Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 15 March 2016

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 15 March 2016 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. Call to Order: 5:05 PM
2. Minutes were approved as posted.
   A. 26 January Special Meeting
   B. 9 February Regular Meeting
3. Announcements and Information
4. Reports
   A. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney

The Speaker thanked those who responded to the survey that he posted as a follow-up on January’s special meeting of the Senate. He said that, given the limited time left in the academic year, he has decided to share the results of the survey in a written form with the individuals and offices from whom the survey respondents would like to hear responses and to request responses directed to him, which he can then share and make part of the record at the regular April meeting of the Senate.

The Speaker announced the creation of two ad hoc committees related to and growing out of faculty concern about the charges and procedures of the Faculty Grievance Committee and the Faculty Hearing Committee. He noted that the Faculty Welfare Committee, for one, has been discussing concerns for the past few years about these committees and this year has endorsed a closer study of the committee charges and procedures. The speaker also explained the work of the two ad hoc committees is complicated by the fact that portions of these committees’ charges lie in the faculty by-laws and portions lie in the administrative section of the Faculty/ Administration Manual (F/AM), and both, at times, refer to an appendix which is no longer present in the F/AM. He reported that one of the ad hoc committees will look specifically at the grievance process and the charge of the Grievance Committee currently in the by-laws and the administrative sections of the F/AM; the other committee will focus on the same matters relating to the Hearing Committee. Letters of invitation to serve on these committees are forthcoming, and the committees are to begin preliminary work this semester and to complete their work in the fall.

The Speaker reported that the College is participating in National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE), a survey taken by first year students and graduating seniors. The first year the College participated in the survey was when current graduating seniors were freshmen. Students may participate through a portal in MyCharleston. The Speaker asked faculty to reinforce and support student participation in this nationally-normed survey since it provides a useful measure of student engagement at the beginning and end of their time at the College. As of now, he said, there appears to be only about 15% eligible student participation, but our goal is at 40% and the survey is set to close at the end of March.
The Speaker also reported that the results from our most recent participation in the Chronicle of Higher Education's "Great Places to Work Survey" will soon be shared. On a related note, the Speaker said that, given that Francis Marion University has scored higher on the "Great Places" survey, particularly in shared governance, he has been trying to arrange a meeting between himself and faculty governance leadership to hear what they might have to say about their success in that area.

The Speaker noted that six faculty/trustees pairs will be participating in the fall in the faculty/trustee shadowing program established by former Speaker Lynn Cherry. Over the seven semesters that the program has been in place, he said, 17 different trustees have shadowed 38 different faculty. He endorsed the program.

Finally, the Speaker offered an apology. He reported that he had been told that his reporting on the Staff Advisory Committee to the President’s spirit day initiative was interpreted as indicating his lack of support. "Nothing," he said, "could be further from the truth, and I apologize," he added, "to anyone who left with such a perception." The campus and the auditorium in which the Senate was at that time meeting, he asserted, "are packed with people who care a great deal about their efforts and the portions of their lives that they give to this institution," even while our morale may slip from time to time. He closed by noting that on both spirit Fridays thus far he "proudly wore [his] maroon, and ... will like do so every [Spirit Day] moving forward." He suggested that all in the audience might consider doing the same.

B. Provost McGee (Topics - PDF)

Work of the Commission on Higher Education (CHE)

The Provost pointed out that, even though the Senate does not very often speak of the CHE, this body approves all new degree programs at the College and requires numerous reports be filed by the College. The CHE, he noted, has many new commissioners and is at present searching for a new director. They have, he reported, recently proposed new legislation that would give them expanded powers, including powers to unilaterally close academic programs that they believe are too small, not cost effective, or not in the best interest of the state. The Provost promised more information on this as it becomes available and on any other higher education legislation that may be brought before the state legislature.

Tenure, Promotion, Third-Year Review, Sabbatical, and Post-Tenure Review

The Provost reported that there were 36 tenure and promotion (T&P) cases and 24 third-year reviews, plus a number of post-tenure and sabbatical request reviews, all of which will be discussed, the Provost said, in his April Senate report. He expressed great appreciation of the work of all who are involved in the time consuming but critically important and valuable work of faculty evaluation and promotion.

