Librarian Tenure/Promotion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He explained that, due to our review cycle shift from five to seven years, there were this year no senior instructor cases.

Policy Development and Implementation

The Provost reminded the Senate of an email he sent to the Senate and to roster faculty two days prior to the meeting in which he attached copies of course numbering and faculty syllabi policies. These policies, now in their eighth versions and long in development with much faculty committee consultation, are nearly ready for the President's endorsement. He offered to address any questions or concerns about the policies in the question and discussion period.

[There were no questions at that time. JMD]

Updating the Faculty/Administration Manual

The Provost noted that we need to produce a final version of the Faculty/Administration Manual for next year much earlier than we usually do because of SACSCOC reaffirmation. And so we will be pushing for an early to mid-June release. He specified some of the changes that will be made in the new F/AM: title updates (to avoid confusion, for instance, with obsolete titles appearing in the current version) and minor editing, an updated adjunct faculty description, by-laws changes (if ratified by the full faculty), and changes in the administrative portion of the document.
Comments on the Senate Agenda

The Provost expressed support for two new program proposals (one undergraduate [Real Estate major] and one graduate [MA in Community Planning, Policy and Design]) to be taken up at the meeting. The proposals, he said, underwent very careful review.

The Provost singled out the Faculty Compensation Committee for their work on both roster and adjunct faculty compensation. He added that Professor Julia Eichelberger's report on the status of adjunct faculty will provide important information on policies and practices regarding our adjunct colleagues. He also expressed gratitude for the Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness's creation of a new undergraduate program review scheme for SACSCOC purposes and for improvement of undergraduate programs.

Questions / Discussion

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked the Provost a question which said he has already asked at a prior meeting and on which received an answer in the negative, but which he said was worth pursuing again after what he described as the President's "largely optimistic" vision of the College's prospects, even facing financial constraints. Senator Krasnoff said that faculty and deans should be able to expect a regular review of requests for faculty lines with the understanding that searches need to be conducted on particular timelines, even if the answer to the question of getting lines is "no."

Senator Krasnoff asked the Provost if he would commit to a timetable for review of all lines and approval of requests to hire by some reasonable date in the fall. He also asked if there can be a regular hiring process next year.

The Provost replied that next year we do not expect a budget reset like this year's, and, he added, it is less likely that we will be in a "holding pattern" on faculty positions. He said that he has discussed many individual faculty positions with deans, and said that, generally speaking, he "is trying to get to 'yes'," but that he also has to consider the financial constraints for next year.

The goal, he said, is to get searches approved and up and running in an optimal timeline, but he observed that it is not preferable to say "no" by a preset date, when it is possible that there could be a "yes' six, eight, or ten weeks down the road, even if only for a visiting position. He agreed that the situation is a very frustrating one for faculty, deans, and Academic Affairs.

There were no further questions.

D. Faculty Compensation Committee [PowerPoint | PDF]
Chair, Cynthia May

Professor May gave a presentation covering three main topics.

1. progress on roster faculty salaries and current status in regard to a 2013 Senate resolution on faculty salaries
2. adjunct salaries
3. issues related to gender and salaries at CofC.

Roster Faculty Salaries

She reviewed the March 2013 resolution of the Faculty Senate that faculty salaries will meet or exceed the median salaries of our CUPA-HR salary peers, institutionally and at each rank and discipline, by September 2018 (slide 2), indicating that we are midway through the cycle set in the resolution.
She listed our CUPA-HR peers (slide 3), a list initially created in 2003 by a faculty committee and updated in 2008, and discussed the selection process, which included several factors (slide 4). She added that one could debate the appropriateness of the peers listed, but that would be a debate for another time.

She reported progress since 2013 (a move from 14th to 10th place among peers on overall mean salary); however, data for the current year was not available at the time of the presentation, and she warned, once the newest data is available, we may find that we are slipping (notably, with growing gaps at both the Associate and Professor ranks) (see slides 6 and 7). Professor May observed that the total cost of closing these gaps would be about $1.4 million.

The committee’s recommendations (slide 8) are that

- the College continue its effort to achieve the goal of meeting mean salaries of our CUPA-HR peers.
- the College target these issues of salary compression at the Associate and Professor levels with raises that are both market- and merit-based.
- the distribution of merit raise monies (that is, funds additional to any state-mandated raises) to schools be proportionate to the size of each school’s salary gap with respect to CUPA-HR peers.

**Adjunct Salaries**

Professor May pointed out that full-time adjunct annual salary (8 courses) is $27,400 with a PhD (slide 9). For comparison, she said that starting salaries for teachers in the Charleston County School District with a PhD and no experience are just over $44,000.

She explained the College’s current policy of differential rates of pay per course for adjuncts depending on how many courses they teach, as opposed to a single rate per course, no matter the number of courses taught (slide 9).

The committee has priced the cost of leveling adjunct salaries at about $547,000 (slide 10).

The committee’s recommendations (slide 11) are that

- the College strive to provide equal pay for equal work by paying adjuncts at the same rate per course, regardless of the number of courses taught per term.
- adjunct faculty be included in any state-mandated raises.

**Gender Differences in Pay**

The committee observed gender pay gaps across all faculty ranks (slide 12). Professor May noted that many factors drive faculty compensation, such as discipline, years in rank, and so forth. She said that because the data needed for a full study have not yet been released, the committee has not yet had a chance to fully study and understand the origin of the gender differences seen.

The committee’s recommendations (slide 13) are that

- the College closely examine salaries for male and female faculty members to understand the factors driving the global differences in mean salaries for men and women.
• the College consider discipline, years in rank, mid-rank raises, prior administrative appointments, and other objective factors that may affect base salaries for a full understanding of salaries across gender at each rank.

Questions / Discussion

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, asked for a clarification of the committee's third recommendation for roster faculty salary: the distribution of merit raise monies (that is, funds additional to any state-mandated raises) to schools be proportionate to the size of each school's salary gap with respect to CUPA-HR peers. He asked if the gap is to be established by comparison of CoF schools to CUPA-HR schools within institutions: would we be comparing our SHSS to CUPA-HR SHSS averages?

Professor May said that one can drill down into the CUPA-HR data to get salary information by discipline. She acknowledged, however, that this can be tricky because, while there are some clear disciplinary comparisons that can be made (Psychology here to Psychology elsewhere), in some cases our peers do not have the exact same departments as we do. Some finesse would be required to set up the school comparisons.

She also observed, however, that not all our departments show roster faculty salary gaps at all ranks. She said that the committee hopes that we address the existing gaps, not adopt a blanket approach. The idea is to look precisely at where we fall short compared to our peers.

Senator Kelly expressed an interest in prioritizing departments that lag far behind the median salary for all professors at a particular rank, regardless of differences in the market with respect to discipline. Professor May replied that there might be some "push-back" on such a plan. Senator Kelly replied that this might help with gender pay gaps, to which Professor May agreed.

She added that this raises the question of how much market should influence our decisions and that a related issue is our hiring practices and the availability in personnel at the application stage.

Senator Kelly asked a second question. What is the nature of the committee's recommendations and what happens next? Is the committee seeking the administration's commitment to accept, reject, or modify the recommendations? He said that he worries that the recommendations will end up in the dubious "file drawer of recommendations."

Professor May asked Provost McGee to reply.

The Provost said the committee's recommendations are read carefully in Randolph Hall and discussed, alongside a consideration of the resources that might be available to address recommendations. In the past, different pools of money have been available to address salary, including, at times, money for state-mandated across-the-board raises. Such mandates, he observed, are beneficial for overall compensation but can also aggravate disparities in pay. In some years, he said, we have been able to create merit and equity pools, which could be used to help smooth out disparities. This has not been the case in recent years, however.

He agreed with the compensation committee that we need to look closely into gender pay equity and said that with the help the Offices of Institutional Research, Planning, and Information Management and Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, he hopes we can make progress.

He added that the College has had success with a change in setting baselines for new Assistant Professors. It is much harder, however, to make progress on salaries
for faculty whose base salaries were set very low many years before we adopted the new practice.

Professor May followed up, saying that there is evidence that the Compensation Committee’s reports have made an impact because there were some targeted efforts following the 2013 resolution to move us closer to our peers.

Janette Finch, Senator - Library, inquired as to the apparent absence of library faculty in the report.

Professor May asked Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker to reply to Senator Finch.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker, noting that she works with and supports the committee, especially with gathering data, said that we have not had raise processes excluding the library faculty, but faculty librarians have not always been included in analyses of the sort conducted by the committee because the CUPA-HR data are not always good for including library faculty salary data in the study. She added that if the new data does not include useful information regarding library faculty salaries, she will seek another source to get it.

Bill Olejniczak, Department of History and former member of the committee, addressed Senator Kelly’s query about what becomes of the committee’s recommendations. He pointed out that the committee looked at the resolution as setting up a kind of assessment. In 2013, he said, the administration committed to the concept of the deadline. The committee’s annual report to the Senate offers a measure of how we are progressing and what remains to be done, in dollar figures. In 2013, he said, the feeling was that adjusting the salary per the resolution was felt to be "very doable." He agreed that financial conditions have changed since then, but he said that as an assessment the report of the committee continues to be relevant and useful.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker expressed appreciation for Professor Olejniczak’s statement and added that a source of difficulty in progressing toward the resolution’s goal is that we’re "aiming at a moving target": the numbers shift in relation to both the economy and the performance of individual institutions in the dataset. Thus the path is not steady or smooth, but jagged, she said. We should keep this in mind if the latest data shows us slipping in position, as Professor May observed it might in her report.

Scott Peeples, Department of English, inquired about the committee's recommendation for adjunct pay. What, he asked, was the discussion that led to prioritizing evening out part-time and full-time adjunct pay per course, as opposed to increases across the board that would benefit full-time and part-time adjuncts alike.

Professor May said that the committee would advocate for an raise across the board, in addition to the leveling, if such raises are available.

She said, in relation to leveling, that “teaching a course is teaching a course,” but she acknowledged that the back story of the current differential pay system involved mandated raises for full time temporary workers. She said that the recommended leveling is to ensure equal pay for equal work. Also, she said, in comparison with other institutions in the area and in the state, while we may rightly feel that adjunct pay is very low, the College’s adjunct pay is not substantially lower than our peers', and, thus, it’s hard to argue that in a comparative sense, our adjuncts are underpaid.
Irina Gigova, Department of History, asked if cost of living is a factor in the committee's deliberations, especially considering the higher cost of living in Charleston compared to where some peer institutions are located.

Professor May replied that the committee did take cost of living into account, noting that Charleston is more expensive than some of the peer's locations and less expensive than others. She said that while she did not have cost of living data with her, that data has not always been helpful in the committee's work, in part because cost of living may be counterbalanced, to some extent, by benefits of living in a place like Charleston. She said that the committee might include cost of living in the future, but the committee's work did not this time around.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, came back to Professor Peeples's query on adjunct salary, stipulating that there are different kinds of adjuncts and the role salary plays can be different in their lives. For instance, he said, for a professional who teaches a single class, it is mainly important that the pay not be insulting. Such a faculty member is not dependent on pay for teaching. But a full-time adjunct, presumably, is relying on her pay to make ends meet. The equal pay for equal work principle, he argued, is abstract and less compelling than a principle of making sure those who are working full time can earn a decent, living wage along with the benefits and protections they need.

Professor May said that it is not necessarily the case that faculty teaching one or two classes are not, therefore, vitally relying on their CofC wages because in many cases adjuncts only find out at the last minute how many courses they will be teaching, perhaps expecting more classes than they get to teach. The committee, she said, found it fundamentally unfair to pay one person more for teaching a course than another in the same rank and level.

Professor May invited Julia Eichelberger to comment, and Professor Eichelberger added that something to keep in mind in this discussion is that for full-time adjuncts who are eligible and choose to enroll, the College makes available health insurance. This was not available before about a year ago, and the College has to pay for it, and it can be seen as an investment on the part of the College and a important financial benefit for full-time adjuncts.

Lisa Covert, Senator - SHSS, came back to the cost of living discussion, pointing out that The Citadel is a peer in our CUPA-HR comparison but has a better rank (8th to our 14th). She suggested we investigate why this is the case.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, replied to Senator Covert by discussing the limitations of CUPA-HR data for some kinds of comparisons. While we can make rank/discipline comparisons (e.g., Assistant Professors in History) across groups, CUPA-HR affords a kind of protection to reporting institutions by not allowing access to any individual institution's specific data. On the other hand, IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Center), which houses data from nationally-required reporting, provides institution-level data, but no individual rank/discipline data.

Stipulating that she was not claiming it as the sole reason for The Citadel's higher ranking, she speculated that if their faculty is distributed differently by discipline, such that higher-paying disciplines have relatively more faculty than are represented in the same disciplines at the College and factoring in the presence of faculty in higher-paying disciplines at The Citadel, like Engineering, which we don't have, these could be factors affecting their higher ranking. We can't tell from CUPA-HR and IPEDS data.
Melissa Thomas, Senator - Adjunct, inquired if there is adjunct faculty representation on the Faculty Compensation Committee, and Professor May confirmed that there is.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked if the CUPA-HR rank by discipline data are available to department chairs.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker replied that they are.

Senator Shaver then asked about the IPEDS data, to which the Associate Provost replied that IPEDS data are public, and so, Academic Affairs could get these to deans and chairs.

Jolanda-Pieta van Arnheim, Library, reported that the CUPA-HR data for librarians is being re-evaluated by the ACRL (Association of College and Research Libraries), and she requested that a librarian be included in Compensation Committee meetings.

She also inquired if the College has considered setting a minimum starting salary for anyone considered faculty. She added that in librarianship, in particular, there are gender disparities. A minimum starting salary that accounts for cost of living might go some way toward addressing gender gaps in pay.

Professor May agreed that a minimum starting salary is something the Compensation Committee might consider.

Provost McGee added that, de facto, a minimum has been instituted on a discipline-by-discipline basis by benchmarking Assistant Professor starting pay by discipline. In a recent case, he said, in which both a woman and a man were hired in the same year, in the same discipline, and at the same rank, and in which the man bargained more aggressively, the College made sure each were paid the same, since a difference in pay (even minimally) would have made no sense. Salary floors are being set case-by-case within disciplines. But a universal floor, given the complexity of the organization, might not work out so well, he said: the floor might be too low or it might interfere with an effort to be responsive to the market.

Professor May said that the data shows that the administration has been sensitive to gender difference and the discipline-specific differences have been addressed to some degree by recent hires.

Kendall Deas, Senator - Adjunct, inquiring on behalf of constituents, asked if the committee discussed differential pay for adjuncts based on degree held, paying more for those with PhD’s, for instance, than those with Masters degrees.

Professor May noted that there is already, though a very small one, a difference in pay for adjuncts holding a terminal degree for those teaching one course. The increase per-course does not continue for those teaching two, three, or four courses.

There were no further questions.

E. Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness
Undergraduate Program Review Process (PDF)

Professor Jones reviewed his committee's charge in relation to the need for undergraduate program review for compliance with SACSCOC reaffirmation (standard 3.4.12), replacing the long-defunct external reviews formerly conducted by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE), the desire to commend exemplary programs and identify programatic innovations that should be replicated elsewhere on campus, and to make suggestions for programatic improvements.
He reminded the Senate that the committee established a 14-point review rubric and articulated where chairs might find the information needed for the review, most of which is readily available through standard sources: departmental mission statements, annual departmental reports and assessment reports, information available in compliance assist, and institutional research.

He noted that the committee has now adjusted the plan to make the review cycle seven, rather than five years. He reported that reviews have begun of four departments (whom he thanked for agreeing to do so in a tight timeframe), the committee is reviewing these departments’ submitted materials (on Sharepoint), and that these reviews should be completed by the end of the semester for use in the fall SACSCOC reaffirmation submission.

Professor Jones pointed out that the review procedure is described in the document circulated with the agenda: "Undergraduate Program Review Process." He noted that the review process is subject to revision and modification if unexpected problems emerge, with the idea of creating a formal policy proposal afterwards based on the experience in the first round of reviews.

Professor Jones specified that November will likely be the time future reviews will be submitted, with notifications going out to programs in the previous year, affording the summer and most of the fall to prepare submissions.

Questions / Discussion

Andrew Shedlock, Senator - Biology, expressed his departmental constituents’ concerns about the potential burden imposed by program reviews, especially for those already heavily engaged in undergraduate program review work in departments. He read into the record one constituent’s expression of such concerns:

"I am not saying that periodic assessment and revision of programs would not be useful, but that the current policy-driven approach does not help. In fact, in my opinion, it incentivizes keeping things as they are, rather than experimenting with new curricula and so forth. It removes flexibility in assessment approaches, [and] adds [a] substantial bureaucratic and reporting load, diminishing resources that could otherwise be focused on teaching and research."

Other departmental constituents said, he reported, that those already heavily engaged in assessment, program chairs, and department chairs may not do some of their existing duties if they become excessive. Granting that the spirit is good and the need to do such reviews has been forced on us by the state, he said there is growing concern and there will need to be very careful, elaborate dialogue before the policy gets written.

Professor Jones, beginning with "you're singing to the choir" and expressing his own frustration with and critical stance toward the College’s assessment efforts, replied that he hopes that the committee’s work will help the College get through the upcoming SACSCOC reaffirmation, but that at some point in the future he would like to see a full discussion of assessment itself, including an analysis of whether it, itself, is effective.

It is important, he added, that program assessment not be a "minimal checklist" that takes a lot of time but doesn’t look very deeply into the program, but also that it not be a very difficult review process. Program review needs to strike the right balance, and the committee puts that consideration in the forefront of its deliberations, Professor Jones said.
Senator Shedlock thanked Professor Jones for his reply and asked a second question gathered from his constituents. With the diversity of the College’s programs, can a single rubric be applied to all programs?

Professor Jones said that these reviews will not be to the depth where a disciplinary-specific approach is needed. The ”gold standard” he said is external program review, which would be a more thorough review that yields deeper information in a disciplinarily specific way. These cost money, however, and that is a serious constraint.

Beatriz Maldonado, Senator - School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs (SLCWA), asked how program review will affect stand-alone programs that are not under another program, like International Studies. Will this end up doubling the work of program assessment already required?

Professor Jones said this is a tough question. The committee has been looking to what sort of documents and information department chairs ordinarily have to provide annually as the set of artifacts program review will use. He said that he cannot speak to the case of interdisciplinary programs like International Studies because he is not familiar with what the program ordinarily has to submit, but he said he hopes that there will not be too much extra work involved for such programs.

Dr. Divya Bhati, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, added here that programs like International Studies should be able to use assessment data to feed back into the program review, but the program review will cover all aspects of the program, including, for instance, faculty information.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked if the program review rubric includes departmental faculty compensation. Professor Jones replied that he couldn’t say off the top of his head and would need to check the rubric. Professor Shaver suggested that it be added if it is not already there.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, asked how ”program” is defined.

Professor Jones said that, since the committee was given a list of 80 or so programs that are to be reviewed, they have not considered a definition.

Senator Kelly asked AVP Bhati the same question, specifically asking if minors are included.

Dr, Bhati replied that there is an institutional definition of programs in Institutional Research, since we must report how many programs we have, how many certificates, how many stand-alone minors, and so on.

Provost McGee noted here that there has been an external review cycle for the graduate program for some time. When CHE’s undergraduate program review was eliminated in 2001, the College had no such reviews, aside from those programs who had a secondary accreditor, such as programs in the School of Business. Were we capable financially of conducting undergraduate reviews as we do graduate program reviews, we would, but we cannot.

The committee, he added, looked at a number of undergraduate review systems at schools similar to ours, and our committee’s scheme very much follows suit. The Provost expressed the desire to develop a review process that avoids extremes of deep-diving into the data and, on the other side, rudimentary box-checking. He added that he expects that there will be continuous improvement in the review process as it develops, and we will continue to weigh the costs of external reviews.
Irina Gigova, Department of History, inquired how item 9 from the rubric ("Produces alumni who use their degree to launch a successful career, to further their education, or to contribute to society") is to be assessed.

Professor Jones replied that departmental annual report information will provide alumni information that might speak to this item.

Dr. Bhati added here that institutional alumni survey can also provide useful data to this end.

There were no further questions or discussion.

F. **Adjunct Policies and Practices**, Julia Eichelberger

- Presentation ([PowerPoint](#) | [PDF](#))
- Achieving Best Practices for Adjunct Faculty at the College of Charleston: Spring 2016 Progress Report and Recommendations (Handout - [PDF](#) | Full Report - [PDF](#))

Professor Eichelberger explained that she served in Academic Affairs as a Faculty Administrative Fellow from 2013-15 (through the fall semester) specifically looking into adjunct faculty practices and policies.

Her report, she said, is based in part on internal research, with information gathered from department chairs and deans and a survey conducted by the Faculty Welfare Committee that she took as a starting point. She also studied other institutions and the work of adjunct and contingent faculty advocacy groups.

While we have made some progress, she said there is more work to be done, and that this work needs to part of our shared governance, advocating for the creation of an elected faculty committee that will keep track of adjunct policies and practices that could consult with Academic Affairs and report to the Senate.

She outlined and discussed 11 best practices for adjunct faculty policy and practices.

1. Adjuncts receive equitable pay and benefits, comparable to pay for comparable work by tenured and tenure-track faculty or other faculty with similar qualifications (slide 3)

   The adjunct faculty position, Professor Eichelberger said, is most comparable to that of Visiting Instructor (VI), although there is a key difference in how they are hired: VIs are always hired through a search, adjuncts, often not.

   She reported some progress in adjusting adjunct salaries, though she said there could be more progress made. The College has accorded health benefits to full time adjunct faculty, which is a significant.

   Noting that many feel that it would be best to convert all adjunct positions into full time positions, Professor Eichelberger offered cost figures for such a conversion (slide 4). The estimated cost to convert a full-time adjunct to a visiting instructor is about $13,000 plus benefits. To make the conversion across the board, she estimated, would require 124 new VI lines. Her rough guess of cost of 124 new VI lines to replace 124 full-time adjuncts was $1.57 million plus benefits.

   She agreed that it is not very likely the College would do this, but neither is it out of the question. In any case, the figures are good to have.

   Professor Eichelberger also pointed out more specifically the changes in adjunct salary since 2013 (slide 5), showing modest improvements, and
adding that the College pays better than many other institutions, though she
granted that "it is a low bar."

She also provided a bit more detail on health insurance for adjuncts who
Teach 10 contact hours or more per semester. She added that this is
something to be proud of: the College of Charleston deliberately defined
adjunct work hours in a way that would allow them to qualify for healthcare
benefits.

2. When hired, adjuncts receive contracts, teaching information and support
comparable to that provided to other faculty. Appointments are made in time
to prepare to teach a course; supervisors clearly stipulate duties,
expectations, and process of evaluation. (slide 7)

Professor Eichelberger pointed out here that national news stories have
attended to the fact that it is not unusual for adjunct faculty to be hired to
teach so late that there is practically no time to prepare for classes before
they begin. Often there is very little support for such faculty. They may not
even have offices.

She said that her evidence is that the College is doing fairly well in this
respect, but that a future committee dedicated to adjunct faculty issues could
survey adjunct faculty to see how they feel in relation to this best practice.
She acknowledged that "just in time" hires are unavoidable at times,
however.

3. Evaluation practices for adjunct faculty are comparable to those used to hire
and evaluate tenure-track faculty: clearly defined criteria, peer review, and
adequate time to seek other employment if not reappointed (slide 8)

There is now, she said, a formal evaluation practice for adjunct faculty at the
College, but this was not the case across the board at the College in the
recent past.

4. Career ladder for adjunct faculty rewards excellent performance and makes
some form of job security possible. (slide 8)

Professor Eichelberger noted that this practice speaks to Senator Deas's
question about the potential of differential pay for adjuncts based on degrees
earned (above). She added that she thinks adjunct faculty ought to be eligible
for raises, just the same as other faculty, to reward performance.

We have titles for adjunct faculty, she noted, and added that there could be
more titles to make distinctions among adjuncts and the kinds of
qualifications they hold, along with different pay grades.

5. Support for adjunct faculty teaching parallels support for tenure-track
faculty: appropriate supplies, equipment, office space, and access to campus
resources, professional development, and mentoring. (slide 9)

She said that the College is doing well in relation to this practice. Many
adjuncts have access to office and equipment equivalent to other faculty, but
a future committee might also keep an eye on this, keeping in mind the limits
departments may have in terms of space and so forth.
Professor Eichelberger also reported that at the College now there are more opportunities for paid professional development than there ever have been.

6. Adjunct faculty are invited to participate in department meetings and may contribute to curriculum design. (slide 9)
   Some departments, she said, are doing this, and this could be monitored by a committee, with recognition and reward for departments who do this well.

7. Representation in faculty governance is available to all adjunct faculty. (slide 10)
   This practice and practices 8 and 9 below, Professor Eichelberger reported, we have achieved.

8. Respect for adjunct faculty is communicated by administration, chairs, and all faculty. (slide 10)
   Professor Eichelberger conceded that, speaking to this practice, she may not be perceiving things in quite the same way that an adjunct faculty member might. An adjunct oversight committee might want to pay attention to this.

9. Support is available for all adjunct faculty’s professional development and scholarly research. (slide 10)
   She said that living up to this best practice is a "big milestone" for the College: adjuncts can now participate in professional development within departments and get paid for doing so (though, admittedly, not much). Programs including Biology, Hispanic Studies, and English piloted professional development programs. She said that there are not many institutions who are doing this.

10. Institution's staffing plan specifies a ratio of regular faculty/adjunct faculty that is desirable for institution to meet its academic goals (slide 11).
   We have not, at the College, achieved this, and Professor Eichelberger said that this could be something an adjunct issues committee could explore in coordination with the Provost and the President. The College, she argued, should have a specified target and when we go above it, we should be concerned about it.

11. Institution collects and publishes data tracking its achievement of best practices. (slide 11)
   Professor Eichelberger said there is strong consensus in the field regarding this practice, though in her role as a Faculty Administrative Fellow, she added, it has been hard to get this information. An adjunct oversight committee could make it an agenda item to seek out and collect such information through regular contact with Academic Affairs: how many adjuncts we have, number of adjunct-taught sections, salary levels, and so forth. The committee could provide a regular report on these and other matters to the Faculty Senate.

   Professor shared a chart with adjunct reliance figures since 2012-13, showing an average of around 30% of student credit hours taught by adjunct faculty (slide 12).

   She said that there is no reason we should be trying to get to 0%, since there
are many situations in which adjunct faculty do fine work for the College, but we could still aim to bring the number down.

Professor Eichelberger advocated for the formation of a standing committee composed of adjunct faculty, those who have supervised adjuncts, other faculty, and the Provost's representative, is designed to monitor adjunct reliance, compensation, and working conditions and which would consult with Provost's office and other College leaders and keep the Senate informed.

**Questions / Discussion**

**Kendall Deas**, Senator - Adjunct, expressing a concern of his constituents, asserted that student course and instructor evaluations are overly relied upon in adjunct faculty evaluations but that research has shown that there can be bias in these evaluations based on faculty's race, ethnicity, and gender. Can we, he asked, move to an evaluation system for adjunct faculty that also accounts for service commitment, participation in professional activities and organizations, working in the community, and other such activities? This could bring adjunct faculty evaluation into closer alignment with evaluation of roster faculty.

Professor Eichelberger replied that student evaluations tell us only part of the story of faculty's teaching and student learning.

Senator Deas added that not some adjuncts may have career aspirations toward becoming tenure-track faculty, and evaluations should include a broader spectrum of activities in order to help them on this path.

Professor Eichelberger said that evaluation processes for adjunct faculty should be just as transparent as they are for other faculty. She suggested that some kind of peer review might be added to the evaluation process, which is not mandated by Academic Affairs for adjunct faculty evaluation, but a department might choose to do. An oversight committee could take notice of departments that integrate transparent peer review practices. And the departments, she added, have an opportunity to further adjunct development for their work here and elsewhere if they choose to pursue full-time work at another institution. She said that in the Department of English, adjunct faculty have had the benefit of an evaluation process that helps those faculty develop a portfolio for use on the job market. She pointed out that professional development programs developed in some of the departments can be seen from links on the Academic Affairs website. She added that many departments also have wonderful collegiality between roster and adjunct faculty and that this is possible in other departments as well.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, added here that Academic Affairs, deans, department chairs believe student ratings are but one piece of evidence providing insight into teaching. Review of teaching should have substance and breadth beyond student course/instructor evaluations, but these do have some value within the larger context. She said that if there are reviews being conducted that do not put student ratings into the proper context, Academic Affairs would like to know. Academic Affairs conducts orientations of new chairs and program directors and this can be a good opportunity to reinforce the role of student course/instructor evaluations.

Addressing the question of evaluation of adjunct faculty on matters other than instruction, the Associate Provost said the Provost has been deliberate in treating adjunct faculty as instructional faculty and not setting expectations beyond that. We provide opportunities for professional development and service without setting those as expectations. It is, she agreed with Senator Deas, appropriate for adjunct faculty to pursue such opportunities for career advancement. She suggested that
evaluation on these activities could made available as an option requested by the
adjunct faculty member, but not an expectation of all adjunct faculty, from whom
these activities are not expected as part of their job description.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked if Professor
Eichelberger had data on adjunct dependence by school.

Professor Eichelberger said that she did not have this information, but it would be useful.

Senator DeLaurell suggested that gathering such data and reporting it could be a function of an adjunct issues committee.

Provost McGee added here that Academic Affairs could provide this information and specified that more useful information might be gathered from the number of sections taught by adjuncts, rather than a head count of adjuncts, within schools.

There were no further questions or discussion.

