Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 9 February 2016

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 9 February 2016 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order: 5:04 PM
2. Approval of the Minutes of the 12 January Regular Meeting Minutes
3. Announcements and Information
4. Reports
   A. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney

   The Speaker thanked Senators for their participation in the recent special meeting and reported that he will soon be distributing to Senators another survey instrument, similar to the one he distributed prior to the special meeting. The survey will determine if there are additional questions Senators and faculty colleagues wish to pursue. He said he will also ask in the survey if there are additional issues around which we should call another special meeting. Regular meeting agendas toward the end of the year, he pointed out, can be quite packed with business and so some may find a special meeting desirable for discussing other issues.

   The Speaker reported that he attended recent Board of Trustees (BOT) committee meetings (January 28-29): Athletics, Academic Affairs, Budget and Finance, Governmental Affairs and External Relations, and Information Technology. Actions taken by the BOT included approval of the new Meteorology program; a resolution recognizing and thanking the city of Trujillo, Spain for their 20 year relationship with the College; approval of housing and food service fees for 2016-17; the announcement of the intended purchase of King George Inn on George St.; and the approval of a second round of budget reductions. At this point, the Speaker distributed hard copies of a document on the latter:

   The Speaker also reported on the College’s recent annual budget request presentation to the State House Ways and Means Committee. The requests for increases this year included nearly $4.1 million in recurring monies, with $2.2 million being general operations money that is not targeted to any specific programs. The Speaker added that it has been quite some time since the college has requested increases in unrestricted general operations funding. The College also requested around $2.4 million in non-recurring funding and another approximately $125 million in capital projects funding. The Speaker added that we have made requests for a significant amount of funding for next year.

   The Provost and the Faculty Budget Committee, the Speaker reported, have announced tentative dates for budget hearings: February 24 and, if needed, March 2. More information is forthcoming on this, he said.

   The BOT, the Speaker reported, has amended and approved their bylaws, the most notable change to which is an addition of term limits for board officers, now set at three terms. Chair Greg Padgett’s current term will expire in October 2017. In
addition, two board members, Lee Mikell and Renee Goldfinch, it was announced, will not be seeking re-election.

The Speaker announced that on Friday, February 12 there will be an announcement regarding the Boundless campaign, which may include a final tally. The Speaker encourage all to attend.

The Speaker said that Senators should be on the lookout for information coming in email regarding various matters of faculty governance, such as notices of elections (including for Adjunct Senators) and requests for desired committee assignments. He said that an election is currently running for Speaker of the Faculty, Faculty Secretary, and school at-large Senators, and he asked that Senators remind their constituents to vote.

Recalling the conversation in constituents’ concerns at the January meeting regarding Yammer, the speaker reported that the Faculty Educational Technology Committee (FETC), as directed, is looking at ways to improve Yammer and/or its use and promises to report at the March regular meeting. The Speaker reported that the Staff Advisory Committee to the President has also been looking into concerns about Yammer. Chair of the Committee, Karen Hauschild, shared with the Speaker minutes of a meeting between the committee and IT on Yammer, which the Speaker said he will share with the chair of the FETC.

The Speaker also reported that the Staff Advisory Committee to the President is also instituting a CofC Spirit Day program to occur on the first Friday of every month. On the first Friday of March there will be special kickoff for the program.

The Speaker closed by asking Senators and faculty colleagues to share their ideas for future Commencement speakers via email to the Speaker or Elizabeth Kassebaum (Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees and Vice President for College Projects) or via an online form available on the Office of the President’s website <http://president.cofc.edu/administration/committee/index.php>.

Questions / Discussion

Alex Kasman, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), asked the Speaker if he knows what the plans are for the George Street Inn.

The Speaker said that there are a few ideas for it. The property sits between a parking lot—what used to be a Chinese restaurant—and our arena. At present, it is a fully operational bed and breakfast, and one idea would be to move current guest accommodations operations located on Glebe Street to that location, opening up the spaces on Glebe Street for academic and other central campus office needs.

The Speaker added that a second building behind the King George Inn is not an historical property, and this affords us a future building site if needed.

B. Provost McGee (Topics: PDF | Presentation Slides: PPT) {FIX THIS LINK, MAN}

The Provost thanked all who participated in recent homecoming events, which were well attended by students and alumni, and at which enthusiasm for the College ran high.
Academic Affairs Budget Development
The Provost thanked all the Senators who participated in the recent special meeting focusing on budget matters and also those who made presentations and answered questions.
A number of budgetary matters have been under discussion in the Senate, the Faculty Budget Committee, the Academic Forum, and the Academic Council, and the Provost expressed his appreciation for the work of all involved.
Picking up on the Speaker’s comments on budget requests to the state government, the Provost said the President has requested unrestricted funding ($2.2 million) that can be applied to our education and general budget. This is the first time, to his knowledge, he said, that the College has requested an increase in unrestricted funding in the last ten years. The Ways and Means Committee had tough questions on this request, he noted, but it is important, he added, to indicate to the state that if we are to maintain academic quality and at the same time hold down tuition, the state will have to allot more funding.
The Provost said that at upcoming meetings (scheduled tentatively for February 24 and March 2), the Faculty Budget Committee will work with Academic Affairs and senior leadership in hearings to review our priorities in the upcoming fiscal year’s budget. The "twin goal," the Provost specified, is to articulate how the budget is tied to the strategic plan and how we will manage in an environment of limited resources. He reiterated that the process will be transparent, with meetings open to everyone.

Peer and Aspirant Institutions
Here the Provost referred to a presentation projected on screen (see slide 2, "Proposed and Peer Aspirant List").
The list of peer and aspirant institutions the Provost provided, he said, is pursuant to the desire of our regional accreditors to know the names of the institutions to which we compare ourselves and, importantly, also how we decide who the institutions are. These are hard questions at the College, he said, pointing out that we have used a series of peer and aspirant lists over the years. Our rapid growth over the last 25 years, our unusual nature as a Masters/comprehensive institution that skews toward undergraduate programming, our broad recruiting territory and other factors have made it difficult for us to identify peers. We have had some long standing peer lists, for instance, for the purposes of salary studies, and we have used other lists for other purposes: we have used athletic conferences to generate peer lists, for example. We cannot, however, tell SACSCOC that we use different lists for different purposes. We should, therefore, try to develop a master list of comparators for which we can articulate the rationale, while also recognizing that we will likely continue to find targeted peer and aspirant lists useful for specific purposes. For instance, he said, we might use different lists for looking at honors colleges or particular schools than we might when we are comparing something like purchasing programs, for which we would probably confined to South Carolina schools.
Jim Posey in Institutional Research, the Provost reported, compiled all our peer and aspirant comparison lists for the last 15+ years and subjected the list of institutions (both public and private) to Euclidean distance analysis in order to develop for the
executive team a ranked list of institutions that includes their relative distance from the College on several variables. The executive team then took the initial listing thus ranked and investigated them qualitatively on several factors: fit, cross-application status, regional presence in the Southeast, research match, admissions selectivity, urban location, history of use at the College as a comparator, and media rankings (college rankings in magazines). No institution compared well to us on all those dimensions, and many that seemed comparable are not among our most common comparators. The executive team decided to engage a qualitative process, looking at the list and distance ranking in order to compile a short master list of peer and aspirant institutions that can be agreed upon, published, and made available to SACSCOC on demand.