Great Colleges Survey

The Provost noted that the survey was conducted last Spring. He reported that the results will be reviewed with the Staff Advisory Committee to the President on March 23 and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President on April 6.
Academic Affairs Budget Development for 2016-2017

The Provost thanked the members of the Faculty Budget Committee for their significant investment of time working on developing next year’s budget in a difficult time, as well as the Deans and unit heads for their help with materials used by the Budget Committee and himself. He said that the Budget Committee's report on the agenda for the meeting will be comprehensive and informative.

Policy Development and Implementation

The Provost pointed out that as part of our preparations for the reaffirmation of our accreditation, Academic Affairs has initiated a review of our memoranda of understanding governing our four joint MA programs with the Citadel, which have not been updated since their original signing (at least one is a quarter century old). These documents are being scrutinized to ensure that they are not inaccurate and far out of sync with practice.

He advised Senators that policy cleanup will be ongoing and that information on policies can be found at policy.cofc.edu.

More recent developments in policy include the development of the new comprehensive intellectual property policy, many years in the making and another policy that SACSCOC demands, on which the Provost offered to take questions in his Q&A following the report and promised responses to anyone who may have written him about them. He also said that he should soon be able to share with Senators (via email) advanced drafts of the new course numbering and syllabus policies.

Planned Review of Undergraduate and Graduate Grading Systems

The Provost pointed out a Post and Courier story published the very day of the Senate meeting on a proposal to change grading scales for public high schools in South Carolina from a seven-point to a ten-point scale, which would have favorable implications for SC student athletes applying for NCAA scholarship eligibility. He added that on March 2, he articulated to the CHE the College’s feedback on the proposal, opposing it on principled and practical grounds. He said that the College and South Carolina higher education more generally need to stay involved in the discussion.

On the College’s grade policy, the Provost pointed out that ten years ago the College moved from a grade system in which only letter and plus grades were awarded to a system in which minus grades could be awarded as well. The change followed much study of the issue by the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid and reported to the Senate on March 13, 2001. A concern expressed at the time was that the minus grades would lead to lower GPAs and have negative impacts on GPA-based scholarship recipients, which was countered by a viewpoint that the letter and plus-only system was imbalanced and provided insufficient specificity for end of course evaluation of student work. In 2006, after many years of discussion, the system we currently have was initiated. Over the summer, he said, he would like to lead an ad hoc committee to review the last decade of data on the performance of the undergraduate grading system, including comparison to systems used at other SC universities and at peer and aspirant institutions. The committee
will also investigate comparisons to our graduate grading system, which differs from our undergraduate grading system, which as he noted, "is a little weird."

**Comments on Today's Agenda**

The Provost congratulated and thanked newly-named Interim Quality Enhancement Plan Director Todd LeVasseur for his service.

He also said that he is very grateful to several committees of the faculty and Faculty Senate for working on a revised major GPA policy, on which an interim report was soon to be offered at the meeting. He noted that there have been some challenges with the policy, and he stated that he has some reservations about our readiness to adopt a major GPA policy, and he said that he wanted to give fair warning that he will express those concerns. He added that it might be a good idea to delay the policy for a month while we have more conversation about it.

The Provost closed with saying that the campus is hosting accepted students weekend at the end of the week. He thanked those involved in developing and putting on the program and asked faculty who might be on campus to work during the weekend to be "extremely nice" to prospective students.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Joe Kelly**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), inquired about the intellectual property policy. He read a sentence from the policy relating to distance education:

> For clarification purposes, the College/University shall retain rights to classes and course work developed at the College/University, including the syllabus, which are software, digital material in any media, videotaped or recorded using any other media or used for distance education, when the College/University has paid a stipend to the faculty member for such development or recording or it was developed with substantial use of College resources or facilities. [Policy 9.1.13, p. 5]

If a professor video-records lectures for a distance education class on his or her computer and posts them on OAKS, Senator Kelly asked, and subsequently leaves the College, does the college own the professor's image and lectures, with the ability to use them in perpetuity?

The Provost said the College does not own such material. He added that, as concerns distance education, in the context of intellectual property, the College has not tried to "plow new ground."