**G. SACSCOC Reaffirmation Update** ([PowerPoint](#) | [PDF](#))

Divya Bhati, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning

Dr. Bhati reminded the Senate that the College will host a SACSCOC on-site team in spring '17, and she broke down what the College will be evaluated on and the stages for the reaffirmation process (slide 2). The compliance certification report (off-site review) covering the standards listed on the slide will be submitted on September 12, 2016. The QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) will be submitted approximately four to six weeks before the spring on-site review.

The off-site review team consists of four to six colleagues from other institutions. If the team has questions, they will ask the College to respond in what is called a "focused report." The on-site team will review the focused report and use it to structure their work on campus. The chair of the on-site committee is Dr. Suzanne Ozment, formerly of The Citadel.

If the on-site team is happy with their review, then the review will proceed to the next stage, a CNR review, which is the review of the Commission's Board of Trustees, and will be completed in December 2017.

A reaffirmation letter will come to the College in January 2018.

Dr. Bhati shared timelines for both reaffirmation and for the Quality Enhancement Plan, on which vertical arrows mark our current position in the process (slide 3). On the reaffirmation timeline, the next step is the advisory visit, May 24-25, of Dr. John Hardt. On the QEP timeline, the different subcommittees are at work on their respective parts of the proposal, and they will be establishing timelines for implementation in April and May.

She gave updates on the progress of the 16 working groups (slide 4) and listed significant dates (slide 5), including due dates. She asked for any faculty wishing to speak with Dr. John Hardt to contact her and asked that faculty put March 28-30, 2017 on their calendars for the on-site team visit.

There were no questions.
5. **Old Business**
   
   **A. Faculty Curriculum Committee**
   
   1. **Math: Course Renumbering** ([PDF](#))
      
      The Speaker explained that this proposal carries over from the March meeting because, even though it was approved by the necessary committees prior to that meeting, the paperwork was, unintentionally, not provided to Senators with the meeting agenda.
      
      There were no questions.
      
      **The proposal was approved by a unanimous voice vote.**

   2. **Environmental Studies** ([PDF](#))
      
      - Change the name of the minor.
      - Make a corresponding change to the name of ENVT 200, the minor's introductory course.
      
      Gibbs Knots, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, reminded the Senate that the proposal was approved by the committee and discussed in the Senate at the March meeting, discussion postponed until the present meeting (see [March minutes](#), pp. 24-29).
      
      The Speaker recognized Todd LeVasseur, Environmental Studies Program Director, to speak on behalf of the proposal.
      
      Dr. LeVasseur provided a [handout](#) to address objections to the proposal voiced at the prior meeting. He summed up his response thusly:
      
      - the program under its current title no longer reflects what is taught in it and the classes that he said the program hopes to add in the future
      - the national trend over the past decade favors the new name and it might disadvantage students to stick with the current name
      - interdisciplinary faculty here involved in steering the program, after research, support the proposal
      - the name change covers one minor and its key course and will not impede developing other classes or programs at undergraduate and graduate levels in sustainability
      
      **There were no questions or discussion.**
      
      **The proposal was approved by a unanimous voice vote.**

   3. **BPS Healthcare** ([PDF](#))
      
      - Create three new courses on healthcare
      - Create a healthcare minor within BPS.
      
      **See below**

   4. **BPS Program Changes** ([PDF](#))
      
      - Add PRST 220 and PRST 230 as requirements in BPS.
      - Terminate the BPS Information Systems concentration.
      - Make numerous changes to the course lists for the other concentrations.
      
      **See below**
5. **BPS Project Management** *(PDF)*
   - Create six new courses on project management.
   - Create a new project management concentration within BPS

Professor Knotts introduced the three proposals above, noting that all the above proposals have now been vetted by the Faculty Budget Committee and have returned to the Senate for consideration (see *March minutes*, pp. 23-24).

**Questions / Discussion**

**The Speaker** asked Julia Eichelberger, Chair - Faculty Budget Committee, to give her committee's opinion on the proposals.

She said that the committee supports all three proposals. She specified that the committee looked at the elimination of the BPS concentration in Information Systems in tandem with the creation of a Project Management concentration. The former did not have enough student interest, whereas the latter showed promise in that regard. The concentration, she added, could serve both our traditional students, current BPS students, and potential new students.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, asked for an explanation of project management: what it is, who teaches it, what their training is, and what disciplines/departments at the College are likely to provide faculty.

Dean Gibbison replied to the last part of Senator Krasnoff’s query first, noting, as an example, that Marvin Gonzalez from the School of Business will most likely be teaching a Quality Control course in the Project Management concentration. The discipline of Project Management, Dean Gibbison explained, has emerged in the past 25 years as a popular discipline initially associated with Engineering as an extension of Engineering into management. It tends to draw from Management and Engineering programs. The field is now very broad and includes construction (organizing the building of structures) and IT (launching IT initiatives with an eye toward maintaining quality, staying on task, communicating with clients along the way, staying on budget, and so forth). The three core aspects of Project Management, he said, are maintaining quality control, developing and working with timelines, and communication with teams and stakeholders.

He added that we have faculty members who have worked in Project Management or have training that is appropriate. No other departments at the College, he reported, have seemed interested in developing a Project Management program of any sort, a fact he has taken care to verify, he added.

Dean Gibbison noted that good adjunct faculty for the program are also fairly easy to come by, as well.

Senator Krasnoff noted that The Citadel has an MA in Project Management that appears to be tied to Engineering. Should we worry, he asked, about students lacking a technical background (Engineering, IT, for instance)?

Dean Gibbison said "not at all." While it is a discipline that can be tied to technical fields, it does not have to be. A more generic version might
actually be better and have a broader appeal. In the community, he added, some have already suggested particular specializations, such as healthcare project management. Yet, he asserted, the broader version gives graduates more open prospects.

**Marvin Gonzalez**, Senator - Supply Chain and Information Management, said that any project needs to be solvent and achieve its objectives. Project Management is the means of satisfying such needs. Project managers, in any business, have proficiency in the use of financial, quality control, and statistical tools.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked if we have a data-established understanding of the demand for the concentration.

Dean Gibbison replied that they looked at job openings in the area and state-wide, investigated data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics for skill sets, and he reported that he used a subscription-based tool called Earning Glass to drill down into job postings for desired skillsets.

Senator DeLaurell said that she asked the question since other departments have passed on the opportunity, which she said might suggest that they know of some negative in connection with offering such a program, perhaps a lack of demand. She asked Dean Gibbison why the other departments passed.

Dean Gibbison replied that he cannot speak for the other departments' decisions.

**There were no further questions or discussion.**

**The Speaker asked for a vote on all three proposals together and, without objection, called for a vote.**

**The proposals passed by unanimous voice vote.**

B. **Motion for a Faculty Representative in the Budget Process** *(PDF)*

Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences

The Speaker asked for unanimous consent to postpone consideration of the motion until the next session of the April meeting (April 12) on account of the motion's author, Bill Olejniczak, Department of History and author of the motion, having to leave. With no objection discussion of the motion was postponed.

[see below]
C. **Motion to Increase the Number of Years Faculty May Serve on Committees** *(PDF)*

Dan Greenberg, Senator - Psychology

---

**MOTION**

Current Policy:

Members of committees (including alternates) serve for a term of one year and may be re-elected twice and then may serve again on the committee only after a lapse of three years.

Proposed Change:

Members of committees (including alternates) serve for a term of one year and may be re-elected up to four times and then may serve again on the committee only after a lapse of three years.

---

**Senator Greenberg** said that in our current practice, faculty may serve up to three years on a committee before having to rotate off, which leads to a significant amount of churn in committee membership. Committees may see a majority of members replaced annually or even a complete replacement. While adding new faculty can be good, too much turnover impedes faculty governance by diminishing institutional memory. This is a particular problem in heavy-workload committees like the Curriculum Committee and T&P.

A consequence of frequent turnover in committees, he asserted, is that the institutional memory then tends to reside with the administration, who serve longer, and while this is not necessarily a bad thing, it seems desirable to have institutional memory reside on the faculty side, too.

It also takes time to build expertise in committees, and this is a real problem for committee leadership because the three year limit often means that by the time some expertise has been developed, it is time to cycle off.

The proposal allows service beyond three years but it does no require it. There might be other solutions to the problems described, he said, but this fix is fairly simple and does not complicate the work of the Nominations and Elections committee. He added that he has discussed the motion with the current Nominations and Elections Committee chair, who is favorably disposed toward it.

**Questions / Discussion**

The Speaker explained that the motion could be discussed at the present meeting but cannot be voted on, as it will be sent to the Committee on the By-
Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual for further consideration, per the by-laws.

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, asked the Speaker if the earliest the motion could be voted on by the Senate would be the first meeting of next academic year (as opposed to the second session of the present meeting). The Speaker affirmed this, and said that any discussion of the motion will become part of the record and help inform the committee's work on it.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, said he was in favor of the motion and thought it would begin to address one difficulty for faculty governance. But he inquired if Senator Greenberg had considered the bolder step of four-year appointments to committees (as opposed to re-election annually).

Senator Greenberg said that he discussed this very idea with Nominations and Elections when he served on the Curriculum Committee, and the feedback was that such a plan would introduce logistical difficulties. He added, nonetheless, that he thinks minimum terms would be a good thing, starting with at least two years, and stipulating in tenure and promotion guidelines that if service couldn't be completed, a faculty member could leave before the term's expiration.

He added that other modifications to faculty committee service could be considered as well, such as broader representation across schools. Setting the expectation of service, he asserted, would allow us to get representation from across schools and, hopefully, good representation. These modifications are probably not simple in execution, he said, but we should keep considering them.

The present motion, however, is simple to do, he said.

Andrew Shedlock, Senator - Biology, asked if it is worth our considering pre- and post-tenure realities for committee service. There is some incentive, he said, for junior faculty to serve on two committees to expand experience, but if a faculty member is on one committee for most of her pre-tenure time at the College, this might not be preferable.

Senator Greenberg agreed that this could be a problem but pointed out that the motion merely opens the possibility for longer service, and does not require it. He said that the Tenure and Promotion Committee will want to consider how much and what type of service they would like to see from junior faculty. In his own department, he said, typically junior faculty are not expected before third-year review to serve on college-level committees. He added that it would be nice to see more leadership from senior, tenured faculty.

Jason Vance, Senator - SHSS, on institutional memory, said that a serious problem emerges when an entire committee rotates off at once. He asked if Nominations and Elections considered the probability of this problem
occurring in the present system. Would the motion do anything to fix that particular problem?

Senator Greenberg replied that he has not surveyed faculty for how many would like to serve four or five years on T&P or Curriculum. In fact, it may not be very many people. But he said that on Curriculum, he lost all committee members, save one, in one year. Allowing for longer service, he expressed hope, would let at least some members stay longer, while still having a cap to prevent "curmudgeons" from serving beyond an appropriate time.

Irina Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, expressed support for the motion precisely for its permissive nature and that it does not require a certain term of service. This accords flexibility to faculty who may need to come out of committee service for any number of reasons (sabbaticals and so forth). She would not support an attempt, she said, to set a term of four years.

Senator Greenberg agreed that such a motion would require a much longer discussion, but he said that he would want some kind of loophole in any motion that sought to set a term length. After a brief back and forth with Senator Anguelova on this matter, Senator Greenberg said that term lengths are not under consideration at present, and especially given the lateness of the hour, it is a discussion for another time.

The Provost said he supports the motion: it's permissive and gives more options for longevity of service. Some committees, he observed, do "vastly more complex work" than others, and there is a real advantage to having those who wish to serve longer be allowed to do so. He added that Nominations and Elections has shown good judgment over the years in creating turnover in some cases where colleagues may have wanted to continue serving. The motion gives Nominations and Elections an additional tool, and we should trust in their judgment. He added that, after discussion on the motion has concluded, he would like the Speaker to come back to him so that he could offer a motion to recess.

Lynne Ford, Associate Provost, offered the suggestion that, should the Senate consider terms in a future discussion, it would be advisable to consider a rotation of the bodies of committees by thirds, so that there is continuity.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, said that this is his sense of what Nominations and Elections tries to do informally: they don't want to see an entire committee rotate out at once. He added that we need to be realistic: some committees are such that people are unlikely to want to stay for four or five years, such as Curriculum and T&P.

He argued we should also take up question from other point of view: some faculty may stay on committees too long. Five years, Senator Krasnoff said, is a long time. Additionally, he said, there are some faculty who should probably not serve as long as they have as committee chairs. Our democratic oversight of committees, he added, is very weak. What if someone who is not a good
committee member wants to stay?: the motion might set up a presumption that such an individual can and will stay to the new limit.

Senator Greenberg replied that increasing the limit to five years would also allow others to serve serve longer, making it easier to elbow out people who have served too long. Any committee’s purview includes trying to manage their own affairs in relation to membership and positions of leadership. Perhaps committee chairs, he suggested, could communicate their wishes to Nominations and Elections in regard to poor committee colleagues.

There was no further discussion.

The Provost moved that the Senate recess until the scheduled meeting on April 17, the motion was seconded, and it carried with a unanimous voice vote.

The Senate recessed at 7:40 PM.

-----

The meeting continued on 12 April, coming to order at 5:05 PM.

The Speaker made a few brief remarks to open the meeting.

He encouraged Senators to, in turn, encourage faculty colleagues to, in turn again, encourage our first year and senior students to complete the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), a survey that provides incoming and outgoing student data on engagement, which is very useful to the College. The survey will remain open through the end of April. Students in the target group will find links directly to the survey in My Charleston.

The Speaker reported that a change has occurred in the nature and schedule of the upcoming Board of Trustees meetings (Thursday 4/21 and Friday 4/22). While typically Thursday is a committee meeting day, some committees will not meet at all but will just be submitting reports at the full board meeting on Friday. The Budget and Academic Affairs Committees will meet for shorter times and on a different schedule. The Speaker gave that schedule and encouraged faculty to attend.

Thursday afternoon will be occupied by half-hour presentations to the full Board of Trustees by all deans. They will speak on the current state of their schools, challenges, and opportunities. The Speaker said he will speak as well. The presentations were scheduled to begin at noon and last through 6 PM. The presentations are open to the public, and the Speaker encouraged attendance.

Finally the Speaker encouraged Senators to, in turn, encourage all faculty to attend the "Celebration of the Faculty" event scheduled for Friday, April 22, 3-5PM. This year, the Speaker said, his office is co-sponsoring the event and, in addition to recognizing faculty award winners, it will feature recognition of many who have contributed greatly to the work of shared governance.

-----

The business portion of the meeting continued at this point.
Old Business, Item B

**Motion for a Faculty Representative in the Budget Process** *(PDF)*
Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences

Be it so moved that the Faculty Senate supports the following proposal:

- The Faculty Speaker (or Speaker’s designee) will be inserted into the annual budgetary process. The Speaker (or Speaker’s designee) will have access to all information required to participate meaningfully in the budgetary process.

- As a participant in the annual budgetary process, the task of the Faculty Speaker will be to consider and make recommendations for budgetary decisions directly affecting the academic affairs of the College.

- The Faculty Speaker will participate in the annual budgetary process once in the fall semester (considering and recommending) and once in the spring semester (review).

