Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 8 December 2015

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 8 December 2015 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order: 5:08
2. Minutes of the 3 November 2015 regular meeting were approved.
3. Announcements and Information
   Speaker Mc Nerney reminded Senators to sign the meeting roll and noted that hard copies of a report (PDF) by the Faculty Budget Committee have been distributed and that he will make this hard copy report part of his Speaker’s report and, thus, it will be included in the meeting record.
4. Reports
   A. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney
      The Speaker announced that, as indicated in an email he distributed to the faculty, there will be a special meeting of the Faculty Senate on January 19, 2016, the intent of which is to allow focused time and attention on budget matters and their impact on strategic priorities. Also, more broadly, he said, shared governance will be a subject of discussion. Senators and other interested faculty will set the specifics of the agenda via responses collected in an online survey the Speaker will send out shortly. He added that he will invite representatives from campus offices to give responses to questions and participate in discussion. As specified by Senate by-laws, the agenda for this meeting will be distributed one week ahead of the meeting. The meeting, he added, by virtue of being set off from regular Senate business, will allow for focused discussion.
      The Speaker also reported that he had just returned from the SACSCOC meeting in Houston, at which he attended sessions and spent a significant amount of time in a resource room researching other institutions’ responses to SACSCOC reviews, including their responses that did not, ultimately, meet SACSCOC standards.
      He described the meeting as “quite illuminating.” He thanked those from the College who attended and all the faculty and staff who are hard at work on our own reaffirmation efforts in numerous ways and offered praise for how much has been accomplished in a short amount of time.
      On the timeline for SACS reaffirmation, he noted that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning has created websites with detailed calendar information and these have been linked to from the Faculty Senate webpage [see the link on “SACSCOC Reaffirmation Information”].
      He also reported that a particular focus of reaffirmation efforts has been in cleaning up, revising, and developing new policies. On the latter, he said these will be vetted by our standing faculty and Senate committees.
The Speaker noted that an enormous amount of work has been done and is being done to meet our challenges, both those of reaffirmation and of our financial realities. In the face of these challenges, “our commitment to our students and their education,” he said, “is as strong as it ever has been.” He added that “[he is] confident that by working together and always keeping that commitment in the forefront of our minds we can meet these challenges.”

The Speaker closed by mentioning the printed Faculty Budget Committee report (PDF) that he distributed and said that this report will be officially part of the record of the meeting. While he said he will not directly address the report, it will be available via link on the Senate website and in the meeting minutes.

Questions / Discussion

Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Science (SHSS), asked the Speaker if there will be an opportunity to discuss the Faculty Budget Committee report.

The Speaker said that it could be discussed, but that such discussion might be better following the Provost’s report, since he would likely raise the budget in his remarks.

B. Provost McGee

The Provost thanked Senators and guests present at the meeting for taking the time at the end of the semester to attend to the needs of the College.

The Provost opened his remarks by saying that he felt obligated to respond to a recent event in our community. Replying to the proposal offered by a leading presidential candidate in Mount Pleasant on December 7 that the federal government should totally ban travel by Muslims into the US, the Provost said it would violate Constitutional principles and international treaties, characterized the candidate’s words as "risible and offensive," and expressed deep embarrassment that the candidate's proposal was met with applause in our community. The Provost, stipulating that the College takes no position on political candidates, said that we should "recognize this candidate's words for what they were: religious bigotry of the rankest sort." He added that "[the] suggestion that a religious test should be used to determine entry into the United States or access to an education at an institution like the College of Charleston is inimical to the values of this great university," and reaffirmed that "all students, all faculty, all staff, without regard to their religious beliefs, are welcome in this academic community."

Applause followed.

Undergraduate Catalogs

The Provost reminded the Senate that at the November meeting (PDF), he took the position that it would be in the College’s best interest to combine the College's two separate undergraduate catalogs (one for the AB, BA, and BS degrees, the other for the BPS [Bachelor of Professional Studies] degree, and only that degree, consistent with the description of that degree to the Senate in 2012).
He argued at that time, he noted, that it would be both financially advantageous and advantageous on the grounds of principle to combine the two catalogs. This discussion continued on Yammer for another couple of weeks, with several members of the Senate and the faculty contributing.

He extracted from these discussions some key ideas:

- our catalogs have been exclusively online for several years, with very few hard copies printed for internal use only
- catalogs provide complete lists of degree requirements and cross-referencing to other catalogs is quite uncommon, he said, as was a subject of recent discussion at the SACSCOC meeting
- the costs of maintaining separate catalogs is primarily a labor cost added to the initial software set up costs
- websites for the School of Professional Studies and the BPS could be better aligned with the rest of the College’s academic program websites, particularly if we adopt a one-College attitude with the catalog and an explanation of why all the programs are consolidated in a single catalog

The Yammer discussion, he added, spoke as well to the nature of the BPS, the relationship between all four undergraduate degrees, and to the College's liberal arts commitment.

The Provost said that, while he respects all the questions raised in the discussion, particularly those related to a shared identity of undergraduates at the College, he still finds the financial and principled grounds he offered for combining the catalogs compelling. He added that if Senators feel otherwise, a Senator could consider offering a motion to that effect in order for the Senate to make their position known definitively. There have been opportunities for dialogue, he said, but the Registrar's office at this point needs a final decision for production purposes.

**Policy Development and the Time-Conflict Registration Form**

The Provost mentioned several policies under development and review, and he expressed thanks for faculty efforts on these: course numbering, syllabi, undergraduate program review. Significant work is underway as well, he said, on a faculty credentials policy, materials on which will be circulated very soon, beginning with academic administrators.