He said that were an individual paid specifically to develop a new course in a work-for-hire arrangement and it was established up front that the College owned the course forever, that would be a different story. But in the typical case of developing a distance education course or developing course materials with electronic technology tools, the College is "not asserting a property interest in perpetuity."
However, there is a specific distance education proviso to consider: if one develops a distance education course and then leaves the College, the College has the right to use the material for a year (not permanently) in order to manage the instructional teach-out schedule to make sure students get the classes they need.

Kelly Shaver, Senator — Management and Marketing, said that the appendix attached to the policy does not identify the name of the individual who is supposed to receive disclosures, and he asked who should receive them.

Provost McGee replied that, unless otherwise instructed by a supervisor, faculty should submit disclosure forms to the General Counsel.

**There were no further questions.**

C. **Faculty Budget Committee** - Chair, Julia Eichelberger

Report Forthcoming

**Committee Documents Folder**

Senator Eichelberger reported on behalf of the committee: Calvin Blackwell, Doug Friedman, herself, Courtney Murren, Tom Ross, Martha Stackel, William Veal

Senator Eichelberger summed up the current budget challenges (presentation slide 2), noting that much of this is familiar information to Senators. On how the makeup of next year’s student body will affect revenues, she added that this year’s graduating class has a higher percentage of out-of-state tuition-paying students. Thus their departure will not be offset by the incoming class.

On the public discussions (Feb 24 & Mar 2) of the Academic Affairs budget, Senator Eichelberger noted a change from last year’s process: unit heads, instead of asking for additions to the budget, were asked to discuss how they would reduce the budget if they had to do so.

The upshot of the discussions was a recognition, she pointed out, that considering the upcoming expenses, including the need to replenish our reserve, and the uncertain revenue picture, cuts to operating budgets in Academic Affairs will not suffice. (See graph on slide 4).

Comments heard in the hearing on cutting budgets in Academic Affairs (slide 5) include observations that little can be saved in the cutting; cutting operating budgets may affect the foreign instructional budget in one unit; professional development, faculty and student research can also take a hit with operational budget cuts; cutting instructional programs may not have an effect for some time; losing lines due to retirement can mean sacrifices in updating research and pedagogy in the department affected; and teaching is central but not the only work faculty do to fulfill our institutional mission. Some deans, additionally, asked if they could give up summer school revenues instead of making operational and instructional budget cuts. Note: Senator Eichelberger made a correction to the slide shown and handouts given at the meeting: in relation to an eliminated program, "Exercise Science" should have read "Athletic Training."

Student fees (slides 6 & 7) from 1998-99 through 2015-16 as a general trend have roughly tripled, with two areas rising at a faster rate: the fees for capital
improvement and athletics. The former is, she noted, paying for buildings students are using at present (not future buildings).

Senator Eichleberger also shared a graph on full- and part-time staff increases 2009-13 (slide 8) and the College’s recurring budget allocations from 2001-2 to present, breaking out allocations by unit. She thanked Sam Jones, Associate Vice President for Budgeting and Payroll Services, for providing the latter and other data and information for the committee.

The Athletics division’s allocations are featured in slide 10, the upper table showing showing allocations since 2007-08. The lower table, she explained, breaks down historic expenditures by the unit with information provided by Athletics in response to the committee’s request. Finally, she presented a slide (11) showing percentage budget increases by unit since 2006, noting that some have risen more steeply than others.

The Budget Committee’s recommendations (slides 12-14), she reported, are:

- Transparency and public accountability for units outside Academic Affairs.

  Academic Affairs, she noted, has worked transparently and is rigorously "soul searching" about instructional and operating budget cuts. The committee would like to see the same transparency from units across campus.

- Prioritize the academic mission instead of decreasing support for it.

  This, Senator Eichelberger said, is what we have to sell and is what students come for, and so should be prioritized.

- Consider reallocating funding to get more money to academic programs and avoid cuts being contemplated.

  Senator Eichelberger said the committee suggests that reallocations might be made from other parts of the budget and other parts of the universal student fee in order to get more money to academic programs so that we can avoid losing lines.