- As a participant in the annual budget process, the Faculty Speaker will submit a written report to the Faculty Budget Committee on the progress of the annual budgetary process once in the fall semester and once in the spring semester.

---

**Senator Kelly** stated that he is making the motion on behalf of Bill Olejniczak, Department of History. He added to the published rationale for the motion that the Senate is charged by-laws, which are approved by the Board of Trustees, to advise the President on the entire college's budget. The motion helps us do that in a more meaningful way, he said.

The Speaker asked Professor Olejniczak to speak on the motion.

Professor Olejniczak thanked Senator Kelly. The proposal, he explained, has three main parts: to insert the Faculty Speaker into the annual College budgetary process at the senior leadership level, to allow the Speaker to participate in the process at that level once in the fall and once in the spring semesters, and to require the Speaker to submit a report in the fall and in the spring to the Faculty Budget Committee.

There are no specific calendar dates, he said, to allow flexibility. The point of the motion is not to set fixed dates but to have the Speaker present at major decision points in the year.

The motion is needed, Professor Olejniczak argued, because a direct faculty voice is needed at the table as we move through difficult fiscal times.
As it concerns the faculty, the current process allows for intermittent updates to the faculty by the Provost and the President. This communication is not formalized and the time at which it occurs can vary from one year to the next. Faculty committees and the Senate are currently notified of budgetary decisions affecting the faculty after the fact. The faculty committees serve as "information receiving bodies, rather than as participating bodies." In the current process, the Provost serves as Chief Academic Officer and has a very wide range of responsibilities and constituents. The deans in the current process represent the interests of their schools.

The motion, Professor Olejniczak stated, would make faculty representation formalized, regular, and certain. The Speaker, he argued, is the best person to represent the faculty because the Speaker is elected by the entire faculty, has key responsibilities, performs important functions, and represents the faculty at important institutional meetings throughout the year, and is well-positioned to provide a faculty perspective that is multi-year and "big picture" in a way that can provide insight. The Speaker also offers a direct channel of communication back and forth between faculty and administrators, all the more important in a time, he said, that the data show we have grown at the administrative level and become more layered.

The motion will increase transparency and mutual trust, he asserted, especially at a time at which we are being asked to make tough academic decisions and sacrifices. At better budgetary times, too, direct faculty representation will be essential to a good budgetary process.

He added that the motion would charge the Speaker only with making recommendations concerning the Academic Affairs budget.

The proposal is offered, he said, in the friendly, collaborative spirit of shared governance. Professor Olejniczak thanked the Senate for considering it.

The Speaker called for a second to the motion and received one.

Questions / Discussion

Alex Kasman, Senator - SSM, asked the Speaker if he felt that he would have time, given his other responsibilities, to fulfill the obligations the motion adds and asked if the Speaker is already involved in the budgetary process in some way without the motion.

The Speaker, noting that he cannot advocate one way or the other, replied in what he characterized as a factual way. While it's not entirely clear right now how many meetings the motion would require the Speaker to participate in, he thought, yes, the Speaker could add the responsibility.
The Speaker pointed out that the Speaker attends Board of Trustees meetings regarding the budget, but at that point, things are largely already decided (though the Board could make changes). The Speaker does not, however, play any direct role in the processes Provost McGee has instituted for the Academic Affairs budget development. The Speaker regularly meets with the Provost and President, but conversations about the budget are not formalized.

The Speaker called on Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS and former Speaker of the Faculty, for his opinion.

Senator Kelly said that, while the Speaker has ready access to the President and Provost, the Speaker has not been privy to the budgetary decision making process. He added that he learned more about the budgetary process from the Budget Committee and its chair, Julia Eichelberger over the past two years, than he knew as Speaker.

Senator Kelly added that he very much supports the motion. While he said he might change a couple items, he said he will not bring those up, preferring not to bog down the process in favor of passing the resolution for its spirit, which will be clear to the President. It is vitally important, he said, that when budget decisions are made the faculty have a representative present, and it benefits not only the faculty, but the President, too, as the faculty now claim a greater responsibility in making difficult decisions and cannot simply complain about decisions after the fact. He added that there is no "hidden villain" that will be exposed as a result of the Speaker being involved in the process, but it will make the process more open and "improve the health of our shared governance," though it will take some time for this effect to set in.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, said that he supports the motion, and added, in reply to Senator Kasman's question, that the motion's provision for the Speaker to appoint a designee to attend meetings would help address any concerns of time/scheduling.

Senator Krasnoff also asked if we know enough or if we feel we know enough about the budget process to be able to be able to pinpoint the meetings in which we want the Speaker to participate. There is a danger that the Speaker might participate in meetings that are not exactly the "right" ones, which would violate the spirit of the motion. Senator Krasnoff noted that many in the room might be able to address this question.

The Speaker recognized Budget Committee Chair Eichelberger, who explained that the committee made a request of the President very similar to the motion not long ago, which he declined. The meetings that she said
would be significant are the meetings at which the budget is being drafted. While the Board can revise the budget in their May and June meetings, the budget has largely been built prior to that point and this may have happened in multiple meetings of the senior leadership. We have never had a faculty member present for any of those meetings with senior leadership at which they are looking at "the whole chessboard" and making decisions about allocations.

The Budget Committee last year was informed after those meetings that Academic Affairs's budgetary plans were to be significantly curtailed. Those decisions were made without a faculty representative present, and such a representative might have been able to at least understand and help communicate the context for the cuts, she argued.

The time of concern is when the budget is being put together. She added that the committee recently learned that in the late summer and fall that a list is composed for legislative special appropriations requests. Here, too, she said faculty representation could come into play.

Professor Olejniczak thanked Senator Eichelberger for her comments and observed that the Budget Committee's work has mapped out for us a "12-month world" in regard to the budget. He agreed that we need to identify and target "decision points" in the process. The motion, he observed, stipulates "one in the fall and once in the spring," and this might be revised as needed, he said.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, asked Senator Eichelberger if the President gave a rationale for rejecting the Budget Committee's proposal to have the Speaker present in senior leadership budget discussions. She added that if the President has a rationale that he still holds, the motion may not be acceptable to him. Also, would it be binding?

The Speaker replied that the Senate can vote whatever its will is. The part of the Faculty/Administration Manual we control, he added, is the by-laws, which already suggest we have a role. We could move that this motion go to the Committee on By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual for conversion into a by-laws amendment, but our by-laws, he pointed out, must be approved by the Board of Trustees.

The Senate, alternatively, can vote the motion up or down, he said, to express a will to the President. It will not bind him, however.

Senator Anguelova asked again about the President's rationale.

Senator Eichelberger reported that his rationale was that he already has in the Provost a representative of the faculty. He also pointed out, she said, that the Speaker attends the meetings of the Board of Trustees (these are
already, she added, public meetings). There is, according to the President, sufficient faculty representation. The committee disagreed, she said. A vote for this proposal by the Senate would affirm the committee's viewpoint.

Senator Eichelberger added that the motion asks for a faculty representative to be there as a witness and a voice with a healthy perspective. She said that it is not that the Provost lacks a faculty perspective but that he has a very different role as Provost, as opposed to an elected faculty representative.

Senator Anguelova said she agrees with the spirit of the motion, but she said that one could argue, as does the President, that the Speaker already in his current role has a place in the process and participates meaningfully.

Senator Kelly countered that attending Board of Trustees Budget Committee meetings is not meaningful.

Senator Anguelova returned that in the President's estimation it is.

Senator Kelly replied that the Speaker has no role in those meetings and is never invited to offer opinions, besides which, the decisions are already made at that point. The motion would insert the Speaker into the prior process, for instance, she added, when senior leadership discusses tuition increases. The key, he said, is "meaningfully," granting that the word is elastic. The intent of the Senate would be clear with the passage of the motion, he argued.

Senator Anguelova suggested that the motion could specifically mention the "decision making process," since "meaningful" is subject to interpretation.

Senator Eichelberger added here, having just consulted a memo from the President to the Budget Committee, that the President mentioned a number of meetings of the senior leadership, but, she said, the committee did not imagine that a faculty representative would attend all such meetings, only those discussions in which decisions get made, where the Provost would be in attendance. It's a hard position, she said, for the Provost, who has to come back and report to the faculty what transpired at these meetings: it would be more efficient for a faculty representative to serve that function.

Senator Eichelberger suggested that Senator Anguelova could move to modify the language of the motion to address her concerns and clarify, and she offered a few suggestions.

The Speaker asked if Senator Eichelberger was actually making a motion, to which she relied, "sure."

The motion to amend was as follows:
Strike the bullet reading

- The Faculty Speaker will participate in the annual budgetary process once in the fall semester (considering and recommending) and once in the spring semester (review).

and replace it with

- The Faculty Speaker will attend executive team meetings regarding the budget in the fall semester (considering and recommending) and in the spring semester (review).

The motion was seconded.

Discussion of Senator Eichelberger's motion to amend began with a request by Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, to offer a friendly amendment to Senator Eichelberger's, which she accepted.

The revised language (striking two occurrences of "once") would now read:

- The Faculty Speaker will attend executive team meetings regarding the budget in the fall semester (considering and recommending) and in the spring semester (review).

Senator Krasnoff pointed out that "once" implies it is satisfactory to only have the Speaker at one meeting each semester, whereas striking this adds flexibility.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, recommended a swift vote of the motion to amend followed by a swift vote of the motion at large. "We're not writing law here. We're communicating to the President our desire." The intent will be clear, and the Speaker can explain to the President and the Board anything that needs explanation. In the meantime, there is a heavy agenda for the night still remaining, he observed.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, called the question on the motion to amend, it was seconded, and it passed by a unanimous voice vote.

The motion to amend the motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

Discussion now turned to the main motion.

An unidentified Senator called the question on the motion, it was seconded, and it passed.

The motion (as amended) passed by a unanimous voice vote.

The approved version reads as follows:
Be it so moved that the Faculty Senate supports the following proposal:

- The Faculty Speaker (or Speaker’s designee) will be inserted into the annual budgetary process. The Speaker (or Speaker’s designee) will have access to all information required to participate meaningfully in the budgetary process.
- As a participant in the annual budgetary process, the task of the Faculty Speaker will be to consider and make recommendations for budgetary decisions directly affecting the academic affairs of the College.
- The Faculty Speaker will attend executive team meetings regarding the budget in the fall semester (considering and recommending) and in the spring semester (review).
- As a participant in the annual budget process, the Faculty Speaker will submit a written report to the Faculty Budget Committee on the progress of the annual budgetary process once in the fall semester and once in the spring semester.

6. New Business

A. Elections to Standing Senate Committees (Slates - PDF)
Committee on Nominations and Elections - Chair, Jen Kopfman

The committee, represented by Tom Kunkel, presented slates for slates for the three standing Senate committees: Academic Planning, Budget, and By-Laws and FAM. The Speaker asked for any additional nominations from the floor.

Seeing none and with no discussion offered, the Speaker took a vote.

The slates as published were accepted by unanimous voice vote.

The Speaker reminded the Senate at this point that at the March meeting he said that, in collaboration with the Provost, he would create ad hoc committee that would look at our grievance and hearing processes. After the March meeting, the Committee on Nominations and Elections discovered in the by-laws that ad hoc committees conducting Senate business and so does the Senate.

The Speaker offered committee slates for both ad hoc committees, on which he consulted with Nominations and Elections and the Provost. He said that he or the Provost’s office has communicated with the individuals listed. Those marked "TBD" on the lists are faculty who have been contacted but cannot yet give an answer.

Grievance

Dr. Amy Rogers, 2013-2014 & 2014-2015, Grievance Committee Chair
Dr. Jean Everett, 2012-2013, Grievance Committee Chair
Dr. Anthony Leclerc, 2006-2007, Grievance Committee Member
Dr. Lynn Cherry, former Speaker of the Faculty
TBD
Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker
Laura Penny, 2016-17 FAM/By-laws member

---

**Hearing**

Dr. John Huddlestun, 2014-2015, Hearing Committee Chair
Dr. Claire Curtis, 2013-2014, Hearing Committee Chair
TBD
Dr. Roger Daniels, 2010-2011, Hearing Committee Chair
Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker
Dr. Conrad Festa, Professor Emeritus, Former Provost
Angela Mulholland, General Council, non-voting ex officio

---

**The Speaker asked and received unanimous consent for approval of the slates as presented and, also, for permission to continue working with the Nominations and Elections committee to fill any remaining open slots.**

Finally, the Speaker asked the Senate for nominations to the Nominations and Elections Committee for next year. He added that he will also be seeking nominations from the campus at large.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - SSM, nominated the following:

- Richard Nunan, Philosophy
- Terry Bowers, English
- Jared Seay, Library
- Jennifer Kopfman, Communication
- Tom Kunkle, Mathematics

The Speaker noted that these individuals are all currently members of the committee (a body of seven) and have said they will serve again. If there were more nominations (from the floor or campus at large) than seven, he said, there will be an election.

The Speaker called for further nominations and there were none. He said he would solicit nominations from the campus at large and inform the faculty of the results and if there is to be an election.

---

**B. General Education Committee**
**Foreign Language Alternative Course Certification Proposals**
Shawn Morrison

Professor Morrison presented the proposals, expressing thanks to the faculty and departments who submitted the numerous proposals for approval as foreign language alternatives. The committee matched syllabus descriptions to program SLOs (Student Learning Outcomes) and have provided to the Senate the syllabi and materials they approved.
The Speaker asked for a clarification of the categories: do the students have to take one course from all or categories or is it a combination. Profess Morrison explained that students have to take one course from category one, one from category two, and two from category three.

She added that the structure of the program is, in this way, essentially the same as the current system, but there is now a commitment to program SLOs for each course a planned assessment.

Professor Morrison requested that the proposals be voted on in groups. The Speaker explained that if a Senator wishes to consider a single item separately, this can be done.

See below the list of proposals for discussion and actions taken.