He then turned to a policy that he said "has never existed" governing time-conflict registration. For around 20 years there has been a form available from the Registrar’s office that, when signed by appropriate authorities, allowed students to register for classes that conflict in a way that makes it impossible for the student to attend the full sessions and/or semester duration of both classes. The form and implied policy is puzzling. Aside from the obvious question of how it is reasonable for a student to be enrolled in two classes that conflict in such a way, there is another question of how this situation does not violate credit-hour policies necessary for regional accreditation and that assume students spend a
certain amount of time present in face-to-face classes. Additionally, the policy would allow students to miss critical content at the beginning and end of classes (even safety instructions). These forms are very rarely used, according to Interim Registrar Bergstrom. Finally, there is no evidence, the Provost said, that any prior Provost approved the form or that the Faculty Senate did so or any faculty committee did so: it appears to have emerged as a "customer service" accommodation.

For these reasons, he reported, he has withdrawn the form. However, should there be a faculty member who wishes to use the form due to a prior discussion with a student and a department chair, then this can be handled on a case-by-case basis in Academic Affairs.

He said that very soon, subsequent to review by the Academic Standards Committee, Financial Aid, and other units over the next few weeks, he hopes the form will be discontinued indefinitely due to the potential harm it may cause to accreditation efforts and because it is not in the spirit of providing the best education for our students. He thanked the Interim Registrar for raising concern about the form.

**The Budget**

The Provost asserted that the College's financial fundamentals are "as strong as they have ever been," yet, he said, faculty concern about their own courses and programs and concerns for the future of the institution are understandable and we can have productive discussions about these concerns. In the past decade, the College has not increased enrollments, but state dollars have essentially decreased, added to which in the past five years, we have not been able to increase tuition above the rate of inflation. Additionally, our attempt to slightly increase our non-resident student population has failed.

The Provost reminded the Senate of the President’s report at the September meeting ([PDF](#)), in which he discussed the need to offset budget shortfalls and in which he asked the Senate to endorse changes to assist our outreach to nontraditional students, a public mission that the Provost said has notable antecedents in evening extension classes the College offered in the 1940s and "aggressive" non-traditional enrollment efforts in the 1970s and 80s. The efforts at recruiting non-traditional students, however, have fallen off more recently.

The Provost said that Academic Affairs, the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Budget Committee, and others have responded to the President’s call in both the areas of budget and expanding outreach to non-traditional students, and he expects continued consultation on the budget in the next few weeks. He congratulated the Senate, in particular, for approving changes in the BPS program to support non-traditional students, which aids the College financial, and more importantly, he said, demonstrates our commitment to our public mission.

Our early efforts to offset budgetary shortfalls, the Provost said, relied on incomplete data and underestimated the shortfall. He noted that in many meetings with the Faculty Budget committee, he has discussed the methodology
employed and what has been learned about how projections are made. He welcomed questions from the Senate and faculty both to himself and to any other member of the administration about the budget process.

He said that in the numerous discussions about the budget, concerns of the values our budget reflects have been raised in the context of an institution in which the faculty have done excellent work with very limited resources, where budgets have been stretched to the limit to invest in additional quality, and where progress on meeting goals in our strategic plan has been slower than we would like. We have had good success in fundraising by College standards, he said, but the effect of this fund raising will not really be felt for a few years.

He specified the priorities he will keep front and center as he participates in efforts to address the additional budget shortfall: meeting our general education obligations and protecting the ability of students to graduate with their majors and minors on time. He added that budget discussions will be guided by the strategic plan (with its emphasis on academic excellence, student focus, and importance of place) and the recently revised mission statement (with the added long-term capacity to develop targeted research and graduate programs in a setting of continued emphasis on undergraduate programs and professional programs in Business and Education). The College will remain a public liberal arts and sciences institution with targeted graduate and professional programs, and "our future," he said, "will be secured by our ability to articulate and defend our liberal arts focus, reimagined for the 21st century and beyond, in a public university that is responsive to community and state needs." Thus, the College is likely to evolve over time, as it has in the past, and "the process of shared governance will shape our future."

Of the budget, he said, we can anticipate more cuts and more adjustments over the coming year. Cuts will be distributed through such offices as the President's, Student Affairs, Business Affairs, Marketing and Communications, Institutional Advancement, but Academic Affairs will also be subject to adjustments, which, he said, is to be expected in a large institution with significant fixed costs. He said that he has been consulting with and will continue consultations with the Faculty Budget Committee, the Academic Counsel, and the Counsel of Deans. He added that Academic Affairs is soliciting ideas from the Budget Committee and academic leaders across campus, and he invited faculty to share their creative and prudent ideas on the Academic Affairs budget through their various representatives or via direct communication. The budgeting process will begin in January, with a movement from ideas to actions to finalize reductions for the year and then to transition into a transparent and open budgetary planning process for next year.

He closed by noting the significant challenges ahead, both in resetting the budget and financial footing of the College and what he expects to be a very rigorous SACSCOC reaffirmation process. He asked on behalf of the President and himself for the faculty's help in these matters and in recruiting an excellent class of new students for the 2016-17 year. He closed by expressing confidence in the bright
future of the College, noted that we are "maturing as a modern mid-sized university," and that "we have exciting opportunities in the future for the preservation of all that we hold dear and for our great traditions, but also for the continuing reinvention, revitalization, and reimagining of our undergraduate and graduate programs, consistent with President McConnell’s vision for access, affordability, and inclusiveness at a nationally-preeminent, public liberal arts and sciences university."

He thanked the faculty and asked for questions.