  She explained that relatively small short-term savings will come from cutting visiting positions that make very important contributions, and we should try to retain as many of these faculty as we can.

  Covering lost positions with “surplus labor” (available adjuncts) is also problematic, she said. Adjunct faculty, in most cases, are only expected to teach and not paid, in addition, to do other things critical to our mission (advising, service, research).

- Healthy academic departments need long-range planning.

  The committee, she said, would like to urge the Provost and the President to protect departments with current vacancies so that they are not forever
- Depleted if they need more positions to carry out their missions and serve students.

- We need publicly stated rationale for reallocations within Academic Affairs and across campus.

  The committee recognizes the need for reallocations but that the decision process and rationale for reallocations need to be shared and understood.

- Other forms of reallocation, including differential teaching loads, should be done carefully.

The committee reaffirms, she said, principles last year’s committee expressed in memos sent to then Interim Provost McGee:

- Principles for prioritizing lines to protect, in the same way that the previous mode of budget development in the committee operated on a set of principles to determine lines to be added.

- Principles for school-based fees, which would provide a means of offsetting costs in schools with higher instructional costs.

She noted that these principles are laid out in the handout she circulated.

She closed by reporting that the Provost has promised to continue his consultations with the Faculty Budget Committee as he gets to the point of talking about cuts to positions and pointing out that, to date, the committee has not been involved in discussions of position cuts. She reported that schools and divisions were asked to "force rank" positions within schools and divisions and the committee expects that those rankings will guide the Provost's decisions. She promised that the Budget Committee will keep faculty informed on these matters.

She closed by adding that the College needs a "bigger buffer," retaining more funds to protect against tuition revenue fluctuations.

She called for discussion and invited all to join in: the Provost, Deans, Senators.

Questions/Discussion

Andrew Bergstrom, IT, in relation to the committee's call for increased budget transparency, pointed out that there is a "Transparency Spending" website (transparency.cofc.edu) that can provide insight in academic and nonacademic department spending, including P card reports. Bergstrom asked how many in the room have seen the site.

The Speaker replied that as a former department chair, he has never heard of it and thanked Mr. Bergstrom for pointing it out.

Alex Kasman, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), asked about the graph showing increases in expenditures in different divisions (slide 11). It does not include the President's office, he pointed out.
Senator Eichelberger noted that the data for allocations to the President’s office are available in slide 9. To consider those figures in the same way as the graph on slide 11 does, the President’s office was allocated about $2.8 million in 2006 and in 2015 about $3.5 million, an addition of about $700,000.

Senator Kasman noted that in comparison to budget increases in other units from 2006 to present, the increases in the President’s office (by percentage) have been among the smallest.

Tom Baginski, Senator - German and Russian Studies, directed a question to either Provost McGee or Senator Eichelberger. He asked what, in slide 13, “differential teaching loads” euphemizes.

"Not a euphemism at all," Provost McGee replied. He explained that the phrase is a reference to a very old provision in the F/AM that sets the default faculty teaching load at 12 contact hours. Over time, we have moved to tenured and tenure-stream faculty teaching closer to nine contact hours. While many academic units have provisions for faculty who are not research productive or active in creative work to teach more, these provisions have not been employed. In conversations with Deans, he said, the need to revisit the assigning of research teaching releases to faculty who, for a variety of reasons and circumstances have not been able to be productive in research or creative activities.

[See Senator Iana Anguelova’s question below and following for further discussion of differential teaching loads.- JMD]

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, asked to go back to the graph on slide 11 (comparing percentage increases in budgets from 2006 to present, and asked why, with the exception of Physical Plant, the two units with the smallest increases over the period are the two units closest to the students: Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. He added a second question: why do units with greater percentages of increase than Academic Affairs not have to come to the Faculty Senate to report why this is?

Senator Eichelberger replied that these are good questions.

The Speaker said, to answer the second questions, we have not invited those units to do so, but there is no reason they cannot be invited to do so.