The lists, as represented in slide, are as follows:

**Proposed Peer List**
- Appalachian State University* (Public)
- Elon University* (Private)
- James Madison University* (Public)
- University of Mary Washington (Public)
- University of North Carolina Wilmington* (Public)
- University of Tampa (Private)

*Those marked with * above also list the College of Charleston as a their peer.*

**Proposed Aspirant List**
- Boston College (Private)
- College of William and Mary (Public)
- Miami University of Ohio (Public)
- University of New Hampshire (Public)

Many of the institutions on the list will be recognizable to those who have done service work involving use of peer and aspirant institution lists, he noted.

University of Mary Washington (Public) and University of Tampa (Private) come up a little less often in the lists ranked by Euclidean distance analysis, but the latter comes up in the analysis as the private institution most like us. Elon University has been our top private cross-applicant peer. James Madison, Appalachian State, Mary Washington, and UNC Wilmington are common public cross-application institutions. Proposed aspirants have tended in the past to be public institutions or, occasionally, private institutions of about the same size as us in undergraduate population, sometimes smaller.

Developing these lists has been challenging, but the Provost said that he did not feel it useful to get into the details. The plan is to settle on a master comparator list and make it public very soon but to still use targeted lists for targeted purposes. He offered the list at hand for the consideration of the Senate and offered to discuss the list during Q&A, if anyone has questions. The list, he said, has no impact on our identity.
December Commencement
The Provost reminded the Senate that he sent the campus an email a year ago in which he explained that a December 2015 commencement would be held and a study would follow that would indicate the viability of a 2016 December commencement (there having been a decline in the numbers of students who participate). The question was, he said, whether or not the resources and effort to put on a December commencement is worth the value it may bring to a relatively few students. The Provost said he thought we had reached a “tipping point” that would mean there would be no 2016 December commencement and was in favor of putting our efforts behind the unique spring ceremony.

175 students participated in the December 2015 ceremony, and students and families enjoyed the experience. Many students could not, for a variety of reasons, participate in the spring ceremony. The President decided to continue December commencements for another two years (2016 & 2017), providing that there will be a reconsideration on the December commencement’s future in early 2018.

SACSCOC Accreditation Update
The Provost expressed his gratitude for the ongoing faculty work on the SACSCOC reaffirmation.

He announced that he will request a change to the late spring assessment planning calendar. Also, later this spring, he said, John Hardt, SACSCOC Regional Vice President, will make a campus visit to give advice and counsel on our preparations for reaffirmation.

Undergraduate Program Review
The Provost reported that deans and chairs received an email the Friday prior from Professor Brenton LeMesurier requesting assistance in completing a select number of undergraduate program reviews this academic year. The Provost thanked the Committee on Institutional Effectiveness for their work in developing a review plan. He asked for cooperation in undergraduate program reviews this year and moving forward, since this is, he said, to “employ a somewhat overused phrase… an expected and a necessary component of our quality assurance work” at the College.

Curricular Alignment
The Provost said that the phrase, "curricular alignment," attempts to capture some issues that pertain to strategic planning, mission statements, and learning outcomes from course to program level. When the current strategic plan was developed in 2009, divisions, schools, departments, and offices also developed strategic plans aligned with the College’s plan. However, we have not insisted on those plans being updated and judged at to how they align with the institutional strategic plan.

A similar case is our institutional mission statement, with which the mission statements of all units are supposed to align, yet it is not clear that such alignment exists. Mission statements may have been devised and revised in an ad hoc fashion without approval by unit heads or, in the case of departments, without approval of departmental faculty. If a department has a mission statement, there needs to be evidence that the statement was approved.
Program learning outcomes provide yet another set of similar issues. While some new programs had learning outcomes approved in their development and approval phase, for older programs there may be no record of approved learning outcomes in Senate documents, yet there has been for some time an expectation that there will be approved learning outcomes that are "owned" by program directors or department chairs and by the faculty, since faculty are expected to adhere to the outcomes.

At the level of course learning outcomes, the issue, again, is the same. Recently approved courses have learning outcomes, and there is an expectation that these outcomes are owned and approved by program/department faculty, not developed and revised in an ad hoc way by individual faculty: "learning outcomes at the course level belong to the faculty of the College, not to the individual faculty, just as the catalogue description for a course belongs to the institution, not the individual faculty member."

The Provost said that this group of issues is important because "in a mature system,...institutional strategic plans, divisional and other unit strategic plans, program strategic plans, mission statements at all levels, and learning outcomes align, at least at the level of not conflicting with one another and also in the sense that any conversant faculty member after examining them could explain in a straightforward way why there is consistency and, in fact, there is synergy among those different documents." The goal should be, he argued, that "what we actually deliver in a class is consistent with what people expect we're delivering at the level of the course and the program and, ultimately, the entire degree program."

Over the course of the spring semester, the Provost said, he will be asking for the faculty and the deans' assistance in building such alignment in academic units where it does not exist and documenting alignment where it does exist. He cautioned that for units without strategic plans or mission statements, or in units who have never discussed program learning objectives at all or in a number of years, there may be work to be done. For other units, due to work with secondary accreditors or work on program redevelopment, there will be no surprise in the request for work on curricular alignment. This work will help create what the Provost characterized as "the kind of maturity in our systems and processes that is now increasingly expected across accredited institutions of all shapes and sizes."

**New and Revised Academic Policies**

The time conflict form discussed at the January meeting, the Provost reported, no longer appears on the Registrar's website, and he is now formally withdrawing it. He added that those who may have a problem with the form being withdrawn should work with directors and deans to reach solutions for particular situations. The Provost expressed appreciation for those who worked on this issue.

A few more policies, he reported, remain under sustained review but approval is imminent: course numbering and syllabus policies.

**Comments on the Senate’s Agenda**

The Provost expressed thanks to the members of the Honors College Committee and the Honors College Dean who worked to bring revisions back to the Senate.
On the General Education Committee’s proposals, the Provost said there has been some confusion about the addition of new courses to the approved general education curriculum. In February 2013, the Provost noted, Associate Provost Lynne Ford passed on to the Senate at their regular meeting important information regarding recertification of general education courses and general education assessment. In the April regular meeting, then General Education Committee Chair Bob Mignone conveyed to the Senate that the committee was likely to recommend that, effective fall 2015 [here the Provost quoted directly from minutes], “the general education curriculum will remain fixed for a period of years that will represent one fall assessment cycle.” This freeze, he reported, was administratively approved to last until fall 2017.

An announcement in the February 2015 Senate minutes, however, indicated that the freeze was to last until fall 2016. This announcement was incorrect. An announcement on the OAKS opening page in September 2015 confirmed the correct end-of-freeze date as fall 2017.

The Senate has approved some courses for the general education curriculum that will take effect at the end of the freeze. General education proposals to be considered at the present Senate meeting, the Provost said, if approved are subject to the freeze in the same way.

The Provost added that the effective date for changes in the curriculum is complicated somewhat by the college's needs in relation to SACSCOC reaffirmation. Therefore, the conversation is ongoing about the fall 2017 start date for those approved general education courses that are currently on hold. The Provost said that he has "great gratitude" for all the work relating to general education over the past few years, from developing general education learning outcomes to the reapproval of general education courses to the ARG (Assessment Reading Group) assessment.

The Provost said that as a result of this work, "some folks have been re-excited by our current general education curriculum and what it can do, while others who remember what some people call the 'general education wars’ of previous decades have a bit of post traumatic stress disorder every time they hear 'general education' said aloud.”