Questions / Discussion

Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), pointed to a number of unanswered questions in the Budget Committee's report and particularly to the offices that have yet to provide information requested by the Budget Committee, specifically Athletics. He said that it would be very helpful to the committee if they could get the information requested in order to discuss matters such as the amount of the Athletics fee and in order to provide this information to the Senate in advance of the special meeting in January.

The Provost replied that he has spoken to the President about the need for this information, and the President agrees that there should be no reason why it cannot be provided.

Alex Kasman, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), raised the issue of the merging of two undergraduate catalogs, saying that the particular issue has raised deeper concerns. He pointed out that a faculty survey about 10 years back demonstrated that faculty find that the common general education requirement for AB, BA, and BS students is central to the identity of the College. While the BPS, as approved by the Senate after that initial survey, has a different general education requirement, a recent, though small, survey that he conducted on Yammer still indicated that a common general education requirement is a key component of the College's identity. He argued that this suggests that the faculty see the BPS as a separate program from the AB, BA, and BS degrees. This sense of separateness, Senator Kasman said, was reflected in the original charge that the BPS's catalog be separate, not only for our own purposes but also to communicate the difference to students and parents.

Senator Kasman likened our situation to that of a business that has two separate brands, such as Holiday Inn and Holiday Inn Express, in which the parent company spends some money in keeping the two brands separate for potential customers. He asserted that unless a unified catalog can make clear the distinction between the BPS and the other undergraduate degrees, the Senate ought to consider the expense of maintaining separate catalogs worthwhile (although we should try to minimize it), a necessary cost to keep the distinction clear.

The Provost replied with what he characterized as "raising one bit of trouble": before 1971, he said, the College had separate general education requirements for its AB, BA, and BS degrees. Thus, the single general education requirement is
a feature of the modern College of Charleston and should not be seen as a feature of the College's identity going back further than 1971.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHHS, agreed with Kasman that there is great value in the common general education requirements for the AB, BS, and BA degrees, but given that the Senate has already approved the BPS with its differing general education requirements, she said she is less concerned with keeping the catalogs separate. She asked the Provost for further information, perhaps to be brought to a future meeting, about the great expense of maintaining two separate catalogs.

The Provost in his reply deferred to Interim Registrar Mary Bergstrom.

Bergstrom said the College will be using DigArc software (Acalog) to build and maintain its catalog. A second element provided by DigArc is a curriculum development software package called Curriculog, which provides a streamlined electronic workflow for curriculum changes. She explained that the catalog and curriculum processes use a common database. If required to maintain a separate catalog for the BPS, we will have to maintain two separate databases because BPS students can have a minor, and so all of the undergraduate courses offered for non-BPS students are available to BPS students as well and need to be included in their catalog.

Another concern, she said, is that there is automation in the Acalog software such that a curriculum change will automatically update the catalog. With two separate catalogs, the BPS catalog will have to updated manually (an additional operation).

Bergstrom also noted that people may be thinking about the issue of the two catalogs through the lens of printed materials, yet we moved away from a printed catalog two years ago. The situation we are in is more like a website. Endorsing Senator Kasman's comparison of the two catalogs to Holiday Inn and Holiday Inn Express, Bergstrom pointed out that from those hotels' parent company website (ihg.com), you can follow links out to the separate brand hotel chains. The College’s catalog will have links taking students out to the requirements of the BPS and to the other degrees. The lens of the printed catalog does not well represent our current catalog reality.

To have the second database built, she added, have to pay an extra cost. It would also increase the workload for the catalog manager and require additional support due the increased data management needed. The immediate cost she said, when prompted by the Provost for specific numbers, would be $3,000 to add the second undergraduate database with an added recurring cost of $20,000 for the support staff required to update the separate database.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, expressed concern that including the BPS alongside the other degrees even in a list on a website may increase the likelihood of confusion between the BPS, which as she said, is a "completely different animal" (different admission standards, different requirements) and the other degrees. The confusion might occur on the part of an interested 18 year old or a parent, but it could also occur with the general
public or potential employers. She added that $20,000 might not be too high a price to pay to eliminate the potential confusion.

The Provost responded that the BPS's minimum age requirements are posted in the materials repeatedly.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, sought clarification: it's not a matter a one or two catalogs but of perhaps two different websites built from a single database?

Bergstrom agreed with this characterization and assured the Senate that whatever the front end of the catalog is, the Registrar's office will take great care in differentiating the BPS from the other degree programs to ensure that the kind of confusion Senator DeLaurell is concerned about does not occur. She said that the only potential confusion would be at the point of choosing a link to click, but once a link is followed all will be clear.

Rick Heldrich, Senator - SSM, said that he understand's Senator Kasman's concerns and agrees with them but that his concerns are misplaced. When one goes to the websites of schools that have systems such as this, like Johns Hopkins, Georgetown, and so on, you cannot find a catalog in the sense of a single document. Instead, he said, there is "a bunch of data" from which is delivered specific and limited information on the click of a link. Clicking on a link on a BA in a particular program will deliver information specifically limited to that program. Senator Heldrich reported that he spent about an hour and a half online trying to find a catalog and came up empty: there are just databases that deliver limited information on clicks.

He added that the entire CofC issue might be resolved if we could see what we are talking about.

Dan Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, added that what the Interim Registrar is speaking to is how the catalog operates "under the hood," and what is involved in trying to maintain two separate databases in order to keep the BPS absolutely separate from the other programs, with attendant costs and possibilities for error. He said that paying for a separate database and maintenance appears to not be required in order to reach the goal of differentiating the BPS. That could be done on the front end.

He added that he served on the committee that selected the software, and the software is streamlined and will offer a significant boost for the work of the curriculum committee.