Senator Shaver followed up: "where do these differential percentages come from? What have we done that is so much not having to do with students and faculty?” He added that there may be good reasons, but that he, for one, would like to hear them.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, speaking here, she said, as Associate Professor of Mathematics, said that it is important to look at relative size of each unit within the total budget, which is not to say that the graph does not provide important information, but that it should also be considered in that context.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, offered two questions.
He asked the Provost if he had discussed with the Deans about adjusting evaluation criteria for annual evaluation and post-tenure review for faculty in the waning years of their careers and who are opting to focus on teaching and not research. Could evaluations for these faculty be focused more on teaching and leave out of consideration research?

The Provost replied that there have been many conversations along the lines Senator Kelly suggested, but there have been challenges in follow through. Conceptually, he said, he agrees with a more nuanced approach to differential teaching loads such as Senator Kelly suggested.

Separate questions from these relate to how faculty researchers are employed and how cost savings might be produced, the Provost said, and these and many other questions will need to be addressed if we are going to discuss differential teaching loads.

**Senator Kelly** also asked about two of the recurring budget requests that President McConnell lists in his 24 February Blog post ["Update on the State Budget"]:  
- Expansion of in-state mission: $2.2 million  
- Bachelor of Professional Studies: $750,000  
- Computer Science: $735,000  
- Mitigating Information Security Ranks: $652,000

What do the first two figures cover?, Senator Kelly asked.

The Provost pointed out that budget requests to the state legislature often involve trying to divine what the priorities are of the legislators of any given year; and what appears to have been compelling over the past few years are programs that appeal to chambers of commerce and business groups in the state (such as Computer Science). He added that new money coming in one area may also free funds for use elsewhere. Thus, we do not turn down targeted funds, and if there seems to be a good chance of getting them, we ask for them.

On the $2.2 million, this would be more Educational and General (E&G) Budget money not tied to a specific purpose. We have not been successful in getting such unspecified funds in a meaningful way, the Provost said, in the 21st century. There may be some support for this ask of money without strings attached to help with our budget challenges.

**Lisa Covert**, Senator - SHSS, on the matter of unfunded state mandate for raises, asked if these raises are unfunded specifically at the College or across the board for employees at other state institutions as well.

Senator Eichelberger replied that it is across the board. We have a number of state-approved lines for which we furnish the entire salary and for these we are also responsible for generating the raises. For lines for which the salary comes from the state itself, the state provides the raise.
The Provost added that, in the short version of a more convoluted story, we will be responsible for 82% of the cost of any state-mandated raises. "Let me be clear," he asserted, "we want our employees to get raises." After not getting raises last year, adding in the rising cost of living here and the need to stay salary-competitive with other schools, "it is delightful to see salaries go up for our very hard working and dedicated employees." Yet it is big challenge to find the money with state only footing 18% of our raise bill.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, noting that we have heard much talk over the years about school-based fees asked if we are close to implementing these.

Senator Eichelberger said that the idea has support in the administration, who are hoping to secure the support of the Trustees, who would have to approve. Both the Schools of Sciences and Mathematics and Business have been developing plans, and according to the Provost, she said, the plans reflect some of the principles and caveats the committee developed last year. She reported that in a recent conversation with her, the President said that he thinks we are getting closer to implementing fees, but she said that she, herself, cannot report anything on it.

Senator Krasnoff followed up: is the any sense of how much revenue might be generated by fees?

Senator Eichelberger speculated that we would do something commensurate with Clemson and USC’s fee structures. We would not want to go above a benchmark set in relation to those schools’ fees. The fees would also be phased in.

The Provost added that models have been developed by SSM and SB that would use fees to support specific programs and return some fee income to the general ledger of the schools. If the fees based on current models were adopted, the Provost said, they could generate and return to the E&G budget about $400,000 in year one and $800,000 annually thereafter for "general support of the institution."

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked how much it cost us to get a raise.

Senator Eichelberger replied that this information is on the handout: $922,000 per each 1% raise.

Senator DeLaurell followed up: "are we saying we don't have that money? We can't get a raise?"

Senator Eichelberger: "It's not looking great." [Laughter]

The Provost added that if by law we are mandated to give raises, we have to. The money may come from a number of places (reductions, tuition and fee increases, other revenue streams), but it has to come from somewhere.