Given the passing of several years and the reinvention of general education at the level of learning outcomes and assessment, it is a good time to begin a preliminary conversation about "next steps" on general education, using what we have learned from the ARGs through this year. Periodically we need to have, he said, a serious consideration of general education to judge whether or not it still makes sense. He pointed out that our current general education’s core dates back to spring 1971, when faculty at the College approved it, and though amended since then, it is still discernible as the 1971 curriculum. We need to scrutinize our general education, he said, no matter what the outcomes of our assessment of it may be.

The Provost specified that he has a particular interest in the integration of general education and our major and minor programs and how this bears out and reinforces our unique identity as a Liberal Arts and Sciences university. After the spring semester ends and before May 15, the Provost said he plans to meet with the current Speaker, previous Speakers, current and previous chairs of the General Education
and Curriculum committees for a conversation about how we might during, but especially after, the current reaffirmation "explore and assess" whether our current approach to general education is the right one or whether we might consider other options. He assured the Senate that general education will be "carefully and transparently discussed."

On a different note, the Provost said that there will be a brown bag lunch on March 29 in Craig 108 to continue a productive discussion about our institutional mission and our Liberal Arts and Sciences identity begun at recent brown bag discussion. The Provost closed by reminding Senators and guests that a 40-foot Tyrannosaurus Rex skeleton now graces the School of Sciences and Mathematics building and is well worth seeing. He thanked new faculty colleagues Professors Manning and Egerton for the inspiring display

Questions/Discussion

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), asked about an item on the Provost’s PDF list of topics for the night, to which the Provost did not speak: "Trujillo Program Anniversary."

The Provost replied that he would concur with what the Speaker already said on the BOT resolution on Trujillo. He added that the College remains committed to the Trujillo program, and he pointed out that there have been conversations in some of the schools about how the program might be revitalized with new ways to create offerings there.

Senator Kelly asked what the status is of those conversations.

The Provost said this question might be best asked of representatives of the School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs, the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, or other schools involved. He asked if any Deans present could speak to these efforts, and getting no reply, told Senator Kelly that he will get a report from the committee and share it with him but added that he doesn't think the committee has completed its work.

**Senator Kelly** asked a second question. Regarding the proposed master peer and aspirant institutions list, has there been any investigation of CofC salary in relation to this newly proposed group.

The Provost noted that current Faculty Compensation Committee Chair Cyndi May was not present to speak to this, but he observed that almost all the institutions on the peer list and some on the aspirant list have been for some time part of the list for salary comparison. He added that he would not recommend using as small asset as represented by the list on the slide for salary comparisons, as, among other things, some institutions do not report salaries annually. The Provost said that Senator Kelly made a good point: we need to know on what basis of comparison we consider other institutions our peers or aspirant peers. He said that we dropped Western Washington from the list on the slide after consultations, since there is no geographic comparison to be made, even though they are on our salary comparison list.

Senator Kelly speculated that in relation to James Madison (JMU), an institution that compares themselves to us (signified by the asterisk), the College probably makes
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their salaries look very good. The Provost replied that in different years we have been better or worse in comparison with JMU. Within a comparison set of 20 institutions, we have been as high as 12 and as low as 18, the Provost said.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, said that she sits with the Compensation Committee and there has been no salary comparison yet, she said, with the list on the slide. She specified two factors to keep in mind in this query.

We employ CUPA-HR (College and University Professional Association for Human Resources) data for comparisons, and we are limited in how the list can be adjusted, due to their agreements with their reporting institutions.

We also use IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) data, which was used to produce the Euclidean distance analysis the Provost mentioned. We have this data for 2014-15 (we won't have 2015-16 data for some time), and we will have CUPA-HR data for 2015-16 in a few weeks, at which point we will be in a position to make some decisions about the nature of our future salary studies.

**There were no further questions.**

5. Old Business

   A. 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 Speaker noted that this proposed by-laws change was brought before the Senate in the December regular meeting, discussed at some length, and returned to the committee for further revision [see December minutes, pp. 16-20].

   Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and *Faculty/Administration Manual* (By-Laws) Jason Vance thanked the Senate for its comments on the prior version of the motion and thanked colleagues on the Honors College Committee and the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration for their subsequent work on the proposal. He projected a document summing up the motion and recent changes to it and providing rationale and supporting charts.

   As laid out in the [document](#), Professor Vance noted that the proposed change to increase the size of committee from 5 to 7 faculty members, representing each of the schools seeks to make it easier to achieve a quorum, reduce the individual burden of reviewing large number of student applications/essays, and to provide broader representation/expertise. With the proposal, SHSS would have two representatives, one for Humanities, and one for Social Sciences. Additionally, four of the committee members will have taught
“recently” in the Honors College (rather than in a set number of years) to ensure sufficient candidates for membership in the committee.

A friendly amendment from December Senate meeting was incorporated, so that "Honors faculty fellow" was stricken in favor of "other Honors faculty and staff" in section 3.b.13.a.

For Article V, Section 3.B.13.b., "Duties," Professor Vance outlined the following proposed changes to existing by-laws language:

1. The same as presented in December: HCC does not make the final decision for selecting students for admission to the Honors College

2. The same as presented in December: revised to clarify duties, and reduce redundancy between sections 3 and 4.

3. Friendly amendment from December meeting incorporated: "To review and make policy decisions" stricken in favor of "To review and apply policy."

4. Friendly amendment from December meeting incorporated: "To review and rule upon" stricken in favor of "To review and make recommendations on." Professor Vance added that this change was in response to Interim Registrar Mary Bergstrom’s concerns expressed in December.

5. The same as presented in December: the HCC serves as an advisory committee to the Honors Dean, and therefore may be requested to advise on a diverse range of topics pertaining to the Honors College.

Professor Vance reported that Senator Rick Heldrich (SSM) expressed concerns in the December meeting [see December minutes, pp. 17-18] about the school representation scheme proposed in the motion, alleging bias in the Honors College against SSM and that SSM has been underrepresented in the Honors College. Senator Heldrich felt that the motion’s allowing two representatives from SHHS (one Humanities and one for Social Sciences) reinforces the bias, Professor Vance said.

In response to Senator Heldrich’s concerns, Professor Vance reported, Jannette Finch gathered data for the committee on the trends in school representation on the committee over the past few years in order to see if the proposal might bear these concerns about representation. The findings are presented in a chart on page 2 of the document, reflecting committee representation from 2010-16 and revealing that out of the 30 total committee members serving in the time period, about 17 were from SHSS; one was from School of Business (SB); four were the School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs (SLCWA); and four were from SSM. Over the last six years, 57%
of the committee was composed of SHHS faculty. The current proposal, with its provision for fixed representation and SHHS guaranteed two members, would half the SHHS representation (bringing it down to 26 or 27%). The current proposal, furthermore, would ensure that 1/7 of the committee would be represented by each of the the other remaining schools, and there will always be a representative from each of the remaining schools. Professor Vance conceded that such representation may not get at what Senator Heldrich might consider the root of his concern, but it will reduce the representation of SHHS relative to the other schools.

Professor Vance noted that more striking figures on school representation on the committee can be seen in a year by year account of the past six years. In any given year, some schools have no representation at all on the committee. In the last two years, for instance, SSM has had no representation, and SB has had only one representative in the last six years. The proposal, he said, would ensure representation from all schools.

Professor Vance at this time called for questions and discussion.

Questions / Discussion

Andy Shedlock, Senator - Biology, thanked Professor Vance and asked how the numbers he just discussed line up against the students in the Honors College parsed by school.