1. Category 1: The Role of Language in Culture (PDF)
   a. ANTH 205: Language and Culture
   b. ENGL 309: English Language: Grammar and History
   c. ENGL 312: History of the English Language
   d. LING 101: Introduction to Language
2. Category 2: Global and Cultural Awareness (PDF)
   a. ANTH 201: Cultural Anthropology
   b. ARTH 101: History of Art: Prehistoric through Medieval
   c. ARTH 102: History of Western Art: Renaissance to Contemporary
   d. ARTH 105: Introduction to Architecture
   e. ENGL 233: Survey of Twentieth-Century Non-Western Masterpieces
   f. ENGL 234: Survey of Third World Masterpieces
   g. ENGL 358: Colonial and Postcolonial British Literature
   h. HIST 103: World History to 1500
   i. HIST 104: World History since 1500
   j. HIST 230: Ancient Egypt & Mesopotamia
   k. HIST 250: Special Topics in Comparative/Transnational History
   l. HIST 291: Disease, Medicine, & History
   m. HIST 350: Special Topics in Comparative/Transnational History
   n. HIST 359: Modern Jewish History: French Revolution to the Present
   o. HIST 366: Comparative Slavery in the Americas
   p. liAS 201: Introduction to Irish and Irish American Studies
   q. POLI 103: World Politics
   r. POLI 104: World Regional Geography
   s. POLI 240: Introduction to Comparative Politics
   t. POLI 260: International Relations Theory
   u. POLI 265: International Political Economy
   v. RELS 235: Introduction to Islam
3. Category 3: Regions of the World
   a. Africa (PDF)
      1. AFST 101: Introduction to Africa
      2. ARTH 210: African Art
      3. ENGL 352: Major African Authors
4. ENGL 353: African Women Writers  
5. HIST 272: Pre-Colonial Africa  
6. HIST 273: History of Modern Africa  
7. POLI 342: Politics of Africa  

**b. Asia** (PDF)  
1. ARTH 103: History of Asian Art  
2. ARTH 241: History of the Art of India  
3. ARTH 242: History of the Art of China  
4. ARTH 243: History of the Art of Japan  
5. ASST 101: Introduction to Asian Studies  
6. CHST 340: Special Topics in Chinese Studies  
7. LTCH 250: Chinese Literature in Translation  
8. LTJP 250: Japanese Literature in Translation  
9. LTPJ 350: Japanese Literature in Translation  
10. HIST 282: History of China to 1800  
11. HIST 283: History of Modern China  
12. HIST 286: Japan to 1800  
13. HIST 287: History of Modern Japan  
14. PHIL 234: Eastern Philosophy  
15. POLI 343: Politics of East Asia  
16. POLI 345: Politics of China  
17. RELS 205: Sacred Texts of the East  
18. RELS 240: The Buddhist Tradition  
19. RELS 245: Religions of India  
20. RELS 248: Religious Traditions of China and Japan  

**c. Europe** (PDF)  
1. ARTH 214: Art of Ancient Greece  
2. ARTH 215: Art of Ancient Rome  
3. ARTH 277: History of Renaissance Art  
4. ARTH 278: Renaissance and Baroque Architecture  
5. ARTH 280: Baroque Art  
6. ARTH 303: Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art  
7. ARTH 370: Early Italian Renaissance Art  
8. ARTH 375: Italian High/ Late Renaissance Art  
9. CLAS 101: Ancient Greek Civilization  
10. CLAS 102: Roman Civilization  
11. CLAS 103: Classical Mythology  
12. CLAS 105: History of the Classical World  
13. CLAS 223: Aegean Prehistory  
14. CLAS 225. The Archaeology of Athens  
15. CLAS 226: The Archaeology of Rome  
16. CLAS 242: Images of Women in Classical Antiquity  
17. CLAS 253: Epic
18. CLAS 254: Tragedy
19. CLAS 255: Comedy (Humor in Rome and Greece)
20. CLAS 256: Ancient Satire
21. HIST 231: Ancient Greece
22. HIST 232: Ancient Rome
23. HIST 234: Early Medieval Europe
24. HIST 235: High Middle Ages
25. HIST 241: Special Topics in Modern European History
26. HIST 242: History of Modern France
27. HIST 244: Modern Germany
28. HIST 247: Empire, Nation, Class in Eastern Europe
29. HIST 252: Women in Europe
30. HIST 336: Renaissance Europe
31. HIST 337: Age of Reformation
32. HIST 341: Age of Enlightenment & Revolution
33. HIST 343: Europe since 1939
34. HIST 344: Modern European Cultural History
35. HIST 345: German Cultural History
36. HIST 346: History of the Soviet Union
37. HIST 347: Special Topics in Modern European History
38. HIST 357: Victorian Britain
39. JWST 230: The Holocaust
40. JWST 330: Representations of the Holocaust
41. LTGR 250: Comedy in Contemporary German Culture
42. LTGR 270: Recent German Cinema
43. LTIT 250: Italian Literature in Translation
44. LTIT 270: Introduction to Italian Cinema
45. LTIT 350: Italian Literature in Translation
46. LTIT 370: Studies in Italian Cinema
47. LTRS 110: Russian Folktales in Translation
48. LTRS 120: A Window into Russia: The Major People, Events and Influences of Russia's Cultural History
49. LTRS 210: Nineteenth Century Russian Literature
50. LTRS 220: Twentieth Century Russian Literature
51. LTRS 270: Studies in Russian Film
52. PHIL 201: History of Ancient Philosophy
53. PHIL 202: History of Modern Philosophy
54. PHIL 205: Existentialism
55. PHIL 252: Topics in Continental Philosophy
56. POLI 352: Geographies and Politics of the European Union

d. Latin America (PDF)
   1. ANTH 328: Aztecs, Mayas, and Their Ancestors
   2. HIST 262: Colonial Latin America
Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, raised a general concern, first apologizing for not attending the General Education committee meeting at which the courses were discussed, the date and time of which he didn't know. He called attention to category two and asked the Faculty Secretariat to project the PDF file, specifically the defining characteristics statement on the course form (page 2 of the file):

"The primary focus of these courses is to introduce students to foundations, theories, and models (as used by the discipline) to understand culture around the world."

Senator Krasnoff said that he interpreted this line as bringing attention to "foundations, theories, and models," but reviewing the committee's approved course list, noted that it includes courses that are introductory or methodological in focus but it also includes specific topics, such as a "Modern Jewish History" and "Comparative Slavery in the Americas," which are not, he argued, methodological in focus. He questioned these courses' inclusion on the list.

He said that he proceeded with submitting Jewish Studies proposals with the thought that category two excluded topically-focused courses. He said, for instance, that he submitted a Jewish Studies course, JWST 215, Modern Jewish History
(essentially the same, he asserted, as the HIST course in Modern Jewish History that was approved in category two), not for this category but for category three (against the arguments of faculty who thought it would fit in category two). This course was rejected in category three, but Senator Krasnoff argued, it would fit category two, if more topically-focused courses are now allowed in that category.

He asked that we either exclude topical classes in category two or that JWST 210 and 215, surveys of Jewish History, be added to the category two foreign language alternatives. On the latter, he argued that if HIST 359 (Modern Jewish History: French Revolution to the Present) is to count in the list, so should JWST 210 and 215.

Lisa Covert, Senator - SHSS and General Education Committee member, said that category two was the category with which the committee had the most problems. At first, she said, the committee went with a narrow definition, but several committee members and departments made a case for a slightly broader interpretation of "foundations, theories, and models." Most of the courses were originally social science courses, and the committee adopted a broader interpretation of use of methodologies based on discipline and what the syllabus said. Some narrowly-defined topical courses included more methodology and analysis in major papers than other classes, which was one of the means of differentiating between courses. Descriptions of assignments became key.

Professor Morrison asked Senator Krasnoff if he also submitted the courses in question for consideration under category two.

Senator Krasnoff said they only submitted them in category three because of his understanding, at the time, of the definition of category two. And, though the courses were not solely centered in Europe (a defining feature of category 3), he said they were largely European in focus.

Professor Morrison clarified: the courses were not rejected in category two? Senator Krasnoff confirmed.

Senator Covert added that when the committee rejected courses in one category, they did not necessarily re-categorize them, mostly because of time. She suggested that Senator Krasnoff could resubmit the courses for category two with no problem.

The Speaker inquired at this point if the course list for foreign language alternatives was now frozen.

Professor Morrison initially replied that she would not have a problem adding courses at the moment, but on further consideration, said that the list was, in fact, closed.

Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience Lynne Ford addressed the "frozen" question: general education is not frozen forever, she said.

Addressing Senator Krasnoff directly, she said that the courses could not be added at this point in the process. The committee, she explained, worked over spring break and over the course of two additional long, intensive meetings to evaluate all the proposals based on the criteria and with input from departments. If Jewish Studies chose to categorize the courses in category three, the committee, deferring to the program's judgment, was bound to consider them within category three. When the committee rejected courses in a particular category, in some cases, she said, the committee did have a conversation with programs and departments about which category might be a better fit.
The matter before the Senate, she said, is the list resulting from the committee’s long and careful consideration. She urged the Senate not to recreate the list on the floor because this does not show proper respect for the committee.

Back to the question of freezing, she said that as general education opens back up again, the foreign language alternative program will go into the general education cycle. The possibility to add the JWST courses in category two will open up very soon in the cycle for foreign language.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, called the question on voting on the proposals in groups.

There was no second. Discussion continued.

Senator Krasnoff disagreed that the case he was outlining showed disrespect for the committee. He said that he understood the amount work done and the brevity of the timeline. He said that he submitted proposals but received no email indicating when he could discuss the proposals.

AVP Ford replied that the dates were in an email she sent inviting departments to submit proposals.

Senator Krasnoff apologized for missing the meeting and said that he did not intend to do that.

"What’s clear," he maintained, "is that the committee changed the understanding [and] the interpretation of the category at some point in the discussion." It would not be odd, he said, to approve the very same class taught in a different department. He argued that he is simply trying to apply the committee’s new understanding of the category. He said that he will ask to amend the motion to count the JWST courses in category two, and added that he would be willing to condition the motion to include the courses on the approval of the committee, which would not, he said, take very long.

The Speaker recognized Associate Provost Ford, who offered a clarification that the general education door opens again for the 2017 catalog. Senator Krasnoff could wait until next academic year to submit the courses under category two.

The Senator agreed that it would not be a "huge deal" to wait but that "neither would it be a huge deal" to approve the courses now.

Rick Heldrich, Senator - SSM, said that he was sympathetic to Senator Krasnoff’s situation and asked AVP Ford what the cycle is. He further asked if the cycle is published, and if it is permanent or specific to SACS reaffirmation.

AVP Ford began to reply, but Senator Heldrich added that his reason for asking is that we represent the College’s curriculum as under faculty control, and he would wager that no one in the room except the Associate Provost knows what the general education cycle is.

Ford responded. Beginning in 2016-17, next academic year, any one who wishes to make changes to the general education list will be invited to do so, and the General Education Committee will consider all proposals for inclusion in the 2017-18 catalog year. The reason for the cycle, she said, has to do with the College’s having done no assessment of student learning in the general education program. It was necessary to establish a fixed list of courses with student learning outcomes attached and to assess that list over a period of time leading up to reaffirmation. Changes to general education in any year, in essence, create a new catalog every year, creating a potential problem in student planning. From that perspective, it is helpful to have a
mostly stable general education. Now that we have assessment data, she said, we can make decisions about what to change, if anything, based on the assessment.

Dr. Divya Bhati added that the College was in monitoring status with SACS twice for general education (not due to lack of effort, but due to a lack of assessment), hence the freezing of general education in order to effectively assess it longitudinally. Now that we have data, she said, we can open it back up again.

Senator Heldrich, SSM, observed that AVP Ford in an extensive faculty debate 20 years ago over general education was "an incredibly strong voice" arguing, he said, that the general education had been static far too long, "and it should change and it should change constantly." He called her present position "an unbelievable switch."

AVP Ford took issue with Senator Heldrich's characterization that she "said it should change constantly."

Senator Heldrich followed up with a question: will the cycle end after the SACSCOC reaccreditation, or is the cycle permanent? Will there be, he specified, "a continuous three-year opening and closing of gen ed?"

AVP Ford said that the General Education Committee has proposed that we work in three-year cycles.

Senator Heldrich asked if the cycle plan is to be approved by the Senate.

Provost McGee entered the discussion here, saying that Senate minutes from the last several years, when Bob Mignone was chair of the committee speak to the freeze and intention to move toward a cycle. The charge of the General Education Committee gives discretion to decide on things as it wishes, and there is an appeals process, so if an individual Senator wants to appeal a decision to have a freeze, he or she may bring an appeal to the Senate. The Provost said that he suspects that there will be an ongoing discussion about how flexible we want the general education curriculum to be. He said that he agrees with Senator Heldrich that there are profound faculty governance issues to consider, but that the back and forth between the committee the Senate and Academic Affairs is ongoing, as ever.

He noted that before the Senate at the moment is an amendment to the General Education Committee’s motion that may or may not have been seconded.

The Speaker said that he did not hear a second. The Provost asked, however the amendment turns out, that the Senate please endorse the committee's proposals so that the College can put into action a plan for foreign language alternatives that can be assessed and defended.

Senator Krasnoff restated his amendment:

The committee will include in the category two list JWST 210 and 215, subject to the approval of the committee.

He added that he is not doing this for himself but for his faculty who argued for those courses’ inclusion in the category, which he argued against, based on his understanding of the criteria for inclusion, which he pointed out, subsequently became more flexible.

The motion was seconded.

Discussion on Senator Krasnoff's motion began at this point.

Registrar Mary Bergstrom asked Senator Krasnoff if JWST 210 and 215 count currently for the general education history requirement. With an affirmative reply from the Senator, she observed that courses cannot count twice in general
The courses would default as History and a student wishing to apply them to foreign language would have to have to get an manual exception take a different class for History credit. Senator Krasnoff said this would be no problem. "Iana Anguelova sought a clarification. Would the courses, if approved, have to come back to the Senate?"

The Speaker and Senator Krasnoff both replied that the motion asks for consent to let the committee make the final decision on these two courses. The Senator replied that the Senate loses nothing in the motion. Steve Litvin, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, responded at this point to a prior comment regarding respect for the committee. "If it is disrespectful for us to amend things, then why bring them to us for approval at all?" This is within the purview of the Senate: there is no disrespect.

Senator Krasnoff asserted here that he was not second guessing the committee's judgment, but rather, since the committee approved another Modern Jewish History course, he is actually trying to follow the committee's judgment. AVP Ford noted that the comment about disrespect was hers, and she said that her meaning was that all departments and programs were invited to submit proposals; Jewish Studies made a decision about whether and to which category to submit courses; they submitted proposals in category three; the committee deliberated on the proposals' rationales, syllabus, SLOs, assignments--all the available evidence to judge fit. The Senate, she said, "sight unseen" would take the word of Senator Krasnoff, "a valued colleague, no doubt," that JWST 210 and 215 fit category two. The committee considered the entirety of the proposal, but the Senate will not be able to do that. Her comment on disrespect had to do, she said, specifically with these facts.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, said she shares Senator Krasnoff's concerns, having had Religious Studies proposals run afoul on the same ground of methodology. In the future, she said, there will be examples for comparison. She expressed support for the motion and called the question.

There was a second and on a voice vote (not unanimous) the question was called. A voice vote on Senator Krasnoff's motion to amend was too close to count. By a subsequent raising of hands the amendment passed by a margin of 16 to 11. The Speaker announced that, pending the committee's approval, JWST 210 and 215 will be added to the category two approved list for foreign language alternative courses.

There was no further discussion on the main motion. On a unanimous voice vote, the courses proposed by the General Education Committee for foreign language alternative were approved as such.

B. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs

Jo Ann Ewalt, chair of the committee, asked to consider proposals 1-11 as a single passage, since these proposals amount to small adjustments and clean up. The Speaker sought and received unanimous consent to do so.