Senator Eichelberger added here that a report from Compensation Committee last year pointing out the pay gaps between ourselves and our peer institutions at Associate and full Professor ranks figured into the Budget Committee’s recommendations last year. The Provost observed at that time that a plan for raises might be implemented but not without cuts from elsewhere in the budget.
Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, asked as a follow-up if the SC legislature might be persuaded to have the state fund the entirety of the raise.

The Provost said that the President has been trying to educate the legislature on the differences between mandating a raise at an educational institution and mandating a raise, say, at the Department of Natural Resources. The $2.2 million mentioned in Senator Kelly’s query above, he said, if we managed to get it, could be swallowed up, every dime, by the mandated raise and we would still need more.

Senator Anguelova asked also how soon differential teaching loads might be implemented.

The Provost said that he "has suggested to the Deans that it is well within their authority, and they should consider doing so, in some targeted cases, as early as this fall."

Senator Anguelova asked how much money it would save.

The Provost replied, "I have no idea, because it would depend on the rules adopted on a school-by-school basis." He pointed out that Article Five of the F/AM specifies that the Provost delegates to the Deans workload management, and these decisions are made within the constraints of budget, disciplinary requirements, limits of accreditation, and other factors.

Hector Qirko, Senator - Sociology and Anthropology, observed that differential teaching loads were studied by an ad hoc committee a decade or so ago (before his time, he said). He asked if this report is still relevant.

The Provost replied in the affirmative and added that he has been thinking about the report a good deal in the current context. The work had much merit. It suggested that we need to consider student credit hour productivity and look at the unit of the department and the program, rather than use a one size fits all solution at the level of the individual faculty member. Yet, while there were many good ideas in the report, execution has been incomplete.

Senator Qirko followed up: should there be a new committee at this time?

The Provost said he would not disagree and, indeed, if we pursue questions raised by Senator Kelly, we will need to do so through our shared governance structures.

There were no further questions.

D. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Update

Todd LeVasseur, QEP Interim Director

Professor LeVasseur said that as QEP Interim Director, he is building on work already done by Professor Brian Fisher, who laid the groundwork for the QEP with his original proposal.

He listed and discussed briefly the subcommittees for the QEP: Marketing, Budget, Student Advisory (graduate and undergraduate), Curricular and Co-curricular, Assessment, and Research, Literature Review, Best Practices, and Writing.
The Curricular and Co-curricular subcommittee, he reported, is at work on goal four of five. There is a meeting of this committee on March 17 and President McConnell will be in attendance. Once this committee is finished developing implementable actions, the Assessment committee can begin its work.

The Research, Literature Review, Best Practices, and Writing committee, Professor LeVasseur reported, will meet within two weeks to finalize definitions of sustainability and sustainability literacy.

A site visit, he said, is planned at Furman the Friday following the Senate meeting to examine their sustainability practices.

In time for the visit of a SACSCOC Vice President in May, the team will have developed some kind of document.

At this point, Professor LeVasseur called on Dr. Divya Bhati, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, for deadlines regarding the document. Dr. Bhati said that if we have in the fall a QEP document that can be shared with the Senate, she will happily do so. Currently there is not a specific timeline. An on-site SACSCOC team will evaluate the QEP in spring of 2017.

Anything needing to go through the curriculum committees will have to go through in the next academic year in order to have an implementable plan in spring ’17 to run in Fall 2017, with the first year of the QEP being 2017-18.

Professor LeVasseur also noted that he is trying to meet with Deans at present.

He reported that all the QEP meeting minutes are accessible through the QEP website. He added that he will be happy to visit departments and programs to field questions as requested.

**There were no questions.**

Speaker McNerney pointed out that links to the QEP materials are available through the OEP's website off the College main page or on the Faculty Senate pages under "Important Links."

### E. Faculty Educational Technology Committee - Chair, David Desplaces

Classroom Upgrade Project ([PDF](#)) and Yammer Update

Professor Desplaces reported that the committee meets monthly to review issues associated with technology and education and IT concerns. Topics have included IT"s budget and the implications of budget cuts for teaching, classroom technology upgrades (shared in the linked report), and Yammer (matters of rollout, user adaptation). On the horizon for the committee are academic networking, Office 360, a review of distance education, and issues with Gmail raised by faculty.