Professor Vance replied that he does not know the figures for graduates by school or how this lines up with school faculty representation on the committee. The Honors College Committee’s justification for the motion, in part, has to do with the technical nature of reviewing applications and the expertise of the reviewers, correcting a problem that has occurred in years when they have lacked representation from particular schools, such as reviewing a science student’s application without an SSM representative. In such situations, the committee has had to rely on outside evaluation.

Professor Vance agreed that Senator Shedlock’s question might be useful to pursue.

Rick Heldrich, Senator - SSM, offered a clarification of his position. He said that his concern is not just with SHHS representation but also with SLCWA representation as proposed in the motion. SHHS representation, added to SLACWA representation would make for 43% representation "by that cohort of faculty," which he asserted "is still too high if your goal is to have the Honors College be representative of the entire faculty." He added that he does not see the argument for having Humanities, Social Science, and Foreign Language represented but only one person to represent Physical Science, Life Science, and Mathematics.
**Tom Ross**, Senator - SHHS, said he was curious about the long-standing dynamics contributing to the disparities of school representation on the committee. While he said he supports diversity of representation on the committee, he also wonders if it will create problems. Does the historical disparity arise from light volunteering for the committee? Does that disparity reflect the proportion of courses that are typically offered in the Honors College, perhaps explaining why faculty from some schools are more invested in the program? Have faculty from other schools been turned away from the committee in favor of SHHS faculty?

Professor Vance replied that Senator Ross posed important questions. How members are selected for the committee, he said, was discussed in the last meeting of By-Laws. He said that future consideration might be given to whether or not it would be worthwhile to consider school appointments of faculty to the committee, rather than relying on volunteers assigned by the Nominations and Elections committee. This might ensure that schools select faculty that are strong representatives of their interests.

Professor Vance invited Phills Jestice, Chair of the Honors College Committee (HCC), to respond as well. She said that one of the important issues was the expectation that there is a significant number of members on the committee that have experience in the Honors College. In its current configuration, that faculty is disproportionately from SHHS, in large part because of the first-year English composition requirement of all students and the sophomore year-long Western Civilization course, which draws for the most part, on SHHS faculty. It has been at times difficult, she said, to find faculty to volunteer from some of the underrepresented schools.

Senator Ross (SHHS) followed up by saying that his question was mainly pitched toward ascertaining whether or not we have an understanding of the causes of disparate representation in the first place, since knowing these causes would be important to the success of the committee. And he mentioned in particular the potential problem of finding faculty to participate.

Professor Vance asked Professor Jestice if she had a response to Senator Ross, and she replied that she hopes the Nominations and Elections committee will be proactive in getting the word out about the committee's new representative structure and will actively solicit new members.

**Professor Vance**, turning to the duties of the committee to review applications, said is that currently, for a number of reasons, Honors College Dean Folds-Bennett ends up reviewing a number of applications on her own. The new representative committee structure would mean that this reviewing
will be distributed across school representatives and to a larger number of individuals.

**Provost McGee** asked Professor Vance if the intent, with the exception of the split of SHHS into Humanities and Social Science representation, is to represent the other schools as discrete entities. Professor Vance agreed. Provost McGee then asked if the reference in the proposal to “Education” is, in fact, to be the “School of Education, Health, and Human Performance” (SEHHP). Professor Vance agreed.

**The Provost asked for and received unanimous consent that the document be corrected so that it uses the exact names of the schools, with the exception of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, attending to commas and word placement.**

**Senator Heldrich** (SSM) asserted that adding two more members to the committee, given that a major role of the committee is to review applications, would be a helpful addition. He added that he does not understand what is so particular about the work of the committee that it requires representation of the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Languages.

In addition, he asserted that the Western Civilization course could benefit a great deal from greater participation of the Sciences in the program. He also asserted that this course impedes the progress of Pre-med, Chemistry, and Biology majors in the Honors College.

Professor Jestice replied that she hopes that a major revision of the course will happen.

Senator Heldrich riposted that the need for such a revision would have been obvious much sooner with stronger representation of the Sciences and Mathematics on the committee.

**The Speaker**, at this point, noted that, since the motion was previously brought to the Senate, the motion at hand is essentially an amendment or series of amendments to the original motion, some friendly, some added through further consultation of the bylaws committee. The Senate, he said, if it so chooses, will need to vote on these amendments, after which it should approach the matter as it does all bylaws changes being submitted from a committee.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, queried a point of order: the Senate will have to agree to amend the previous motion to include this new language? The Speaker agreed.
The Speaker asked for a second and received it. The Speaker asked for further discussion. Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, called the question, which was seconded, and agreed to on unanimous voice vote.

The amended version of the motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

The motion now stood as presented by Professor Vance with the unanimously consented edits asked for by the Provost above:

**Motion to Change Faculty and Administrative Manual for Composition and Duties of Honors College Committee**

*With specific changes to the FAM Bylaws: Article V, Section 3.B.13.a-b.*

13. Honors College Committee
   
a. Composition: Seven faculty members (one representative each from Humanities; Social Sciences; Science and Mathematics; Business; Arts; Languages, Cultures and World Affairs; and Education, Health, and Human Performance; four of whom shall have taught recently in the Honors College), and two student representatives, one junior and one senior, chosen by the Honors Committee from students nominated by the Honors student body. The expectation is that faculty committee members will serve a two-year term; student member terms are one year and they are eligible for re-election. 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 other Honors faculty and staff to participate as an ex-officio non-voting members.

b. Duties:
   
   (1) To review student applications for admission into the Honors College.

   (2) To review faculty course proposals and select Honors College courses.

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

   (4) To review and make recommendations on written requests from students, faculty members, schools, or departments for exceptions from Honors College regulations and requirements.

   (5) To review information from the Dean of the Honors College concerning Honors College admissions, retention,
curriculum, and other matters pertaining to the Honors College.

(Rev. Pending)

**The Speaker** noted that the motion does not require a second since it has been brought by a committee, but it requires a two-thirds majority vote to pass because it is a change to the bylaws. The Speaker then asked for further discussion.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked if the Provost's unanimously approved edits (see above) would appear on screen before the Senate votes. Professor Vance replied that since the document projected was in PDF format the changes could not be made but they will be part of the record.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator - SSM, asserted that the crucial point to consider is the number of Honors College graduates from each school. "Word of mouth," he said, is that the Honors College is more suited for students in SHHS than in SSM. He added that, looking at the offerings this semester in the Honors College, the majority are in Humanities and Social Sciences. He said that he would like some reassurance from the Honors College that the program is owned by the entirety of the College of Charleston.

Senator Krasnoff (Philosophy) added that without numbers, we are relying on anecdotal evidence. He asserted that "the general anecdotal sense is that there are way more Science and Math students among the honors students than Humanities students." He pointed out that the discussion underway is about the committee, not all aspects of the program, and a primary duty of the committee is admissions. The committee, composed as it has been, has clearly been admitting a large number of Science and Math students. Thus, he argued, the claim of bias is somewhat strange.

In the Western Civilization program, Senator Krasnoff added, his Philosophy colleague Richard Nunan has offered History of Science content, "and the students hate that more than anything else." The courses need to be interdisciplinary, and the faculty participating have sought interdisciplinarity. In his estimation, he said, the Honors College would be very happy to receive course proposals from the Sciences and Mathematics.