Senator Kasman asserted that he would not be satisfied if "BPS" is just another choice along with "BA," "BS," and "AB," because a clear distinction between the BPS and the other three is what he would like to see. That said, he agreed that such a separation could be achieved on the front end in how the information is presented. He added that his desire has been to see how it will be presented before we agree to combine the catalogs. The distinction must be clear and the the BPS not be presented as merely one more choice, no different in kind from the rest.
The Provost said that draft mock-ups could be easily supplied to the Senate. Bergstrom agreed, adding that currently DigArc has our catalogs and is coding. We should have it in late January.

She raised a separate point as well: many DigArc customers have completely eliminated PDFs. She added that Charleston Southern’s faculty found this unacceptable when they went with DigArc and after a year went back to providing access to PDFs. We have a choice to provide a PDF export of our catalog. She added that currently, with the information we have, our printout would be about 800 pages.

-----

Questions about the catalog during Q & A for the Provost’s report ended at this point. Provost McGee added that if there is no motion forthcoming at this meeting regarding the catalog, the process will be to announce a time when people can come to look at a mock-up on the catalog as scribed when it becomes available.

Discussion of the catalogs returned in the Constituents’ Concerns section of the meeting (below) and closed with a motion.

-----

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, returning to the issue of the time-conflict registration form, asked if the use of the time-conflict registration form has become more popular since the move of Computer Science to Harborwalk and a ten minute offset added in the schedule of their classes.

The Provost deferred to SSM Dean Auerbach, who said that offset is more than ten minutes.

Associate Provost Conseula Francis added that this change has not affected the frequency of the use of the form.

Dean Auerbach added that he has not had a single complaint about schedules related to the move.

Note: Senator Krasnoff’s queries and comments below came slightly later, after the question about the budget posed by Senator Greenberg below, but as they speak to the time-conflict form, I included them at this point in the record. - JMD

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked who approves the time-conflict form.

The Provost replied that there have been different iterations of the form, but in its most recent iteration, it had to be printed by a chair and signed off by that chair and any other chair or program director who might be involved. It would be then seen by the Registrar but only flagged for further review by the Associate Provost for curriculum in the case of a form being deemed suspicious for some reason.

Senator Krasnoff said that a student might have a need for the time-conflict form when she is trying to complete a program or minor and there is only one section
of a needed class and there is a conflict with another. He asked if, in such a scenario, there might be an exception offered if the student took an equivalent independent study.

The Provost agreed that in such a case a student and chair might make avail of the exception management policy. This concern also calls to mind, the Provost said, the advantages of longer cycles of planning in majors, particularly those with many lab or studio requirements, which he said was a discussion also raised in the recent Academic Council meeting.

-----

Dan Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, inquired about the budget, asking the Provost to speak to why we heard about the additional $600,000 shortfall in the budget at the time we heard about it.

The Provost explained that never before has the College made a mid-year adjustment prior to having all the official fall semester financial numbers (after all deadlines for withdrawal and pulling cash out of the system have passed, and so on), but we did this year because we knew we had a higher-than-anticipated melt in the incoming freshman class and that we would not, as a consequence, make the numbers. The Board of Trustees adopted a proactive stance because cutting earlier in the year is better than cutting later in the year. The idea, he said, was to create from partial data, unofficial data, and projection a model for fall and spring revenues, which had never been done before. The model did not work, and we ended up being off substantially.

The Provost added that what we learned from the experience was to be reluctant to build such a model again because having two rounds of mid-year budget reduction is "agonizing" and "distracting." The College did its "level best," with people working hard to create a model they thought would work, but it didn't.

Greenberg followed up by inquiring "when does the next shoe drop?" When would another correction be needed?

The Provost said that he cannot speak with absolute confidence but that he believes the adjustment that Senator Greenberg asked about will be the last for the year. Even if we prove to be off in projections for the rest of the year, he added, there should be enough in cash reserve to cover it, and it would be sensible to use the cash reserve for this.

Kendall Deas, Senator - Adjunct, inquired if the need for cuts are endemic to the College or if other state institutions like USC or Clemson are experiencing these problems as well.

The Provost said that nationally it's a "mixed bag," but he said he does not know if other four-year institutions in the state are going through similar adjustments to ours, given that they all use different budgeting models. There are only a couple that have a high presence of non-resident students. Clemson, who have a similar non-resident discounting model to ours, does not seem to be having problems meeting their non-resident student needs. USC and Coastal Carolina,
on the other hand, have aggressive non-resident discounting that brings those students somewhere close to resident tuition. There are not many in-state comparisons, he said, that we can make. But universities that are trying to hold down tuition costs are having a difficult time making ends meet.

There were no further questions or discussion.

C. **Lowcountry Graduate Center** *(PDF)*

Nancy Muller, Director and Associate Dean

Muller said that she hoped her presentation would show some pathways that the College might explore for increasing enrollment of part-time, older graduates living and working in the Lowcountry.

*Please see the presentation slides (PDF).*

Muller explained (slide 1) that the Lowcountry Graduate Center (LGC) was created by local politicians to draw on the resources of the College of Charleston, the Citadel, and MUSC to provide graduate education to meet the needs of the local workforce and to build the talent pool in the area in order to attract more businesses. The LGC is a state-funded entity, governed by representatives of the boards of trustees of the three schools. Muller added that as Director she reports to the Provosts of the three institutions, but that she also works on behalf of the local workforce and employers.

Access is a central focus of the LGC in terms of location and class times. The LGC shares a North Charleston facility, replete with state-of-the-art technology, with the College’s School of Professional Studies (SPS). The LGC and the SPS share costs of some personnel—library, reception, IT. The LGC, she said, tries to offer a "high touch, high tech" environment for its students, some of whom may be a hundred or more miles away from their home campuses (slide 2).