The classroom upgrade report (linked to above) indicates the process for upgrades. A particular classroom referred to in the January special meeting in Q & A with Bob Cape, Professor Desplaces said, had a contractor issue and many classrooms simply have an awkward configuration that cannot be addressed by IT upgrades. Future discussions of the committee will also include the outfitting of the Technology Center.
Professor Desplaces stated that Bob Cape and his staff have worked very diligently to make classroom upgrades. While they fell short of the goal of upgrading 26 classrooms, there are also ongoing capital projects to consider that will bring 55 upgraded classrooms online.

Professor Desplaces also noted that many have posed questions about how we can best use Yammer. The committee, he says, feels Yammer has a functionality unrecognized by most faculty and has gone untapped.

Questions / Discussion

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, asked how, in practice, decisions are made on the rooms to be upgraded and how they should be upgraded. She asked if IT watches teachers in particular rooms, and she singled out as her "pet peeve" smart boards, which she said are expensive and take up too much room.

Zach Hartje, Teaching, Learning, Technology (TLT), responded that IT works with people they call "needs definers," and in this context, these are department chairs on whom IT rely to work with faculty on what should go into a classroom upgrade. All the classroom with smart boards (about 52% of those upgraded since the beginning of the upgrade project) were outfitted with smart boards based on feedback from department chairs. IT does not make the decision about what goes in the classroom.

Senator Anguelova asked for clarification: smart boards were requested by the chairs?

Mr. Hartje affirmed this.

Professor Desplaces at this time asked for a show of hands for how many faculty in the room remember getting an email in the last four months from their department chairs inquiring about technology needs in the classroom. Seeing few hands, he added that every chair was strongly encouraged to communicate with faculty on this matter.

Senator Anguelova stated that when smart boards came up in discussion in the Math department, they had to make a concerted campaign to keep their blackboards (and not adopt smart boards). The faculty's opinion, she said, not only was not solicited, and they had to fight.

She added another question: who decided on idea paint?

Desplaces clarified that the FETC in not involved in the upgrades. He added that the committee agreed that not everyone seems to have been solicited on classroom upgrades. Another complicating factor is that classrooms are "owned" by particular departments. For example, a Theater-owned classroom will be upgraded based on feedback from that department's chair, even though that classroom may also be used by languages faculty. A list of classrooms and their owners, he pointed out, is on the web. Professor Desplaces suggested that those in a situation similar to the one described above might try to open lines of communication with the chair of the classroom-owning department.
Senator Anguelova followed up by asking where initial ideas for upgrading classrooms are originating?

Zach Hartje, TLT, replied asked for clarification. Senator Anguelova said that she assumes IT proposes ideas to the need definers. She asked "do you ask the need definers to give you ideas on how they want the classroom to be upgraded?"

Mr. Hartje replied that IT asks the need definers to tell them about how the classroom is used in the department, and there are recommendations from IT (standard configurations) available, based on what need definers say.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, said that a problem is assuming that very busy chairs have time to think about the details of classroom configuration. Posing questions to faculty directly, she suggested, would yield more valuable information. In her own department, she said, her proactive chair and faculty went into classrooms together and discussed the options. Her department’s classrooms, as a result, have no smart boards, though they were unable to resist whiteboards, even though they requested to keep chalkboards.

Senator Anguelova reiterated that Math faculty were not consulted. Senator Cormack replied that when there are changes that affect teachers across the College, the whole faculty need to be aware of the proposed changes and able to respond.

Senator Andy Shedlock (Biology) at this time suggested that the ongoing discussion could ported to Yammer in order that the meeting’s business could move forward.

Jannette Finch, Senator - Library, on behalf of her constituents, asked for a clarification as to whether we are sticking with Yammer; to which the IT staff on hand said "yes" and after which she asked, provided that the idea is to offer more training in how to use Yammer well, what will the training/help look like?

Andrew Bergstrom, IT, explained that IT have met with the Staff Advisory Committee, the FETC, watched positings on Yammer, and gathered Helpdesk information, all of which revealed two trends.