Senator Kunkle followed up. He argued that one reason why there might be fewer proposals from Science and Math is that there is less flexibility in Science and Math majors then there is in Humanities majors. There is less room for special topics courses in the former. The perception is that it is harder to be an Honors student as a Science or Math major.
Bill Manaris (Computer Science), said that he taught an Honors College course with a faculty member from Music, and they sought students to do research with them, but were met with students’ saying that they have no time for additional work. Professor Manaris said that the curriculum is so tight that there is no space for the kind of research students do in the sciences.

Senator Shedlock (Biology) agreed with Professor Manaris, adding that one of the unique features and draws of the College of Charleston is the ability for undergraduates to do research in the Sciences and Mathematics. Some of our best students are in the Honors College, yet, he asserted, there is an irony in the fact that due to "gridlock," talented Science and Math students in the Honors College have less of an opportunity to position themselves to deliver high quality research than do those less talented or motivated students who are not in the Honors College, "especially due to courses like Western Civ." He said, based on his experience, this is a real phenomenon.

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, said that there are data available on graduates of the Honors College broken down by school. He reported that in 2015, there were six graduates from SEHHP, 12 from the School of the Arts, 14 from SB, 15 from SLCWA, 44 from SHHS, and, the plurality, 55 from SSM. Thus, he said, there are a high number of SSM students able to complete their programs in the Honors College. We cannot say, from these numbers, he added, whether there might be others who have been precluded from getting through their programs in the Honors College, however.

Senator Shedlock replied that "getting through" is not the issue, but rather students’ competitive footing if they are not able to deliver very high quality bachelors essays. This is due, he asserted, to a great deal of extra work required in the Honors College and the timing of the courses they take. The timing of coursework, he specified, is critical in helping students build the flexibility they need to get into position to become investigators in their senior year.

Beth Meyer-Bernstein, Senator - SSM and Associate Dean - Honors College, offered several replies to the discussion. The required courses in the Honors College map well onto general education requirements at the College, she said. Students should not have to take extra coursework, except in order to fulfill the research requirement. Honors students get started in their first year with work in research labs, much sooner than do non-Honors students, she observed. She added that the Honors College realizes that the Western Civilization course is difficult and is a "roadblock" for many of the Honors College’s strong science students but said that a careful examination of the
curriculum is underway. The proposed new makeup of the committee will help with that work by providing the expertise of a faculty member from SSM, as well as from the other schools.

Honors College Dean Trisha Folds-Bennett added to the conversation on the school distribution of Honors College students. About 40% of entering students are from SSM, which is a consistent proportion from first year to graduation. Our Honors College reflects national norms in honors colleges, she reported: only about 50% of students complete the Honors College requirements, due to a number of reasons. She observed that students are just as likely to exit the Honors College due to the Calculus requirement as they are due to other factors, and this is the requirement they dislike the most. Exit surveys of students leaving the Honors College and focus groups of graduating seniors bear this out: they are just as likely to leave due to a requirement in SSM as to requirements in the Honors College.

Dean Folds-Bennet added that the Honors College understands that the 6-hour Western Civilization requirement in the fall and spring is challenging, but not just for students in SSM. This curriculum, she said, is under careful review, for which the Honors College has sought feedback from SSM faculty. She added that her own background is not in the Humanities, but in the Social Sciences, which she said is a discipline also not well represented in the Honors College. She stated flatly that she does not bring a Humanities bias to the operations and decisions of the Honors College.

Dean Folds-Bennett also said that the Honors College considers undergraduate research central to their mission, and to that end offers an entire first-year class devoted to getting students from all disciplines started in research. Students are devoted to research throughout their programs and this comes through in the results, in their successful applications to graduate school and in their national awards.

Professor Vance, speaking as an SSM at large Senator, said he supports the added representation of SSM in the proposal. Continuing with the current by-laws arrangement (not adopting the amendment to the by-laws, in other words), would probably mean trends of weak representation of SSM and schools other that SHHS will likely continue. If, he argued, there is any bias in the current arrangement, that, too, would perhaps continue. Guarantees of school representation are needed. Senator Vance suggested that an amendment might be offered to apportion seats on the committee in relation to Honors students’ schools.
The Speaker at this point noted that any number of actions might be taken, such as amendments proposed or returning the motion again to the committee for further work.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, suggested that the Senate vote to pass the motion, with the understanding that the representation scheme could be changed as needed as future experience made more obvious what the needs are. Representation is the issue, she said, but there should be a minimum of one member from each school. She suggested approval in order to "move this along."

Senator Rick Heldrich (SSM) asserted that there are two solutions to his problem with the motion. One is to reduce SHHS representation to one member (not two), but this would make the committee have an even number, which is undesirable. Another option would be, he said, to increase SSM representation to three seats, which would maintain an odd number.

Responding to Senator Worzala's idea that additional seats could be added at a later time, he said he would rather add seats now and reduce them later if needed, particularly at a time in which the program is contemplating many changes for which added SSM representation could be very helpful.

Senator Heldrich then moved that the motion be amended to split SSM representation into three seats, one each to represent the following areas: Physical Science (Physics and Chemistry), Life Sciences (Geology and Biology), and Computer Science/Mathematics. The motion was seconded.

Discussion now began on Senator Heldrich's motion.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked why it is absolutely critical to have an odd number on a committee. Are there not other ways of addressing, he asked, what are likely very few disagreements resulting in tied votes?

The Speaker asked HCC Chair Phylis Jestice to respond, and she replied that it is traditional to have an odd number of committee members in case of a close vote. This was the committee's logic.

Senator Shaver labeled this reply a "this is how it has always been done argument" and said a full consideration might also include a reconsideration of the traditional odd number requirement.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHHS, said he did not see logic of three seats for SSM and said he would, therefore, vote against the amendment, and should the amendment fail, he would, if one was offered, vote for an amendment for two seats for SSM. He added that he does not see the logic of the implication that
seats for SHSS and SLCWA amount to a single block. He agreed with Senator Shaver that the odd number should not be a requirement.

Senator Heldrich followed up. SHSS and SLCWA, he observed, used to be together in a single school, hence, his lumping them together.

**Senator Krasnoff** (Philosophy) asked for a clarification. Senator Heldrich’s motion put Geology in with Biology under “Life Sciences,” but could it not also fit under “Physical Sciences”? Senator Heldrich expressed ambivalence as to where it should be categorized, and Senator Krasnoff used this ambivalence to point out that the methodological distinction doesn’t seem to be very important, after all.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asserted that, if we are making finer distinctions within schools, the School of Business (SB) is also woefully underrepresented, considering the large number of SB students in the Honors College.

**Annette Watson**, Senator - Political Science, pointed out that it would be very difficult to schedule full meetings with nine different committee members.

**Bill Manaris**, Computer Science, argued that school representation on the HCC should be proportional to the number of Honors College students in each school.

Professor Vance added here that the numbers for Honors College students discussed so far are only graduation numbers.

**Senator Kunkle** (SSM) noted, based on his experience serving on Nominations and Elections, stated that, apart from whether or not the number of committee members in the amendment is desirable, it may be difficult to seat the committee.

Professor Vance observed, again, school appointment of seats on the committee might be a better arrangement, though this is not on the table at present.

Senator Kunkle said that his point was not a criticism of the proposal per se, but a caution about the feasibility of implementing the proposal. The more seats there are and the more restrictions there are about who can be seated, the harder it is to seat the committee.

**Alem Teklu**, Senator - Physics/Astronomy, asserted that he did not like the way in which Senator Heldrich’s amendment breaks down representation within SSM. He asserted that three seats for SSM makes sense, but they should not be specified as to area: the three seats should be expected to represent the school, not different areas with it.
The Speaker inquired if this was being offered as a friendly amendment to the amendment on the floor.