She explained that the LGC has no programs or faculty of its own and is not responsible for student learning outcomes. Rather, it is a facilitator, a portal for programs and serves by design as a bridging agent between academia and local employers.

She reported that nearly 800 students have graduated from the LGC in the last five years (slide 4), and she shared a list of current program offerings at the LGC (slide 5), noting that new additions to the list have come from Clemson (MS in Mechanical Engineering) and the University of South Carolina (Master of Social Work and MS in Engineering Management).

She explained that the LGC supports different class meeting times (including Saturday) and formats (slide 6). The Clemson Engineering program’s classes offers live, synchronous streaming classes in which the faculty travel back and forth from the main campus to the LGC, conducting sessions from both locations in the course of a semester. Up to fifty students at Clemson meet simultaneously with around ten at the LGC, and they can see and talk to each other live. Lectures given at both locations are recorded on site and archived for student use later.
There are several new programs set to launch at the LGC soon (slide 7), and these new programs reflect, Muller noted, three "major target sectors" for new programs: advanced manufacturing, engineering services, software development, and IT; health services management and community wellness; and pre-K through 12 teacher education and administration.

This targeting is based on research and feedback from employers, chambers of commerce, and the Charleston Regional Development Alliance (CRDA) (slide 8). The graph in slide 8 derives from the work of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce and the CRDA, with help of two consulting groups. The medical area of employment is very strong. The study concluded that the medical area is the single largest employer filling advertised jobs in the area. K-12 is a target section (though not strongly represented on the chart) because education is central to developing the region's workforce.

The LGC has several advisory councils comprised largely of hiring managers (slide 9). In addition, the LGC is undertaking some consumer research on its own, gathering data from prospective graduate students living in the area.

Muller pointed out that students at the LGC are not the LGC’s students, per se, but enroll in the institution that offers the program they are pursuing. The only role LGC has in recruiting students is through public awareness campaigns. Tuition dollars (slide 10) are paid directly to the programs' institutions and never pass through the LGC itself. For engineering and high tech programs, she added, at least half of the tuition is paid by or reimbursed by employers, bolstering the security of those enrollments.

Engineering programs at the LGC compete with online offerings from UCLA and NC State. Billboard advertising gets the message out (slide 11). Advertising focuses on easy access (location, hours, parking, in-state tuition) to high quality education from accredited universities. She pointed out, however, that there is no longer state funding to advertise individual programs.

Slides 14-16 focus on outreach. The LGC helped secure the Governor's proclamation of "Manufacturing Week" in South Carolina (14) and used that as a springboard for outreach to high school students via mentoring toward careers in manufacturing (15). This event help build awareness of the LGC and, indirectly, helps build a pipeline for future students. To kindle literacy education, the LGC sponsored in October "Begin with Books," an organization affiliated with Dolly Parton's Imagination Library (slide 16). In January, the LGC will host an open house for teachers and others interested in teaching, focusing attention on programs offered by the Citadel and the College of Charleston at the LGC.

95% of the LGC's budget (slide 17) comes from the state, Muller pointed out, and the LGC is enjoined from seeking foundation funding or soliciting funding in other ways. Reflected in the expense lines at the top of the slide, the LGC pays about a third of the College of Charleston's total occupancy expenses on the North Campus (lease, utilities, maintenance, and other costs) and pays a fee to the College for services such as procurement and HR. About a third of the
personnel costs (including benefits and related expenses) are for the shared staff. All totaled, about three-quarters of the LGC’s annual state appropriation, she pointed out, goes directly to the College of Charleston. The remainder the LGC can spend on dedicated staff, marketing, and communications.

The LGC’s challenge, she said, is to build the talent pool in the Lowcountry, rather than leaving employers no choice but to recruit talent from out of state to fill some of their highest paid jobs. To do so, the LGC, she pointed out, has to rely on faculty willing to take on the challenge of hybrid course design, travel, and weekend teaching.

Questions / Discussion

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, inquired about the decreasing pattern of tuition earned from College of Charleston graduate programs from 2011-15 (slide 10), asking why that is the case.

Muller replied that the College had a program in Communication that launched at the LGC but was subsequently pulled downtown. The figures point only to graduate program tuition income from the LGC. She added that there have also not been any new programs from the College added at the LGC. The two most successful and continuously growing programs at the LGC have been the Project Management program (Citadel) and the MS in Social Work (USC), and these institutions’ tuition incomes have increased in the same period.

5. Old Business

A. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs
Chair, Jo Ann Ewalt

1. **Environmental Studies**
   New Course Proposal: EVSS 606 – Wildlife Law ([PDF](#))

   There were no questions or discussion.  
   **The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**

2. **Teaching, Learning & Advocacy (MTLA): Program Changes** ([PDF](#))
   - 4 new course proposals (MTLA 668, 671, 672, and 674)
   - 1 program change (adding a new concentration)

   There were no questions or discussion.  
   **The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**

6. New Business

A. **Resolution to Award Degrees, December 2015** ([PDF](#))
   Provost McGee

   The motion was seconded and approved unanimously on a voice vote.
B. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs
   Chair, Jo Ann Ewalt

1. English
   a. ENGL 650, Course Changes (PDF)
      Ewalt explained that the course’s number is 511, not 650.
      There were no questions or discussion.
      The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).
   b. Changes to MA Program (PDF)
      Ewalt noted that all references in the document to ENGL 650 should be
      changed to ENGL 511.
      There were no questions or discussion.
      The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

2. Mathematics
   Program Changes (PDF)
   There were no questions or discussion.
   The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