See below.
1. **M.A.T. Middle Grades Education** ([PDF](#))
   a. EDFS 687 – Existing course added as prerequisite course
   b. EDEE 690 – Existing course added to core requirements
   c. EDFS 635 – Delete course
   d. EDEE 640 – Existing course added to core requirements
   e. EDEE 678 – Delete course from English emphasis requirements

2. **M.Ed. Languages** ([PDF](#))
   a. SPAN 590 – Deleted course from Spanish emphasis requirements
   b. SPAN 671 – Delete course from Spanish emphasis requirements

3. **M.S. Mathematics** ([PDF](#))
   Changing existing courses to comply with new cross-listing policy
   a. MATH 402/502 – Course description change
   b. MATH 415/515 – Course title change, course description change
   c. MATH 423/523 – Course title change, course description change
   d. MATH 430/530 – Course title change
   e. MATH 431/531 – Course description change
   f. MATH 440/540 – Course description change
   g. MATH 441/541 – Course description change
   h. MATH 445/545 – Course description change
   i. MATH 449/550 – Course description change
   j. MATH 451/551 – Course description change
   k. MATH 452/552 – Course description change
   l. MATH 455/555 – Course description change
   m. MATH 460/560 – Course number change, course description change
   n. MATH 461/561 – Course number change, course description change

4. **MS Environmental Studies Proposal** ([PDF](#))
   a. Follow-up Cross-Listing Proposals: Re-numbering existing courses to comply with new cross-listing policy
      • EVSS 619 → EVSS 519
      • EVSS 628, EVSS 628L → EVSS 544, EVSS 544L
      • EVSS 629 → EVSS 506
      • EVSS 631, EVSS 631L → EVSS 541, EVSS 541L
      • EVSS 638, EVSS 638L → EVSS 538, EVSS 538L
      • EVSS 642, EVSS 642L → EVSS 52, EVSS 542L
      • EVSS 649, EVSS 649L → EVSS 549, EVSS 549L
      • EVSS 657 → EVSS 557
      • EVSS 669, EVSS 669L → EVSS 569, EVSS 569L
      • EVSS 695 → EVSS 595: ST: Applied Quantitative Methods
      • EVSS 695 → EVSS 595: ST: Ecopreneurship
   b. Affirm past practice: add existing courses to possible electives:
      • BIOL 618
      • BIOL 650

5. **MA Communication Proposals** ([PDF](#))
   a. COMM 535: Delete Course
   b. **Affirm past practice**: Add existing courses (7) to requirements or electives: ENGL 558, ENGL 559, ENGL 560, ENGL 562, PUBA 640, PUBA 656, PUBA 650
6. **M.Ed. in Languages Proposals** *(PDF)*
   a. Change/Delete Graduate Program Proposal
      Add existing course to requirements or electives, Interdisciplinary: EDFS 692 – add existing course to core requirement.
   b. *Affirm past practice*: add existing courses to possible electives from interdisciplinary programs: (see proposal)
      - Languages (1)
      - Spanish (6)
      - Teaching, Learning, and Advocacy (3)
      - Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education (15)
      - Elementary & Early Childhood Education (3)
      - Communication (1)

7. **MPA Proposals** *(PDF)*
   a. Change/Delete Graduate Program Proposals: Add existing course to requirements or electives: PUBA 617: Add existing course to possible electives
   b. *Affirm past practice*: add existing courses to possible electives from interdisciplinary programs: EVSS 630, EVSS 605, EVSS 635, EVSAS 632, EVSS 633, EVSS 649, COMM 514, COMM 540

8. **MPA Urban and Regional Certificate Program Proposal** *(PDF)*
   (same as above)
   Change/Delete Graduate Program Proposals: Add existing course to requirements or electives: PUBA 617: Add existing course to possible electives

9. **MTLA Proposals** *(PDF)*
   a. Change/Delete Graduate Program Proposal: add existing courses to possible electives for all MTLA concentrations:
      - EDFS 760
      - EDFS 761
      - EDFS 762
      - EDFS 763
      - EDFS 764
   b. Add to New Literacies concentration: EDFS 670

10. **MEd. Science & Math** *(PDF)*
    Graduate Policy Change Proposal: Policy Change to Capstone Curriculum in catalog (See proposal)

11. **MS Marine Biology Proposals** *(PDF)*
    a. *Affirm past practice*: add existing courses to possible electives:
       BIOL 502, BIOL 503, BIOL 506, BIOL 510, BIOL 514, BIOL 523, BIOL 544, BIOL 545, BIOL 549, BIOL 618, BIOL 627, BIOL 630, BIOL 632, BIOL 635, BIOL 641, BIOL 643, BIOL 644, BIOL 646, BIOL 649, BIOL 690, EVSS 649, EVSS 669
    b. BIOL 700 Research and Thesis (4): Edit description to “repeatable: up to 4 credit hours”
    c. Add waive option to core course requirements
d. Renumber courses to conform to new numbering and cross-listing policies:

- BIOL 614 → BIOL 514
- BIOL 619 → BIOL 549
- BIOL 623 → BIOL 523
- BIOL 628 → BIOL 544
- BIOL 629 → BIOL 506
- BIOL 640 → BIOL 504
- BIOL 645 → BIOL 545

Proposals 1-11 above were approved by unanimous voice vote.

12. MS Child Life (PDF)

a. Graduate Program Change Proposal:

- Replace EDEE 655 with CHLI 602
- Replace EDFS 654 with CHLI 607
- Replace EDFS 635 or COMM 501/502 with CHLI 608
- Replace COMM 521, EDFS 670, MTLA 605, EDEE 620, EDEE 655 for CHLI 610

b. Graduate Course Proposals: New Courses (4):

- CHLI 602, Therapeutic Play for Child Life Specialists
- CHLI 607 Advanced Child Development
- CHLI 608 Research Methods
- CHLI 610, Infant Development and Child Life

Professor Ewalt explained that the program is preparing for national accreditation and the changes will help them align with standards. The proposals include new courses and replacement of current courses the program uses in Education with their own courses.

Questions / Discussion

The Provost asked MS Child Life Program Director Susan Simonian why the courses are 600-level.

Professor Simonian said the program used 600 numbers on the courses because many students come to the program with a good deal of prior work. Additionally, the idea was to make the courses more seminar-style and involve applied work as well.

The Provost asked if a 600-level research methods course is more advanced than a 500-level research methods course.

Professor Simonian replied in the negative and specified that the students are coming in with research methods already under their belt. She said that the program could use 500 numbers if this is the Provost’s preference, but since the program was built with 600-level courses, the new course numbers were chosen to be consistent with the program as it is.
The Provost said that the numbering scheme "should receive some additional attention," since it is a goal of the soon-to-be finalized course numbering policy to have consistency in introductory graduate course numbering.

**The Provost** further inquired how CHLI 608 - Research Methods differs from the course it replaces.

Professor Simonian said that a key issue is the title, "Educational Research," which is an impediment to accreditation by the Child Life Council, who will not accredit the program with a course only in educational research. She added that the program is fortunate that those teaching the current course teach both qualitative and quantitative design and said that the program will be pursuing a "meets with" designation.

The Provost asked in what form the guidance from the council has come to her.

Professor Simonian replied that she has been on the accreditation pilot committee for the Child Life Council.

Is the guidance, he further asked, that we should have customized research methods classes that are tailored specifically to Child Life?

This is not exactly the case, she replied. Before the students can apply for an internship, which is competitive in a way similar to medical residencies, the courses taken have to be verified by the council. The courses in the proposal were flagged by the council as problematic for students who have already gone through the first cycle of internship accreditation. She explained that, in this case, she fixed the problem by adding descriptors to the courses, but this is not allowed in relation to SACS regulations.

The Provost came back to the idea he expressed about customization: does the council, he inquired, require customization to Child Life content even in teaching core social scientific research concepts?

Professor Simonian said that it is important to consider that the research is being conducted in pediatric psychiatry in pediatric hospital settings. It is also not always, necessarily, social science research, she said.

The Provost thanked Professor Simonian for her answers.

Steve Litvin, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, asked if it is the preference of the Provost that there be a motion to renumber courses.

The Provost said that many of our programs have gone through a substantial clean-up in order to conform with the course numbering policy that is soon to be finalized. Child Life has not yet. He said he would ask the program to come back to the Senate at the earliest opportunity, having reconciled their numbering scheme with the course numbering policy in a comprehensive way.

Professor Ewalt added here that there are graduate 600-level research courses, and Child Life will not, she said, be seeking to
cross-list with undergraduate courses, so if they choose to remain at 600, no additional problems will be created.

The proposals were approved by unanimous voice vote.

13. MA English (PDF)
   a. Delete courses: ENGL 516, ENGL 530, ENGL 557, ENGL 563, ENGL 570, ENGL 571, ENGL 572, ENGL 650
   b. Terminate emphasis: African American Literature track

Professor Ewalt said that committee were troubled by the deletion of the African American Literature track in the English MA and wanted to be on the record as saying so. The program’s justification had to do with lack of student interest and concomitant inability to staff courses for it. In light of the College’s diversity goals, she reported that the committee “was saddened that we seem to be moving in the wrong direction.”

Discussion / Questions

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, asked if there other concentrations in the English MA Professor Ewalt replied in the negative.

The proposals were approved by voice vote with one opposed.

14. MA Community Planning, Policy and Design: New Program Proposal (PDF)
   a. ARTH 565 – New course
   b. CPAD 605 – New course
   c. CPAD 615 – New course
   d. ARTH 535 – New course
   e. CPAD 619 – New course
   f. CPAD 790 – New course
   g. CPAD 830 – New course
   h. CPAD 631 – New course
   i. CPAD 895 – New course
   j. CPAD 690 – New course

Professor Ewalt pointed out that the program is a 56-hour interdisciplinary program including urban design, economics, transportation, planning, and public policy.

The Speaker at this point distributed hard copies of documents from the Academic Planning Committee provided after the Senate agenda deadline: the committee’s report (cover letter | report) and a minority report from the committee {link}. Committee Chair Agnes Southgate was on hand to address questions.

Questions / Discussion

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, asked Julia Eichelberger of the Budget Committee to comment on their deliberations on the proposal.

Professor Eichelberger reported that after detailed discussion of the program, the committee approved of it as a sound proposal

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, inquired about the minority report provided by the Academic Planning Committee.
Professor Ewalt noted that the majority and minority reports of Academic Planning did not come before to the Graduate Council.

Professor Eichelberger noted that Academic Planning’s position on the program is to support it, which the Speaker verified.

Both Senators Shaver and Anguelova asked to hear about the dissent in the committee, with the latter calling, in particular, for discussion of the new faculty line in the proposal.

Committee Chair of Academic Planning Agnes Southgate reported that the full discussion included the proposing faculty members and occurred after the Graduate Council had accepted the proposal and before the budget committee reviewed it. She reported that the committee’s overall discussion was focused on the program's visibility and potential to recruit students to make the program viable, and the committee was enthusiastic about the program’s academic quality and its infusion of the liberal arts ideal of the College and blending of traditional and modern ideas of architecture and planning. The committee, she said, liked the program design, its leveraging of the advantages of the place (such as using the Riley Center).

Concerns of the committee included the logistics of the student cohort system (its disallowing staggered entrance into the program, for instance, or part-time students). The committee suggested to the proposers, she said, that after running the program for a while, they might consider these issues again. She said the committee did not think the concerns sufficient to withhold its support for the proposal.

There was, she said, a discussion about the budget and whether or not the program could support itself. The committee, however, had no discussion with the Provost on that matter; but, she said, the committee was reassured that the program’s economic footing would be vetted very carefully before it went up for approval.

Senator Anguelova, Mathematics, asked the provost to comment on the program’s economic footing.

The Provost replied that graduate programs should generate enrollments and tuition revenues that can be clearly measured against expense. He observed that the proposal before the Senate is not the original proposal, but a much revised one that went through revision primarily to address self-sustenance. Academic Affairs, he said, is satisfied that the program now makes financial sense without relying on any philanthropic commitments whatsoever and under realistic expectations for enrollment. His office, he said, was also clear with the school and graduate deans that if the program was not able to break even or do better financially, then further review would be needed and the program would be subject to cancelation, such as happened a few years back with an MA in Bilingual Legal Interpreting that was much loved but did not generate enough enrollment support to make financial sense. The Provost said that if the proposed MA does well with enrollment, then an additional faculty member will be considered, since enrollment would warrant it, and without this financial justification, we will not, he stated flatly, add a faculty member.

Senator Anguelova inquired about the review cycle for such a decision, and the Provost specified that "after three years or so" the program will have had time to demonstrate viability (or not).
**Professor Eichelberger** reported that, with regard to staffing, program proposer Grant Gilmore made the Budget Committee aware of the numerous qualified area people who would be eager to teach in the program as adjuncts. Some of the courses the students would take, she added, would meet with undergraduate courses already on the books. Graduate students would do different work, but there is ready capacity for a graduate student cohort in these classes. Professor Eichelberger added that a table in the proposal (PDF page 16) specifies that in academic year 2020-21, provided there were donor support, they could add a full-time faculty member, but not before such time. The proposers assured the committee, she said, that the program would be fully operational without added faculty, which was a central reason for the committee’s support. Finally, she said, as a graduate program, it will bring in students not already here, unlike an undergraduate program, which necessarily draws from a set population.

**Senator Daniel Greenberg** sought a clarification. In the Academic Planning Committee’s minority report, item 3 speaks, in part, specifically to instructional costs. Senator Greenberg asked if the "meets with" classes help allay that concern by not adding additional instructional costs.

Professor Eichelberger agreed: undergraduate faculty would not be pulled out of their classes and replaced by adjuncts in order to meet graduate staffing needs. Additionally, she said, local qualified professionals will be able to teach in the program, including the city’s former Mayor.

Professor Ewalt added that three things help address the concern: the ability to run "meets with" classes, the ability to use interdisciplinary courses already being taught, and ability to attract specialized adjuncts drawn to the program’s philosophy.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, pointed to the program proposal (PDF page 2), which speaks to the proposal supporting "a new financial model at the College." She wondered if the new model mentioned will be heavily adjunct based, drawing from the community, and not affording new faculty lines. What is the new model?, she asked.

Professor Ewalt suggested that Nathaniel Walker, one of the co-proposers, might address Senator DeLaurell’s query. But speaking to the question of adjuncts, she said that the program as proposed would intentionally seek adjuncts with specific training and experience when there is not a line or roster faculty with that expertise.

Professor Walker said that "new financial model" does not refer to hiring adjuncts but to correcting the flawed model that expected to cull revenue from an increased number of out-of-state students. Instead, we are thinking of new MA programs as a place of growth. The phrase comes from the strategic plan, he explained.

He reiterated what the Provost said about the program’s solvency and what others said about the particularity of the program’s plan for adjunct instruction. Having disciplinary practitioners, with their grounded knowledge, is a great benefit to the students. Historically, he said, architecture programs have relied on such expert adjuncts.

Senator DeLaurell inquired whether Professor Walker feels the program will have access to such high-level instructors who are willing to work for adjunct pay.
Professor Walker replied "yes," adding that he has "had to ask them to quit emailing [him]."