**Senator Teklu said it was and Senator Heldrich accepted it as such. The amendment to Senator Heldrich’s motion to amend specified that SSM would have three at-large representatives on the committee.**

**Idee Winfield**, Senator- SHHS, asked of the Senator Teklu’s amendment, why there would need to be three representatives, since the logic of Heldrich’s motion to amend the motion brought by By-Laws is that SSM breaks into three distinct areas that need separate representation.

She asserted that two at large seats from SSM might be better.

Professor Vance said that the three seats might still stand if they are thought of as representing Honors College students in SSM.

**The Provost interjected here.** The Senate, to his mind, "gone down a rabbit hole." The College has not, for purposes such as the one at hand, ever divided schools by disciplines or orientations, he asserted. Rather, there has always been a preference for the simpler approach of not splitting up school units. The present amendment, he said, creates problems in seating the committee, problems of size and scale, and the Senate had been sidetracked from the original goal of creating cross-college representation on the committee. There can be no tidy solution to representation. He counseled that the Senate reject the amendment and amend the original motion to seat one committee member per school.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - SSM, argued that part of the problem in the discussion originates in the original motion’s splitting up of disciplines in SHHS. We could specify, he suggested, one member per school with an additional member (to bring the committee to seven) that could rotate in line with some other dimension, like number of students, number of courses, etc.

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, said he agrees with bringing the representation on the committee down to one per school. He reported that, looking over the data for the past three years, SSM predominated in Honors College graduates for two years, SHHS for one. If we go with a proportional representation scheme, he asserted, the Honors College committee will be returning to this issue, potentially, year after year. He suggested that the Senate vote the present amendment (specifying three at-large representative from SSM) down, and then amend the original motion to one representative per school.
Honors College Committee Chair Philis Jestice added here that such a move to bring the representation down to one member per school, is not far out of line with the desires of the committee.

**The Provost called the question, it was seconded, and secured a unanimous voice vote.**

**The amendment to the By-Laws- sponsored motion brought by Senator Heldrich and subsequently amended by Senator Teklu was defeated by a unanimous voice vote.**

The discussion turned again to the original motion as represented above, featuring representation of one member from all schools, save SHHS, which was split into two seats, one for Humanities, one for Social Sciences.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - SHSS, moved that the motion be amended: SHHS should not have two seats, but one. The motion was seconded.

Discussion was now opened on Senator Kelly’s amendment.

**Philis Jestice** suggested a friendly amendment to Senator Kelly’s of adding one member to the committee (for a total of seven) at-large from the College. Senator Kelly accepted the amendment.

The pertinent section of the motion with Senator Kelly’s amendment would now read:

a. Composition: Seven faculty members [one representative each from: Humanities and Social Sciences; Science and Mathematics; Business; Arts; Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs; and Education, Health, and Human Performance; plus one member at-large (four of whom shall have taught recently in the Honors College)], two student representatives (one junior and one senior) chosen by the Honors Committee from students nominated by the Honors student body.

**The Provost called the question, and it was seconded.**

Senator Krasnoff (Philosophy), raised a point of order. Is the Provost a member of the body, and does he have a right to make a motion such as calling the question?

The Provost affirmed that he is a member of the body, and though non-voting, he has privileges to make motions.

Senator Krasnoff queried if guest in general have the ability to make motions.

The Speaker verified with the Parliamentarian that guests cannot make motions.
The calling of the question was approved on voice vote (not unanimous).

The amendment by Senator Kelly (one representative to the committee from each academic school, plus an additional member at large) was approved by unanimous voice vote.

There was no further discussion.

The Speaker pointed out that as a change in the by-laws, to be approved, the motion would require 2/3 majority vote.

The motion as amended by Senator Kelly was approved on unanimous voice vote.

The Speaker noted that the change just approved will have to be ratified by the full faculty before it goes into effect.

The full text of the approved by-laws amendment is as follows:

**Motion to Change Faculty and Administrative Manual for Composition and Duties of Honors College Committee**

*With specific changes to the FAM Bylaws: Article V, Section 3.B.13.a-b.*

13. Honors College Committee

   a. Composition: Seven faculty members [one representative each from: Humanities and Social Sciences; Science and Mathematics; Business; Arts; Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs; and Education, Health, and Human Performance; plus one member at-large (four of whom shall have taught recently in the Honors College)], two student representatives (one junior and one senior) chosen by the Honors Committee from students nominated by the Honors student body. The expectation is that faculty committee members will serve a two-year term; student member terms are one year and they are eligible for re-election. 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 other Honors faculty and staff to participate as an ex-officio non-voting members.

   b. Duties:

      (1) To review student applications for admission into the Honors College.
(2) To review faculty course proposals and select Honors College courses.

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

(4) To review and make recommendations on written requests from students, faculty members, schools, or departments for exceptions from Honors College regulations and requirements.

(5) To review information from the Dean of the Honors College concerning Honors College admissions, retention, curriculum, and other matters pertaining to the Honors College.

(Rev. Pending)

6. New Business

A. General Education Committee
   1. Requests for Humanities General Education Certification
      a. ARTH 230 - Islamic Art and Architecture (PDF)
      b. ARTH 278 - Renaissance and Baroque Architecture (PDF)
      c. ARTH 294 - City and Cinema (PDF)
      d. JWST 220 - History of Israel (PDF)
      e. JWST 305 - Israeli Cinema (PDF)
      f. PHIL 105 - Contemporary Moral Issues (PDF)
      g. PHIL 252 - Topics in Continental Philosophy (PDF)

Questions/Discussion

Jannette Finch, Senator - Libraries and Paul Collins, Senator - Theater and Dance, both asked about the effective date of these courses if they are approved.

The Speaker noted that these courses, if approved, will join a group of other courses that the Senate has approved for general education credit but have not entered the catalog yet.

Provost McGee said that, as previously approved by Provost Hynd, the courses would go into effect in fall 2017. But, as he noted in his remarks, an optimal starting date in terms of SACSCOC reaffirmation is under investigation.

The proposals were approved on unanimous voice vote.

B. Foreign Language Alternative Program Proposal
   - Proposal distributed February 2: PDF
The Speaker noted that the latest version of the motion was distributed via email to Senators earlier in the day. He also handed out hard copies of the same. The latest version included friendly amendments not present in the version of the proposal distributed with the Senate agenda on February 2.

**Associate Dean Morrison** explained that the foreign language alternative program has been in place for many years. It has only recently become apparent, however, that the College should have been assessing the program all along but has not been. The present proposal represents an attempt, through faculty committees and through the Senate, to add transparency and make it clear to students what courses they can take. If the proposal is approved, we will be able to produce assessment data from students who have completed the program, which will then allow appropriate changes to be made to the program based on data.

The basic way in which the program works has not been changed in the proposal before the Senate, she added. What has been added is a mechanism for assessment, including student learning outcomes, which had not been in place before. The Senate has already approved one list of courses for the requirement, and, should the proposal be approved, departments and programs will be able to recertify courses, in a similar way to the recent recertification for general education. Departments and programs will submit courses to be certified only if they desire that those courses be added to the list.

**Questions / Discussion**

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - SSM, characterized the foreign language alternative program as “a way around” Senate-approved general education requirements. He asked if the existence of the program is subject to Senate approval or required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Associate Dean Morrison explained that the program is for students who have a documented foreign language learning disability and who are approved through the Students Needing Access Parity (SNAP) office to take foreign language alternative courses.