C. Curriculum Committee
   Gibbs Knotts, Chair

1. Historic Preservation and Community Planning
   Creation of HPCP 222 (Old & Green: Where Heritage Preservation and
   Environmental Conservation Overlap) (PDF)
   There were no questions or discussion.
   The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

2. Management and Marking
   Removal of prerequisites from ENTR 200 (PDF)
   There were no questions or discussion.
   The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

3. Environmental Studies Minor
   a. Add HPCP 222 to the ENVT minor (PDF)
   b. Add GEOL 441 to the ENVT minor (PDF)
   There were no questions or discussion.
   The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

4. Marketing
   Delete the Marketing concentration from BADM (PDF)
   There were no questions or discussion.
   The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).
5. **Computer Science**
   Add CSCI 115 as a prerequisite for CSCI 215; several changes to the prerequisites for CSCI 220, change the prerequisite for CSCI 362 from CSCI 221 (with a C-) to CSCI 230 (with a C-); change the INFS major to add more flexibility to the required business coursework ([PDF](#)).

There were no questions or discussion.  
**The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**

6. **Teacher Education**

   a. *(Read to Success Compliance) – Delete EDEE 374 to EDEL programs; add TEDU/EDFS 436 as an option and require ANTH 101 ([PDF](#)).*

   Bob Perkins, Teacher Education, clarified that a class is not being deleted from the inventory in this proposal, just being deleted from a particular degree. Also, he said there is no such course as EDFS 436 (“a gremlin” that he said keeps returning in the paperwork).

   There were no questions or discussion.  
   **The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**

   b. *(Modify Secondary Education Cognates) – Modify secondary education cognates to include TEDU 325 as a requirement and to allow TEDU 436 as an alternative to EDFS 326 ([PDF](#)).*

   There were no questions or discussion. 
   **The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**

   c. *(Other Changes) – Delete EDEE 327 from the EDEC major; move EDEE 363 within the program (and change its prerequisites); add EDEE/TEDU 436 as an alternative to EDFS 326; change entry requirements; add a prerequisite to EDEE 455, requiring a student to get at least a C- in EDEE 415 ([PDF](#)).*

   Bob Perkins, Teacher Education, explained that there is no such course as EDEE 436.

   There were no questions or discussion.  
   **The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**

7. **Supply Chain and Information Management**

   Create new minor in Information Management, create four new courses INFM 330 (Enterprise Data Management), INFM 350 (Business Analytics), INFM 360 (Special Topics in Information Management), and INFM 390 (Enterprise Resource Planning); add DATA 101 to the prerequisites for INFM 350; change the SCIM 366 prerequisite; and add DSCI 323 to the SCIM electives ([PDF](#)).

There were no questions or discussion.  
**The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).**
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8. New Degree in Meteorology (Physics and Astronomy)
Create a new degree in Meteorology and several new courses (PDF)

Questions/Discussion

Dan Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, asked why the degree is a BA and not a BS.

Lee Linder, Physics and Astronomy, replied that the BA is attuned to the liberal arts population. He added that there is a concentration in the works for Astronomy and Physics students and if that is successful, then a BS could be designed, added to which, there was concern that CHE might object to a BS at this particular time.

The proposal was approved on voice vote (unanimous).

D. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual (Jason Vance, Chair) and The Honors College Committee (Phyllis Jestice, Chair)

Motion to Change Faculty and Administrative Manual for Composition and Duties of Honors College Committee (PDF)

The motion, the Speaker explained, is a "co-motion" of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual (By-laws) and the Honors College Committee (HCC).

Vance reported that HCC sent By-laws the proposal in October, By-laws reviewed it and sent comments and criticisms back to HCC, who addressed the criticisms and sent a revised motion back to By-Laws, who agreed that the criticisms were sufficiently addressed to bring the motion to the Senate for consideration.

Vance summarized the changes that the motion would make to the Faculty By-laws as specified in the document (PDF).

Questions/Discussion

Provost McGee asked how a distinction will be made between the humanities and social sciences faculty, given that some faculty may represent both of these disciplines.

Vance pointed out that the Chair of the committee, Phyllis Jestice, was not present to address concerns and asked if another member of the HCC was present and could answer questions. Dean of the Honors College, Trisha Folds-Bennett agreed to answer questions.

Dean Folds-Bennett said that faculty would be identified as humanities or social science according to how their home departments identifies themselves.

Provost McGee also commented on the language, as revised, of section 13 b. (3):
"To review and make policy decisions concerning the Honors College curriculum, admission and retention standards, and course selection procedures."
He said that he does not interpret this language as overriding the ability or cancelling the authority of other Faculty Senate or college committees relating to academic standards or other curriculum matters that may touch on Honors. If the Senate agrees with his interpretation, the Provost said, it would be helpful that the Senate makes this clear in order to guide various future proposals through the vetting process.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - SHHS, asked if Dean Folds-Bennett would respond to the Provost’s comment. Is it the intent of the motion, Kelly asked, that the HCC makes final decisions or that it makes recommendations to the Senate to changes in the curriculum, policy, and so forth?

Dean Folds-Bennett replied that in the case of anything requiring the input of other committees and, ultimately, the Faculty Senate, the HCC’s decisions are not final but advisory.

Senator Kelly followed up by asking if "policy decisions" regarding the "curriculum" is to the same as "changes to the curriculum"?

Dean Folds-Bennett agreed with Senator Kelly's reading, but further specified that it would also include appeals by students about course requirements and similar matters, not all of which would go to other committees. She said that "'recommendations' would be a change that the HCC would accept, not 'decisions,' but 'recommendations'."