The Senator followed up: will the program be predominately relying on adjuncts?

Professor Walker said that adjuncts will not be in the majority since the program will be utilizing many classes already offered at the College.

Senator DeLaurell asked if "new financial model" is just another way of saying "revenue generating."

Professor Walker agreed: we cannot grow the numbers of undergraduates on the historic campus and cannot expect higher numbers of non-resident students, but we can add new MA programs.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, observed that the proposal references the School of Business and also that it refers to transportation as part of the course of study. In relation to transportation, he asked, does the program propose any connection to the School of Business on transportation?

Professor Walker said that the reference to the School of Business is a reference to a Real Estate class that the Carter Real Estate Center has committed to helping the program find the right person to teach. The transportation course is one already taught in the Urban Studies program, and it also covers infrastructure and land-use planning.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked a question related to the Academic Planning Committee's minority report, item 5, addressing it to Professor Ewalt, not as committee chair but as Director of our Masters of Public Administration program. He observed that the program proposed in ways resembles an MPA program with another, add design and art component. Will that component, he asked, make graduates more attractive to employers who typically seek MPA graduates, or will that component, in effect, make graduates seem "watered down." Are there things, he added, that graduates of this program can do that MPA graduates cannot? He asked Professor Ewalt to speak to employment for graduates of the proposed program for her MPA directing perspective.

Professor Ewalt said that this was, indeed, her major concern when reading the first drafts of the proposal for the 56-hour degree: students could opt for less expensive degrees in roughly the same terrain. But, she said, she has been convinced that the MPA is fairly utilitarian, but the combination of policy and design, added to the rest of the curriculum, in the proposed MA is going to offer preparation for specific jobs in specific cities, and there are many such places globally that should find the combination of policy, planning, and aesthetic design very appealing. She added that a graduate of the program could very well be the kind of person former Mayor Joe Riley speaks of as who he looked to for thinking about design in this city.

Professor Walker added that the three different constituencies that he and Professor Gilmore conferred with in developing the program are urban design firms, development companies, and city governments. All three expressed a need for people versed in design but who also have good knowledge of planning and policy. There are many design programs to churn out designers who are very good at esoteric things but are incompetent in economics, planning, development, policy, gentrification, cultural heritage,
and practical planning. He said the proposal seeks to produce what a few have called "perfect generalists," able to act as ligaments connecting different organizations and efforts.

Professor Ewalt specified that students in the program who end up going on to study architecture will be few. Professor Walker agreed that, while some will go on to pursue an MA in Architecture, the program does not expect many will do so. It is also the case, he said that many architects holding MAs go on to pursue MAs in urban design and planning.

There were no further questions or discussion.

The proposal was approved by unanimous voice vote.

C. Faculty Curriculum Committee

Committee Chair Gibbs Knotts sought unanimous consent to consider, discuss, and vote on 1-20 in a block.

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, asked if questions about a specific proposal can be asked.

The Speaker affirmed that they could, but added that to vote on an item separately would required separating it from the group.

See below for discussion and actions taken.

1. **Archaeology** *(PDF)*
   a. Create ARCH 499 (Bachelor’s Essay in Archaeology).
   b. Add ARTH 317 and CLAS 325 to the electives in the ARCH major and minor.

2. **Arts Management** *(PDF)*
   a. Create ARTM 255 (Fundamentals of Presenting the Performing Arts).
   b. Replace ARTM 360 with this new course in the ARTM Music Industry concentration.
   c. Add flexibility to the selection of electives.

3. **Biology** *(PDF)*

   Add lab courses that can accompany BIOL 250 and BIOL 453.

4. **Business Language Minor in French** *(PDF)*
   a. Deactivate FREN 382. Change the title and description of FREN 380 and FREN 381.
   b. Create FREN 383 (Summer Internship in a French Workplace).
   c. Make the corresponding changes to BLMF and add FREN 342 and FREN 363 to the electives.

5. **Comparative Literature** *(PDF)*
   a. Add four courses to the CPLT electives (two from the RUST proposal).
   b. Remove LTRS 150 and LTRS 450 from CPLT (deactivated in the RUST proposal).
   c. Change the role of LTSP 250 within CPLT.
6. **Data Science** ([PDF](#))
   In the DATA minor, change the 100-level math requirement from “MATH 111” to “MATH 105 or MATH 120.”

7. **European Studies** ([PDF](#))
   Add HIST 241, HIST 347, and JWST 330 to the EUST electives.

8. **French** ([PDF](#))
   a. Remove the 400-level course requirement for the French minor.
   c. Remove the requirement for INTB majors who minor in French to take FREN 380.
   d. Split FREN 361 study abroad into two courses, one specifically for France and another for other French-speaking countries.
   e. Make corresponding changes to the FRFS major and minor.

9. **Global Logistics and Transportation** ([PDF](#))
   Add TRAN 420 to the GLAT minor and concentration.

10. **History** ([PDF](#))
    Add HIST 498, HIST 499, and CLAS 401 to the list of courses satisfying the capstone.

11. **International Studies** ([PDF](#))
    Add four courses to the electives in the INTL Latin America concentration.

12. **Irish and Irish American Studies** ([PDF](#))
    a. Revisions to IIAS.
    b. Deactivate IIAS 301, IIAS 302, and IIAS 303.

13. **Latin American and Caribbean Studies** ([PDF](#))
    a. Create six new courses:
       - LACS 310 (Race, Gender, and Ethnicity in Latin American and the Caribbean)
       - LACS 320 (Human Rights and Social Movements in Latin American and the Caribbean)
       - LACS 330 (Colonial and Postcolonial Studies: Latin America and the Caribbean)
       - LACS 340 (Afro-Caribbean & Afro-Latin Studies)
       - LACS 350 (Globalization and Mass Media in Latin America and the Caribbean)
       - LACS 360 (Latina/o Identities: Constructions, Contestations, and Expressions).
    b. Add these courses to the LACS major and minor.
    c. Other modifications to the LACS major and minor.

14. **Math** ([PDF](#))
    Add MATH 105 (with a C-) as an option for satisfying MATH 350’s calculus prerequisite.

15. **Middle Eastern and Islamic World** ([PDF](#))
    Add ARTH 231 to the list of MEIW electives.
16. Philosophy (PDF)
   - Add a requirement that PHIL majors take a course on Value Theory.
   - Decrease the required number of elective courses.
   - Correct a mistake in the PPLW concentration.

17. Russian Studies (PDF)
   - Numerous changes to the RUST minor.
   - Deactivate LTRS 150 and LTRS 450.
   - Create RUST 250 (Vampires), RUST 300 (Gender and Sexuality in Russian Culture), and RUST 360 (Special Topics in Russian Studies).

   The course creations and deactivations also affect the CPLT proposal.

18. Theater and Dance (PDF)
   - Create DANC 380 (Dance Concert Production) and add it to the DANC major and its Performance and Choreography concentration.
   - Create THTR 401 (Advanced Problems in Design) and THTR 411 (Main state Design and Production) and add them to the THTR major.
   - Add FYSE 139 as an alternative to THTR 230 in the THTR major.

19. Women’s and Gender Studies (PDF)
   - Add ten courses to the list of electives for the WGST BA.
   - Add those same ten courses, plus two more to the list of electives for the WGST minor.

20. Accounting-Business Administration (PDF)
    Prevent ACCT majors from double majoring in BADM.

Questions / Discussion, Proposals 1-20

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, made a general inquiry based on proposal 19 in Women’s and Gender Studies. He pointed to a course proposed to be added to the WGST major: LACS 332: Latin American Politics and Society in Film. The class is topical and could, conceivably be taught with or without a significant emphasis on gender. There are different models, he said, for handling courses such as this one, and he asked for a clarification for how classes are handled as far as counting to an interdisciplinary degree or program like WGST or Jewish Studies.

Associate Provost Conseula Francis replied that in the case of the course Senator Krasnoff has pointed out, it will always count for WGST (if the proposal is approved).

A different system is in place, she explained, for special topics classes, the so-called asterisk model holds sway there. Special topics classes taught in particular semesters and sections are marked in such a way that they will could in particular programs.

Senator Krasnoff inquired about variable-topic courses.

These, Associate Provost Francis pointed out, are a horse of a different color. For a number of reasons variable-topics classes are tricky to nail down as to applicability to degree programs. For now, the only way to handle them is to make exceptions case-by-case.
Senator Krasnoff thanked the Associate Provost for her explanation.  

All proposals above (1-20) were approved by unanimous voice vote.

21. Bachelor of Professional Studies (PDF)
Create an undergraduate certificate in Project Management.

The Speaker pointed out that the budget committee vetted the proposal.

Questions / Discussion

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, opened a general discussion about what defines an undergraduate certificate at the College of Charleston. Graduate programs, he said, often offer certificates, and they tend to be in specific topic or content areas, such as an interdisciplinary field related to the major field of study. At the undergraduate level we have, also, concentrations and minors. In some ways, Senator Krasnoff said, the proposal resembles a minor because anyone can take it, and it has six courses and a capstone. What, he wondered, are the guidelines for a certificate? He said that his ultimate concern is that anything can be called a certificate.

Dean Godfrey Gibbison said that, at present, the College has no certificates at the undergraduate level. The certificate can be completed by students at the College and people from outside the College, as well, such as people who live in the area and wish to add the certificate as a credential for work purposes. Such a person could not complete a minor. The certificate has an expanded potential clientele, he said.

Senator Krasnoff asked if the main motivation for the proposal is to reach an outside audience.

The Provost, addressing Senator Krasnoff’s question, added to Dean Gibbison’s definition of the category of “certificate”: the undergraduate certificate is the counterpart of the graduate certificate, and both are well represented in academia. Certificates are not degrees, and a student entering a college just to complete a certificate is not a degree-seeking student. Undergraduate certificates, like graduate ones, are coherent collections of courses centered around and adding up to a sum of knowledge about a single subject. Undergraduate certificates are approved in the same ways that graduate certificates are. They tend to be around 12 credit hours, and they are regulated by SACSCOC in the same way as graduate certificates.

If approved, this proposal, the first undergraduate certificate at the College, will precipitate a need to develop procedures for admitting non-degree-seeking students who wish to complete the certificate. The procedure would be developed in consultation with the Academic Standards committee.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, congratulated Dean Gibbison on the development of the certificate proposal. She added that Mathematics might explore undergraduate certificates as well specifically to attract outside clientele, mentioning specifically cryptography and information security as possible programs. She said that undergraduate certificates are good for the College.

Jon Hakkila, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, expressed concern that if certificate programs generally make use of lower-division courses
(because they have no prerequisites), especially popular offerings, we may run into a capacity problems.

The Provost said that each new certificate would be approved on its own merits and with an understanding of enrollment demand for any existing courses the certificate employs. In majors, he added, there are often courses that do not have prerequisites and they often build on one another: the same model could be used for certificates.

Dean Gibbison asked if the Professor Hakkila was concerned about demand. Professor Hakkila replied that the issue is more a planning one: understanding that a certificate that draws on established courses needs to make sure seats will be available through consultation with programs that the certificate might affect.

The Provost agreed that poor enrollment planning will yield poor outcomes.

Dean Gibbison specified that the Certificate in Project Management does not create a demand on any existing courses.

**Senator Anguelova**, Mathematics, said that certificate programs do not always make use of lower-division classes. Some employ higher-level classes.

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, said that future certificate programs are likely to be decided upon on a case-by-case basis.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Marketing, expressed concern about the word "certificate" itself in the proposal as possible source of confusion between this program and the national project certification exam. A person completing the certificate program will have earned a certification in project management, but this can be confused with earning certification through passing the national certification exam.

Dean Gibbison replied that anyone desiring the national certification knows that he or she has to take the national examination.

Senator Shaver inquired if the intent of the certificate program is to prepare those who earn it for the exam.

The Dean replied that the program covers a good part of the territory covered by the exam, but the program is not making any guarantees that students who earn their certificate will pass the exam.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator - SSM, expressed concern that the discussion focus on the merits of the certificate proposal brought by the BPS program and steer away from conversation about certificates in general. We cannot regulate hypotheticals, he said.

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, said he agrees that there are some very particular concerns we should attend to, but "on the other hand, this is a big moment." The proposal creates a new category at the College.

**Senator Krasnoff** then asked if people seeking a certificate are all non-degree seeking or can degree-seeking students as well complete the certificate?

Several people replied that anyone can earn a certificate.

The Provost said that if someone outside the College desires to complete the certificate, she would have to matriculate as a non-degree seeking student. A
student already at the College would have to seek separate permission to pursue the certificate.

Senator Krasnoff asked if the Provost was saying that the primary audience is non degree-seeking students. The Provost said that this will depend on the certificate. In the proposal before the Senate, the primary audience will be degree-seeking students.

The Provost said that we will have to set up smart procedures for future proposals, and fortunately for us, he added, hundreds of universities have established undergraduate certificate programs, and we will look to them for models.

Senator Krasnoff asked Professor Knotts if there was any concern or discussion in the committee about the size of the certificate (18 hours) or any general feeling about what the right size is for certificate programs.

Professor Knotts replied that the committee didn't express a will on this matter but mainly thought of the current proposal as equivalent of a graduate certificate. He said that 18 hours seems high, but the committee did not discuss that.

Senator Krasnoff said he is interested in general what people think the proper size for a certificate is. He expressed a concern that along with approving the proposal, should the Senate do so, we may be setting a precedent on size.

Dean Gibbison noted that the number of courses in the Project Management Certificate was driven by the curriculum that needs to be covered.

Jon Hakkila, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, concurred with Senator Krasnoff that the proposal raises important concerns. He asked if the proposal should have gone to the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs. Is the certificate, he asked, a special program?

The Provost replied that the program is credit-bearing and thus could not be called "continuing education." "Special Programs," he said, has remained an undefined term for decades. The appropriate body to consider the proposal, he said, seemed to Academic Affairs to be the undergraduate Curriculum Committee. He added that it was also vetted by other Senate committees as well.

Senator Daniel Greenberg, Psychology, agreed that at some point it would be worth thinking about the size of certificate programs; however, it is also advisable to not chain things up a little too early. He argued that the proposal at hand does not implicitly argue that any new certificate needs to be 18 hours, but, rather, that a certificate can be 18 hours, if need be.

Alex Kasman, Senator - SSM, said that certificate programs are becoming popular at other universities, in part because the looseness of the term. It seems, he said, reasonable to begin experimenting with the idea of undergraduate certificates without the concern that we are setting some kind of dangerous precedent.

An unidentified Senator called the question; it was seconded, and on a unanimous voice vote, approved.

The proposal passed on a unanimous voice vote.
22. Real Estate– Create a new major in Real Estate (PDF)
   a. Create REAL 389 (Real Estate Valuation Analysis) and REAL 418 (Real Estate Feasibility Analysis) to be included in the major.
   b. Add REAL 310 to the prerequisites for REAL 376.

Professor Knotts explained that the proposal seeks to create a new major and creates some new classes to support it.