Senator Kasman countered that there are no alternatives to all of the other general education requirements.

Associate Provost Lynne Ford, self-styled "Keeper of Gen Ed, Currently," replied that the ADA requires us to provide students with an accommodation based on documented disability. The nature of the accommodation is in the purview of the Senate, however. The proposal under consideration is a curricular proposal for a particular mode of accommodation that is in line with the most prevalent accommodations at other schools: course substitution for required courses in foreign language. While the Senate can decide on the form of accommodation, it cannot forgo accommodation.

The Provost added that there was a lengthy faculty discussion of this accommodation in the Faculty Assembly in 1988, which, he pointed out, occurred prior to the ADA. The faculty and the College, he said, desired to accommodate
students for whom second language acquisition at college age is extremely difficult to the point of being practically impossible.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - SHHS, asked about departments that have classes that might fit the bill but whose classes are not on the list. Will these programs be asked to provide courses to be certified?

Associate Dean Morrison explained that if the proposal before the body is approved, there is a form that can be filled out by departments and programs that wish to have courses certified as foreign language alternatives. The process is similar to the general education recertification but with a simpler form. The General Education committee will evaluate the requests and bring approved courses to the Senate for approval and addition to the catalog.

**Senator Kelly** also noted that in the document, in section III “Regions of the World,” item C., "Europe" is followed by a parenthetical ",(e.g. UK, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Spain, Ancient Greece, Ancient Rome).” The other regions identified in the list do not carry similar parenthetical examples, and he asked if this parenthetical could be removed.

Associate Dean Morrison said the committee will take it as a friendly amendment to strike the parenthetical following "Europe."

Associate Provost Ford said that the footnote following the parenthetical does provide important information, however, since it explains what former categories in the current system of course substitution are now encapsulated by the word "Europe."

**Senator Kelly** asked, on another tack, if there might be a bias against English language speaking countries in the policy.

Associate Dean Morrison said that this will be up to the Senate. It is, she said, a "deep question." We will have to see, she said, what course proposal requests come through and take it from there.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, asked what the timeline for recertification will be, if the proposal is approved.

Associate Dean Morrison replied that she hopes courses can be re-certified in time for the fall catalog.

Senator Krasnoff asked if this would violate the general education moratorium.

Provost McGee replied that the general education freeze currently in place is there to facilitate developing good assessment practices. Since the current foreign language alternative program is "the antithesis of effective program assessment," the moratorium will not apply in this case, so that we have time to gather baseline data on the foreign language alternative program.

Dr. Divya Bhati, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, reinforced Provost McGee’s reply. "Zero assessment” on this program, she said, is unacceptable going into reaffirmation.

**Senator Krasnoff** followed up, pursuing a different question: have we identified a post test that clearly matches the proposed learning outcomes? He said that if he were designing a course to be added to the list of foreign language alternatives, he
might want to see the post test. Or, he asked, will the outcomes themselves be sufficient for course design purposes?

Associate Dean Morrison replied that if a course is designed to meet the learning outcomes, it will also match up with the post test.

Senator Krasnoff then cited a particular sentence from the assessment section of the document: "The scale is designed to measure intercultural attitudes, skills, and knowledge."

He questioned whether measuring intercultural attitudes, skills, and knowledge fits with the idea of "the role that language plays in culture" [student learning outcome 1]. He suggested that these two are not exactly aligned.

Associate Provost Ford replied that assessing this program is different from assessing general education courses because students making use of the program are not all in the same courses. When we assess foreign language in general education, she said, we assess 202 (whatever the language is) and we use the same signature assignment across sections as the assessment artefact. With the foreign language alternative program, since students can choose a variety of courses, we are assessing the totality of the program's outcomes, not individual course outcomes. We will be employing, she said, a scale developed at Purdue (which we still have to finish customizing). The assessment will be a student self-assessment of their knowledge, attitudes, and skills, on pre and post tests.

Senator Krasnoff said he assumes we are not legislating this particular instrument if the proposal is approved by the Senate.

Associate Provost Ford agreed. What the Senate is considering and approving in proposal will be, she specified, the learning outcomes, the structure of the requirement, and permission to start the certification process. This will allow us to have something that we can assess in relatively short order, she hopes.

**An exchange followed** between Senator Rick Heldrich (SSM) and the Provost regarding the policy at hand but also, more broadly, faculty governance.

Senator Heldrich said that he is not sure how he feels about "waiving the gen ed requirements for one thing and holding everybody else at the College of Charleston hostage to a decision made by somebody who is no longer here."

The Provost replied that Senator Heldrich's was "an extremely fair question," but added that former Provost George Hynd did not enact the foreign language alternative proposal unilaterally. Rather, it was a product of faculty discussion in the General Education Committee at the time, which was chaired by Bob Mignone (who was not present at the meeting and could not contribute, therefore, to this discussion). The point, the Provost said, was to get us through a complete assessment cycle in order to develop a baseline for future assessment of this particular program. While our general education assessment has now had a few cycles, we are starting from scratch, he said, with the foreign language alternative program. Coming into reaffirmation with as much data and as mature a process as possible is important for the College's success in reaffirmation. "But I get your point," he said.
Senator Heldrich replied, “maybe...” He asserted that what passes as "approved by the faculty" may actually be more accurately characterized as faculty acquiescence. Some decisions have been made by a single committee, he charged, or an Associate Provost, but not the Senate. When the college represents the curriculum as controlled by the faculty, "that should mean that it is voted on by this body, and I don't believe that has happened in this case.”

Associate Dean Morrison added here that the Senate will be voting on this proposal at the present meeting.

Senator Heldrich countered by saying the Senate "will be voting on a binding that we never voted to accept" in the first place.

The Provost said that he is a little confused by the question and asked Senator Heldrich if he is referring to the foreign language alternative program, to which the latter replied, “no; I'm referring to the statement that often is made that 'this is now the rule because the faculty has decided it,' when it might just be one committee that decided it, or it might be one Associate Provost who decided it.”

The Provost replied that in this particular case, he agreed with Senator Heldrich that there was a committee recommendation to the Provost, who then made a final decision.

As part of our shared governance, faculty control the curriculum, he agreed, "but some time, place, and manner decisions very much belong to the administration." "In this particular case," he continued, "no one's saying that a faculty decision is not going to go into the catalog. There was a decision made administratively in consultation with the faculty that said we were going to restrict when we would do this." The Provost said that an objection might be made to the Provost’s having that kind of administrative power, or one might say the Provost made a bad decision. Either way, he said," you have heard the best argument I can articulate for it."

There was no further discussion.

The proposal was approved on voice vote (not unanimous).

C. Faculty Curriculum Committee

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, moved, given the lateness of the hour, that the Senate vote on all the proposals below, except number 19 (Southern Studies Minor) as a single package. The proposal for the new minor would be considered separately. The motion was seconded.

There was no discussion of Senator Greenberg's motion, and it was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

There was no discussion offered of the proposals below (1-18).

By a single unanimous voice vote, proposals 1-18 were approved.