The Speaker asked if the Dean was making a friendly amendment. There was no reply before Senator Krasnoff (Philosophy) spoke.

Senator Krasnoff offered the following suggestion for an amendment: adding "To review and apply policy" in the place of "to review and make policy," and striking "decisions."

Senator Krasnoff asked Dean Folds-Bennett if she would accept this on behalf of the committee as a friendly amendment, to which she agreed. He then asked Chair of By-laws Vance the same, to which he agreed.

With the amendment, section 13 b. (3), now read:

"To review and apply policy concerning the Honors College curriculum, admission and retention standards, and course selection procedures."

Dean Folds-Bennett stipulated that there are, however, cases in which the committee has to recommend policy changes, and she said that she wanted to make sure this is reflected in the motion as well.

Senator Krasnoff said that "review" would include recommendation. He said he is fine with adding "recommend" but that it is not necessary.

The Speaker verified that the amendment as rendered above was accepted by Vance and Folds-Bennett.

**Rick Heldrich**, Senator - SSM, said that he objects to the proposal, "primarily because it continues the bias of the Honors College against Science and Math." He
observed that in the revised language, there will be three representatives, he said, from what he sees as the humanities (a humanities representative, one from Social Science, and one from Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs) and only one from Science and Math. He asserted that "the Honors College program has advised against Science and Math since [he has] been at the College, not intentionally," but perhaps, he said, due to the larger presence of humanities faculty involved in the program. The motion offers an opportunity, he said, to get a wider faculty involvement. He pointed out that the rationale in the motion for a wider disciplinary representation and splitting SHHS representation into humanities and social science representation on the committee actually included an example from science. He closed by saying that we have an opportunity to be more inclusive of the sciences in the HCC, and that it is inappropriate to be debating the motion at 7PM in the last fall meeting. It deserves a debate by the whole faculty.

**Melissa Thomas**, Senator - Adjunct, called for a quorum. The count of Senators was 31, a quorum.

Senator Krasnoff (Philosophy) argued that the motion adds representation for SSM, which does not necessarily exist in the current state of things.

**Senator Krasnoff** offered another amendment to the motion, which he hoped would be accepted as friendly, pertaining to the last sentence of section 13 a. as revised:

"The Dean of the Honors College (or the Dean's designee) is an ex-officio non-voting member of this committee; the dean may also invite an Honors faculty fellow to participate as an ex-officio non-voting member."

He said that "Honors faculty fellow" is not a position defined in the by-laws and asked the Provost to confirm this, to which the Provost replied that there is no such position defined in the by-laws or in the administrative portion of the F/AM. The Provost noted in this connection that there are also a number of position titles referenced in the F/AM that no longer exist, and the only way to edit these out of the portion controlled by the faculty is via Senate vote and faculty ratification, the same process we use for any by-laws changes. The position of "Honors faculty fellow" was approved by the office of the Provost, he said.

Senator Krasnoff observed, then, that the title is "living," but may not always be so. He said he agreed with the principle of this sentence in the motion, however, and offered the following amendment of the final phrase in the last sentence in 13 a., which he hoped would be accepted as friendly:

"the dean may also invite other Honors faculty and staff to participate as an ex-officio non-voting members."

Senator Krasnoff specified that the Dean need not invite more than one such person but may. He also suggested that there is sense in inviting a staff member to serve on the committee. Also, the amendment, he said, would avoid using titles.
Dean Folds-Bennett and Vance accepted the amendment as friendly. The Speaker invited further discussion of the main motion or friendly amendments thereto.

Joe Carson, Senator - SSM, sought and received clarification of what is meant by “friendly.” In this case, the Speaker said, it is friendly if accepted by both the chair of by-laws and Dean Folds-Bennett for the HCC. Their acceptance changes the main motion’s language to reflect the amendments.

Mary Bergstrom, Interim Registrar, called attention to 13. b. (4), as revised:
"To review and rule on written requests from students, faculty members, schools, or departments for exceptions from Honors College regulations and requirements."

She said that it is important, in reference to this item, to be clear that in the exception management process there is already a set group of guidelines used to handle exceptions and anyone wishing to go beyond those guidelines or ask for further exceptions, those would have to go through Academic Affairs and that these policies cannot be ruled on by any other body.

Vance argued that with the motion’s striking out "act upon" and replacing it with "rule on," "review" then covers recommendation by which any further policy applies. The revised language, he said, suggests that there are some things the committee cannot act upon, but they can, rather, make a ruling in support of or against, which could then be bound by the exception management policies. Vance asked Dean Folds-Bennett if this is correct.

Dean Folds-Bennett replied that there are different kinds of regulations and requirements. Some require input from other committees or units. Others, such as applying guidelines on retention, are subject to the committee’s consultation with the Dean, case by case. Matters such as graduation requirements would clearly require consultation beyond the HCC.

Dean Folds-Bennett asked Interim Registrar Bergstrom if the different cases need to be distinguished. Bergstrom replied "yes, if that is at all possible, particularly the exceptions from Honors College regulations and requirements," since those are specifically in the purview of the Honor College.

Vance suggested an analogy. While a faculty member might sign off on (and thereby approve) a student request (such as an override or, up until now, a time-conflict form), but that request will still go through other approvers. The same is true of the HCC’s rulings.

The Provost asked if it would be helpful to distinguish in the motion between catalog requirements and what are other requirements of the Honors College. Is this the distinction?

Dean Folds-Bennett agreed that it would be helpful, though she said she is not sure how to represent the non-catalog requirement side of the distinction.
The Provost posed a hypothetical example. If a student, for some good reason, failed to attend a required number of colloquia (per Honors College internal policy), the HCC could rule on the exception, the policy not being a catalog policy.