Questions / Discussion

Julia Eichelberger read into the record a prepared summary of the Budget Committee’s discussion on the proposal:

"We are forwarding the Real Estate proposal to the Senate with no recommendation.

We had concerns about the high cost of a new hire needed to support this program, because much less expensive positions are now being cut from other programs. The hire represents a very significant commitment of resources over potentially 30+ years, a commitment that the College is making in a very difficult financial climate. The high cost makes this seem an imprudent hire. On the other hand, we recognize that there are a large number of students taking Real Estate courses now, that additional students may pursue a major which is likely to be more appealing than a minor or concentration, and that a new hire will be able to teach in other areas besides Real Estate, helping relieve some of the demand within your School.

Some members of the committee felt that a program with such a high per-credit-hour cost should have program fees. This seems like a more prudent and fair way of paying for this hire—program fees would ask the students who receive this very expensive instruction to bear more of that higher cost, rather than requiring all C of C students in every major to absorb that cost. On the other hand, we recognize that this program’s per-credit-hour cost is not so far from the per-credit-hour cost of other SOBE instruction, all of which, one could argue, should have program fees added to them.

Given these factors and the unusual circumstances that prompted the Provost to decide to approve a new line in Real Estate, we were unable to make any recommendation on this motion. This was our committee’s unanimous decision."

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, said that he would like to know about votes in the various committees that vetted the proposal, and he said that he had heard there was a vote in the School of Business and he asked to hear about that as well.

Professor Knotts said that the Curriculum Committee sought several changes to the proposal as it developed, and the committee did vote unanimously to support it. As to the School of Business's vote, he said he could not say.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, who worked on the proposal, said that she heard that Academic Planning also voted unanimously for the proposal as well. She added that there was a vote in the School of Business with a majority favoring the proposal.
Senator Krasnoff expressed the following concerns:

- The major has a very large number of hours, which he thought is a problem in a liberal arts environment in which elective hours allow for exploration.

- He thought that it might actually be better for real estate to stay as a concentration of the finance major rather than as a stand alone major. While he said that looking into the proposal himself revealed that the major has a very deep business grounding, there may be an appearance from the outside given the name “Real Estate” that the degree is more limited in focus that it actually is. It might be better for the students’ prospects to not have a separate major but to keep Real Estate as a concentration.

- He asked if there is a connection in the proposal to a donor or a donation that is driving the idea of a separate Real Estate program. If that is part of the history of the proposal, he said, the Senate needs to hear it.

Senator Worzala, responding to Senator Krasnoff’s second question, replied that Real Estate is a wide-ranging topic. Students at the College have the option of going the standard route offered across the country, which is to earn a finance degree with a concentration in real estate. But students here can choose a number of other routes within the proposed Real Estate degree.

Her own informal survey of professionals in the field (emails sent to around 150 people) showed that only a very, very small number thought a real estate concentration would be superior to a full blown major.

She said that there is more specialization in the Real Estate major, but that the differences boil down to three additional required classes, which allow staging from introductory to advanced study. This is strong preparation for work after college and solid foundation for graduate school in Law, an MPA, etc.

Real estate, she added, is a important part of our economy: one out of every four jobs is related to real estate. It’s not just selling houses but involves asset management for large corporations, managing numerous property leases, and other such things.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, said that she would not comment on the proposal itself, but that she felt ”the Faculty Senate is entitled to know the truth” about the School of Business’s vote, which she reported was 27 for, 24 against, and 16 abstentions.

Joe Carson, Senator - SSM, struck by the budget committee’s unanimous statement that it offers no recommendation, but the Senate will be asked to vote up or down on it. He inquired if the proposal could go back to the committee to try to resolve the issues.

The Speaker replied that is is possible for a Senator to move that the proposal go back to a committee.

Senator Carson moved that the proposal be sent back to the Faculty Budget Committee, which was seconded by Senator Anguelova, Mathematics.

Discussion now began on Senator Carson's motion.
**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHHS and Chair of the Budget Committee, observed that the faculty line needed to support the proposed major, a very expensive line, will go through regardless of whether or not the Senate approves the new major. The committee found itself "flummoxed," she said, by the situation because the committee is concerned about cost and this cost will be incurred, regardless.

Tom Ross, Senator - SHSS and member of the Budget Committee argued against the motion to remand: the committee will have the same information it has already reviewed, and the hire will be made, regardless. The committee’s inability to make a recommendation had nothing to do with the merits of the major itself. Remanding is not likely to yield an different recommendation.

Senator Anguelova, on hearing Senators Ross and Eichelberger, withdrew her support for the motion.

**Jocelyn Evans**, Department of Finance, said the new hire will teach in both Finance and Real Estate. There is growing demand for Finance classes (six classes in the summer are filled, for instance). She recognized the expense of the hire, but noted that the quantitative, finance orientation of the hire will allow for collaboration with other quantitative disciplines and specialities at the College. She added that alumni hired by firms such as Goldman Sachs have been asked to work in finance in the real estate sector without prior training and have expressed support for a full major in Real Estate. The new major, she said, is projecting 240-50 majors. Demand is high.

The Provost here suggested voting down the motion to remand, gathering information, and seeking answers to Senator Krasnoff’s questions, and giving the proposal an up or down vote.

The Provost called the question on the motion to remand. It was seconded and unanimously approved on a voice vote.

The motion to remand was defeated by a unanimous voice vote.

**Jason Vance**, Senator - SSM, expressed grave concern about the vote in the School of Business and further expressed concern about attendance in Senate. He called for quorum.

The Speaker and Parliamentarian counted Senators in attendance. With 27 Senators out of 51 present, there was a quorum.

The Speaker here said that, though the hour was growing late, important business remained to be conducted at the meeting.

**Tom Baginski**, Senator - German and Russian Studies, asked for a clarification: are students not allowed to double major in Real Estate and Business Administration, and if so, is that due to too much overlap?

Senator Worzala said that the school is pulling away from double majors with Business Administration, though the students can do concentrations. Finance, too, cannot be part of a double major.

**Alan Shao**, Dean of the School of Business, said that Real Estate is a very specific area, and the market is asking for specialists, not generalists. Combined with the liberal arts focus of the College, the student-centered approach, and our connections to the business community, he asserted, the Real Estate program will be unique and very strong. And he added that the business community is ready to hire our graduates (he characterized the
business community as "waiting by the phone" to hear the outcome of the night's vote on the major), and our graduates will be ready to work at commencement.

Weishen Wang, Chair of the Department of Finance, agreed that, on the expense side, a new hire in Finance is, in fact, expensive (he gave the figure of $125,000), but considered from the revenue side, the picture is different because 57% of Finance students pay out-of-state tuition, paying he said $28,900 annually for 30 credit hours, as opposed to the $10,900 paid by in-state students. He asserted that, in the Finance department, "each colleague ... contributes $2.4 million cash each year," because "every faculty member generates 283 credit hours per semester (over 560 each year), the majority from out-of-state." So, on the cost side, Finance professors are more expensive, but they "generate huge revenue."

He also argued that the Real Estate major provides a specialization in demand in the job market. He concluded that the numbers will bear out a strong case for the major, and he offered to provide them.

Jason Vance, Senator - SSM, agreed that Professor Weishen made a "strong business argument," but questioned why the vote in the School of Business does not indicate strong support in the school itself. He characterized the numbers provided by Senator DeLaurell as demonstrating divisiveness.

Professor Weishen replied that many faculty who talked to him in his office said that the new major is a natural extension of the finance program and the real estate concentration. He added, however, that at times there can a tense relationship between administrators and faculty members.

Senator Worzala added here that the Department of Finance voted unanimously in favor. She also said, as she understands it, in the most of the College, only the department, and not the school, conducts such votes. In the School of Business, however, there is a school-wide vote that derives from sharing so many courses across programs.

The Provost addressed Senator Vance's question as well, cautioning that he cannot speak to individual's votes in the school.

He said that this goes back to the third question from Senator Krasnoff. A major donor supported the Real Estate program at the College, with the idea of it becoming a major. Relations with the donor, however, were, in the Provost's opinion, poorly handled (not, however, in Institutional Advancement, he specified). Reticent to speak in a public forum to the details, the Provost went on to speculate that School of Business faculty outside of Finance, hearing of the missteps, may have voted in the negative or abstained based on judgments perhaps independent of the academic and financial merits of the program.

On the approved faculty line, the Provost said that he committed to the line in light of the College's original commitment to three Real Estate positions going back several years, prior to the recession, and his belief that there will be a good return on the line and the ability of that faculty member to teach both Finance and Real Estate courses. The commitment to the line is part of the College's planned and ongoing support of the program, whether the major is approved or if the program remains in its current form for now.
The Provost said that he would be happy, as he imagined would Senator Worzala, the Dean of the School of Business, and other Business faculty present, to field any questions that can be answered in a public forum.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, pointing out that the Budget Committee registered its objection to the process and the Provost had just responded, offered this as reason to hope that the President will support Professor Olejniczak’s resolution, approved at the beginning of the present meeting.

He suggested that the question before the Senate now required that Senators set aside matters of process pertaining to the faculty line and consider the Real Estate major on its merits and whether or not we think it will serve College of Charleston students. Senator Kelly said he believes it will, and he intended to vote for it. He added that he hopes Senators vote for or against the proposal on its merits and not based on the baggage that is going along with it.

Dean Shao agreed with Senator Kelly’s sentiment. He said that the proposal will serve CofC students very well. There is already demand in the minor and the concentration, and, he said, based on what he has heard from the community, enthusiasm for the new major is high. The timing is good, as well, in terms of the overall real estate market in the city.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, pointing out that resistance to the proposal is now being represented as having only to do with the process and an assumption that, had the process gone a better way, there would be no substantive objections to the proposal. Senator Krasnoff said that his concern is that because of this vexed process, the Senate may not be hearing the substantive objections of those who opposed it in the school. Many voted against it, and, he said, that he did not think they were all objecting to the process. Many of them had substantive objections, he thought. He said he would like to hear these objections and would feel better if the Senate could hear objections from faculty in the School of Business. Then the Senate could assess them.

He expressed deep concern that the reason we are not hearing objections is that there is something very wrong happening. There were 16 abstentions: "that strikes me as an environment," he asserted, "in which people are not willing to say what they think." This and the proposal’s background, he added, is very disconcerting.

Nathaniel Walker, Department of Art and Architectural History, speaking to Dean Shao’s earlier comments, expressed agreement. He said the Real Estate is a "perfect major for Charleston" and majors would dovetail very well into the MA program just approved.

Senator Worzala, replying to Senator Krasnoff’s comments, said that there was a meeting with the entire School of Business faculty. The vote was conducted by secret ballot, electronically. At the meeting, no one, she said, spoke against the proposal. Professor Robert Pitts, not part of the Real Estate group, represented the proposal to the Academic Planning Committee. No one, she also said, approached her with dissent about the proposal. The proposal has been free of negatives, except for the resource issue, on which the Provost decided without the prompting of the Real Estate group. She mentioned in this connection that on her own hiring, she was told of plans to hire two additional Real Estate faculty as part of plan originating now ten year ago.
Steve Litvin, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, specifying that he has been more of an observer of this process than a participant. He said that the abstentions may just be absences.

Senator Worzala pointed out that the vote was electronic. Senator Litvin countered that the meeting lacked full attendance. He said that abstentions are accounted for by either those people not "hitting the button" or not in attendance.

He also supported Senator Worzala's observation that pushback on the proposal was resource-based, not on the academic merit. There was no argument of whether it was academically meritorious.

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, said that the emerging argument seemed to be that the Senate should vote on the merits of the major, but that the School of Business faculty did not, themselves, do that.

Senator Litvin and Worzala disagreed with Senator Greenberg's characterization.

Senator Litvin, prompted for more information by Senator Greenberg, characterized what dissent there was as amounting to, "I'm not going to approve your major, until you get me a line." He added that on the academic merits, certainly the positives were presented.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, suggested that, based on the numbers Senator DeLaurell provided, voter turn out was low.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, said that at the meeting in question, he heard arguments against the proposal on its merits. He said, therefore, that is not entirely accurate to say that only issue for faculty in the School of Business was a resource issue.

Tom Baginski, Senator - German and Russian Studies, inquired how many Real Estate minors are currently enrolled who might be said to be inline to take the new major?

Senator Worzala reported that in a survey of 230 students in an early Finance class, 226 said they would consider a major in Real Estate. She added that 93 students are declared in either the minor or concentration.

Senator Krasnoff, Philosophy, suggested that, at this point, the Senate would be voting on whether it wants a major in particular, versus sticking with the traditional model of a concentration or minors. He said he is still persuaded that the latter might look better for students on the market. He discounted the idea that not being a major makes the program "not real." He expressed his intent to vote against the proposal.

The Provost said he believes in the academic merits of the proposal. He added that the donor business is unfortunate, but it should not drive voting decisions on the proposal. The ultimate question is whether students are better served by a major in Real Estate than they are with the current program.

The Provost called the question, which was seconded, and carried on a unanimous voice vote.

The proposal was approved on a non-unanimous voice vote.
D. **Motion: Form a new standing Senate committee known as the Adjunct Oversight Committee** ([PDF](#))

Elizabeth Baker, Senator - English

The Speaker explained that the motion, like all motions that seek to change the faculty by-laws, if seconded, will have to go to the Committee on the By-laws and Faculty/Administration Manual for further review.

Senator Baker presented the motion, noting that it grew out of the work Senator Eichelberger did as a Faculty Administrative Fellow exploring adjunct faculty issues and policies, on which she reported (Best Practices for Adjunct Faculty) in the April 5 session of the present meeting.

Senator Baker specified that the committee would not replace the work on adjunct faculty of other committees, but make that work centralized, collected, and monitored.

Alex Kasman, Senator - SSM, seconded the motion.

**Questions / Discussion**

Jon Hakkila, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, asked if any problems might arise in seating the committee, considering the particular qualifications stated as they are in the motion.

The Speaker suggested the by-laws committee could take up this concern.

There were no further questions.

E. **Resolution from the Provost to Award Degrees** ([PDF](#))

The Provost asked unanimous consent to waive the reading of the motion and secured it. There was a second. The Provost then asked unanimous consent to call the question. There was a second and the question was called by unanimous voice vote.

The resolution passed by unanimous vote.

7. **Constituent’s Concerns**

The Speaker recognized Faculty Secretary Mike Duvall for three years of “dutifully and almost ‘verbatimly’ transcribing” the Senate’s doings. Cheers and applause rained down on the unsuspecting scrivener, who humbly and deeply thanked the body.

Joe Carson, Senator - SSM, expressing a concern brought to him, noted that our syllabuses have been getting longer and longer over time, “partly motivated by our legal department or sometimes our disciplinary committees.” The length, however, may be contributing to fewer students reading our syllabuses, which is not being taken into account, he relayed, by those who are requiring and motivating longer syllabuses.

Senator Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked that the Senate also recognize and thank the Speaker, Parliamentarian, and Secretariat for their work. Applause rang out.

A motion to adjourn was heard and unanimously approved.

8. **Adjournment: 7:57 PM.**