1. Jewish Studies (PDF)
   a. Deactivate JWST 450 (Research Seminar in Jewish Studies)
   b. Add JWST 305 (Israeli Cinema) as an elective and replace current JWST 450 requirement with JWST 400 (Independent Study) or JWST 499 (Bachelor's Essay) to the JWST major
c. Add JWST 305 and delete JWST 450 to the JWST minor
d. Change description of JWST 400 so that it requires independent research
e. Create new course: JWST 399 (Directed Reading)

2. **Athletic Training**: Terminate Athletic Training major ([PDF](#))


4. **Asian Languages** – Change prerequisite (202) for ARBC 390 (Special Topics in Arabic), ARBC 496 (Independent Study), JPNS 390 (Special Topics), JPNS 496 (Independent Study), CHNS 330 (Collateral Study), and CHNS 496 (Independent Study) ([PDF](#))

5. **Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs** – Prerequisite changes (202 or 205) to FREN 330, 496, 498, 499, GREK 390, 490, 496, 498, GRMN 213, 325, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 341, 365, 490, 496, 499, HBRW 330, ITAL 328, 329, LATN 490, 496, 498, PORT 330, 498, RUSS 313, 330, 398, and SPAN 390 ([PDF](#))

6. **French Francophone and Italian Studies** ([PDF](#))
   a. Deactivate LTIT 150 (Italian Literature in (English) Translation), ITAL 330 (Collateral Study), and ITAL 370 (Studies in Italian Cinema)
   b. Change prerequisite for ITAL 390 (Special Topics in Italian)

7. **Classics** ([PDF](#))
   a. Create new course: CLAS 325 (Ancient Houses and Households)
   b. Add this course to the major and the minor
   c. Deactivate LATN 301 (Introduction to Latin Literature)
   d. Changes some prerequisites

8. **Atmospheric Physics**: Delete PHYS 301 (Classical Mechanics) and add PHYS 272 (Methods of Applied Physics) to list of possible prerequisites for fluid mechanics ([PDF](#))

9. **Physics**: Create new course: PHYS 481 (Physics Problem Solving) and add as an elective in the BA and BS in Physics degrees ([PDF](#))

10. **Communication**: Change of restrictions for COMM 310 (Message Design and Influence) and COMM 481 (Capstone in Communication) ([PDF](#))

11. **African American Studies** ([PDF](#))
    a. Add four courses to list of pre-approved electives in both the major and the minor
    b. Create two new courses: AAST 340 (Remembering and Forgetting: Race, Violence, and Memory in American History) and AAST 345 (Race and Sports in American Society)
    c. Add seven courses to the minor

12. **Computing in the Arts** ([PDF](#))
    a. Create new concentration in Digital Media
    b. Create new course CITA/CSCI 140 (Graphic Design and Digital Media)
c. Change description of CITA/CSCI 180 (Computers, Music, and Art)

d. Add CSCI 380 (User Interface Development) and CSCI 392 (Seminar in Computing and Society) to the list of required courses for the major

e. Add MUSC 349 (Jazz Arranging) to the list of music electives in the music concentration

13. Exercise Science (PDF)
   a. Change prerequisites for EXSC 433 (Research Design and Analysis)
   b. Change credit hours for EXSC 439 (Advanced Topics in Exercise Physiology)

14. Health and Human Performance (PDF)
   a. Change course number of HEAL 395 to HEAL 456
   b. Change prerequisites
   c. Deactivate HEAL 395

15. Hospitality and Tourism Management (PDF)
   a. Change prerequisites for HTMT 444 (Hospitality Management Internship)
   b. Change HTMT concentration, eliminating one of the required HTMT electives and making HTMT 444 mandatory
   c. Create new course: HTMT 244 (Internship)

16. Mathematics: Modify the course catalog description for MATH 229 (Vector Calculus with Chemical Applications) (PDF)

17. Religious Studies (PDF)
   a. Create three new courses RELS 215 (Religion and Globalization), RELS 370 (Advanced Topics in American Religion), and RELS 382 (Teaching Apprenticeship)
   b. Add new courses to the Religious Studies major and minor

18. Theater and Dance (PDF)
   a. Remove prerequisite for THTR 230 (Fundamentals of Theatrical Design)
   b. Change prerequisite for THTR 316 (African American Theatre)
   c. Create new course: THTR 314 (Dramaturgy)
   d. Add THTR 314 to the list of major electives

19. Create new minor in Southern Studies (PDF), including creation of two new course SOST 200 (Introduction to Southern Studies) and SOST 400 (Southern Studies Capstone Project)

Senator Greenberg (Psychology) stated that he wanted to separate this proposal for consideration from the others because a new minor deserves separate deliberation. He endorsed the proposal enthusiastically.
**Senator Krasnoff** (Philosophy) agreed that the proposal is strong and said he intended to vote in favor, but had a couple questions.

How many interdisciplinary minors, he asked, have both an introductory course and a capstone?

Several people replied (no one identified her- or himself) that a couple such minors do have both introductory courses and capstones but most don't have both.

Senator Krasnoff said there might be capstone enrollment concerns with the new minor and asked Professor Julia Eichelberger (co-sponsor of the minor) if she feels good about offering the capstone without knowing at present how many minors there will be to take it in the minor's first few years

Professor Eichelberger replied that the capstone is only a one-hour course and will be supervised by the director as part of that position's duties, so enrollment will not likely be an issue.

The proposal was approved by unanimous voice vote.

---

7. **Constituent's Concerns**

**Hector Qirko**, Senator - Sociology and Anthropology, raised two constituent concerns.

He read the following two items into the record.

"The Housing Authority of the City of Charleston has income limits developed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The HUD fiscal year 2015 income limits documentation system categorizes a one-person family in Charleston County making less than $35,250 annually as low income. If I teach five classes in both the spring and fall semesters of the same year, I make $34,250 dollars for that year."

This 5/5 Adjunct Professor, Senator Qirko said, is categorized as being low income. Given our reliance on adjuncts at the College and that adjunct pay is "adjustable and negotiable in many instances," Senator Qirko said "this is, at best, embarrassing and [is] something to pursue."

His second item relates, he said, to the process—not the outcomes—of both the recent budget and the appointment of the Provost.

"Hypothetically speaking, according to the F/AM, the Senate serves as an elected body that represents the faculty. The Senate, in turn, elects committees to serve certain functions, including the Budget Committee and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. If neither the Senate nor the committees were consulted as representatives of the faculty with respect to the budget and with respect to the appointment of the Provost, it is worth asking whether these bodies continue to serve any function and if they should not disband. If these bodies no longer serve an advisory function, they represent not only a tremendous waste of faculty time but also serve to perpetuate the illusion of shared governance. Or perhaps shared governance no longer exists. (If we have no power, why let others pretend that we do?)"

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked if there is any way the Senate can consider these statements of concern at a future Senate meeting.
The Speaker replied by saying that, as he said in his report, he will be distributing another survey instrument that would allow for those particular topics to be captured, and we then might consider setting aside specific times to discuss them.

**Kendall Deas**, Senator - Adjunct, inquired if there is a faculty welfare committee to which adjuncts can bring their concerns. He specified that he has heard concerns similar to those raised by Senator Qirko.

The Speaker pointed Senator Deas to the chair of the standing Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC), Emily Skinner, and he added out that the committee has an adjunct representative. Professor Skinner replied that there is an FWC subcommittee working on adjunct issues. She wondered, however, how much power the committee has in relation to salary.

Senator Qirko replied that adjunct salaries are adjustable and negotiable above the minimum, and different adjuncts have different salaries across the College. He reasoned that there may, therefore, be some room to discuss raising the floor.

Deana Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, noted that she sits with the faculty compensation committee, one of three faculty committees that have adjunct representatives. The committee is finalizing its recommendations for the year. She said that anyone who would like to speak or meet with the committee is welcome to attend upcoming meetings.

**There were no further constituent concerns raised.**

8. **Adjournment: 7:14**

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Duvall  
Faculty Secretary