Dean Folds-Bennett agreed: these are the kinds of exceptions the HCC would be involved in ruling on.

Vance asked at this point if there is an intent to propose a friendly amendment to the motion or if the discussion record will be sufficient to illuminate the differences between what the HCC can rule on and what it cannot.

At this point, Melissa Thomas, Senator- Adjunct, after consulting with the Speaker and Parliamentarian on the best option, moved that the motion be referred back to the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual. She explained that numerous issues have arisen, the Senate's quorum may be evaporating, and it seems that the motion needs more work.

The motion was seconded.

Senator Krasnoff (Philosophy) inquired if the motion is debated and was answered to the contrary.

**On a voice vote (not unanimous), the motion passed.**

7. **Constituent’s Concerns**

   **Jannette Flinch**, Senator - Library, said that she would like to raise a concern but would defer doing so until the January meeting, when there may be more time for its discussion.

   **Elaine Worzala**, Senator - Finance, expressed concern that the Senate vote on the matter of the catalog, since the Registrar's office needs to move forward on it.

   Melissa Thomas, Senator - Adjunct, pointed out that if the Senate does nothing, the Registrar office will move forward.

   **Alex Kasman**, Senator - SSM, observed that in discussion it became apparent that the term "catalog" may not even apply any more. He suggested that the Senate consider making a statement of some sort that, whatever software is used, there should be an attempt to "conform to the intent" of the requirement that the BPS have a separate catalog, so that a distinction is clear, as it has been with separate, paper catalogs.

   Two or three Senators (unidentified) or audience members (unidentified) expressed doubt that this could be done.

   Senator Kasman suggested one way of doing so: just as at the top level of the catalog website, we will be given a selection of graduate or undergraduate programs, could a third selection be added for the BPS?

   Again, two or three Senators (unidentified) or audience members (unidentified) expressed doubt.
Kasman said that it seems very plausible that such an arrangement could be deployed with a single database.

Associate Provost Conseula Francis asserted that Senator Kasman’s solution would require a separate database, and this is what Academic Affairs and the Registrar’s office is trying to avoid as both expensive and duplicative of effort.

Julia Eichelberger, Senator - SHSS, asked for a clarification of the Senate’s role in the decision. Is this a matter of consultative courtesy or does the Senate have control over the College’s catalog? "It sounds like you’re saying," she said, "‘we’ve made the decision and unless you talk us out of it, we’re going ahead with it.’ Is that correct?"

"That is correct," the Provost replied; however, he also stipulated that if the majority of the Senate said they want two separate databases with the additional expense, "I will honor that decision."

Jason Vance, Senator - SSM, followed up Senator Kasman’s suggestion. Can’t HTML hyperlinks be deployed in such a way as to make the program distinction clear at the top page of the website?

Associate Provost Francis replied that this is what will happen.

Senator Vance asked if the website will have top-level, separate links to the undergraduate catalog, graduate catalog, and Professional Studies catalog.

Associate Provost Francis said that the catalog will have all the schools in which we offer undergraduate degrees. One of those schools will be the School of Professional Studies, where we offer the BPS, and on clicking that link, the user will be taken to all the BPS information.

Hector Qirko, Senator - Sociology and Anthropology, said that the process for deliberation on this matter seems to be out of sorts. He asked if the discussion should be occurring in a relevant committee, which could then advise the Senate as a whole, rather than the Senate’s spending a great deal of time as a body trying to figure out the nuts and bolts of an issue that may turn out to be trivial in the end.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, suggested that one solution to the problem would be to let the administration go forward with their plan for a year, after which the Senate could review it and vote accordingly to keep things as they currently are or revert to the prior mode.

Kunkle specified that we make a new catalog every year. Interim Registrar Bergstrom said that this is true, though the current software being used to do so is to be decommissioned and must be replaced with new software. She said that they had hoped to avoid duplication of the undergraduate database, but if the Senate is willing to accord a year to work with the new system and to revisit it at that time, she supported that.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHHS, inquired if at this point in the meeting (Constituent’s Concerns) a motion can be made. The Speaker said a motion could be made.

Senator Kelly moved that the Senate adopt the plan to combine undergraduate catalogs as specified by the Provost and Interim Registrar for two years in order for
any problems to be ironed out, if any are encountered. Additionally, while the interface is mocked up, the Senate will be given opportunity to provide feedback on it. Finally, the Senate would have to act in two years time to do away with the combined catalog as such.

The motion was seconded.

**Discussion of Senator Kelly’s motion**

**Provost McGee** cautioned that, while he accepts the motion, he cannot make promises for future Provosts.

**Senator Krasnoff**, Philosophy, pointed out that Faculty Technology Committee reviewed the software, and he said that the decision on the catalogs is essentially being driven by a software purchase. He asked Senator Greenberg (Psychology), who had been on the committee, if the committee discussed the issue of combining the two catalogs.

Senator Greenberg replied that this particular question did not come up since the focus was on whether or not the software would be an improvement and if it would provide a good user interface for the catalog (a “yes” on both counts). The committee, he said, reviewed four different proposals and the one chosen came out the best for price and functionality.

He added that while it is important to make a distinction between the BPS and the other undergraduate programs, he said that he would prefer not to get into the details of locating hyperlinks on certain webpages, since the Senate does not have those pages to consult. He said that the flexibility of the software should give us many ways of making the distinction between the BPS and other undergraduate programs.

**The motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.**

**Several nearly simultaneous motions were made to adjourn and seconded, and on a unanimous voice vote the motion to adjourn was approved at 7:18PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Duvall
Faculty Secretary