1. People want to know how to do things.

To help with this, John Schroeder has developed a class that meets on Tuesdays from 2-3 (Bell 500). If this meeting time does not work, Mr. Bergstrom asked faculty to contact Helpdesk or Mr. Schroeder to schedule an alternate time, which they will be happy to do.

IT will also be building out an instructional site on Yammer itself.

2. People wanted to return to a listserv system.

There was a misconception among these users about how the faculty/staff listserv worked, Mr. Bergstrom said. The listserv never reached all faculty and staff because it was an opt-in list, which has, he pointed out, been said in the Senate at least a couple times, yet the misconception persists. There are mandatory lists at the College that reach all faculty and all staff, but these are moderated as to what can and cannot go out.
Mr. Bergstrom strongly recommended Yammer training, and said that once faculty see how it works they will see what can be gotten out of it.

Senator Cormack (Religious Studies), given Mr. Bergstrom's stating that the old faculty/staff listserv did not reach all faculty and staff, asked how many people are not reached by Yammer.

Mr. Bergstrom said that the current number of people on Yammer is 1374.

Senator Cormack asked for a comparison to the numbers on/off the old listserv.

John Schroeder, IT, replied that the highest number of subscribers to the faculty/staff list was 1600, fairly evenly divided between faculty and staff. Mr. Bergstrom added that many of the subscribed addresses on faculty/staff were "debris," email addresses not longer used but still on the distribution list since listserv does not automatically decommission or purge unused addresses.

Senator Anguelova (Mathematics) stated that many people are technically on Yammer but do not really use it. She also claimed that, compared to the old open discussion listserv, Yammer's open discussion group is not as active.

She added that while a justification for moving from the listserv system was that it was wasting time. Yammer, she complained, also wastes time, evidence of which, she said, is the constant notifications on some of the lists and a large number of emails she does not want and which are not helpful. Yammer wastes more time, she argued, than listservs.

Professor Desplaces suggested the digest mode, which Senator Anguelova said comes the next day and may be too late to act on information contained therein.

John Schroeder, IT, observed that all this conversation suggests the value of training and a little more guidance. For Yammer to work best, he said, you need to go in and sign up for groups. The daily digest amounts to only a teaser for what is going on in groups. He added that IT does not recommend subscribing to "All Company" because that group cannot easily be subscribed to by email.

He added that IT recommends that everyone sign up for the faculty and staff announcements group as a default place to post and read announcements.

If you don't want to use the Yammer website, you can use Yammer to see email notifications when there are postings to a group.

Mr. Schroeder said that he is more than happy to work with everyone to help them get set up to use Yammer effectively. The whole point of Yammer, he added, is to allow users a choice in what they want to see.

An exchanged followed in which Senator Anguelova expressed concerns with her Yammer experience and Mr. Shroeder tried to answer these and to provide further information.

Senator Eichelberger (SHSS) asked that the Senate move to the next agenda item. There was no further discussion.
F. **Academic Standards Committee** - Chair, Quinn Burke  
Proposed Language for College-wide Major GPA Policy ([PDF](#))

The Speaker explained that the report is being offered by the Faculty Academic Standards Committee (FACS), but is really coming from an ad hoc committee.

Professor Burke said that the report is coming from a joint ad hoc committee of members from the FACS, Curriculum Committee, and the Academic Planning Committee. The process began in the fall.

He explained that some colleges have major GPA on transcripts; others do not. The College does not include major GPA on transcripts, though students do often include major GPA on resumes/CVs, particularly in applications to graduate school.

Across the College, he stated, there is high inconsistency in how departments are calculating major GPA. Some majors require courses that they exclude from calculating major GPA. The College's major GPA policy currently states that courses required for a major need to be included in major GPA calculations. A central issue is one of prerequisites, a term that needs to be well defined, which is the aim of the proposed policy.

In the proposed policy, prerequisites are broken into two categories for the purposes of calculating major GPA.

- **Pre-Requisite Course Required for the Major:** A prerequisite course for a required major course that is itself a required major course.
- **Pre-Requisite Course Only:** A prerequisite course for a required major course that is not itself a required major course.

Required major courses only would count in major GPA.

Nothing at this point is finalized, he said.

Professor Burke thanked the many who have worked on the policy and called for questions and discussion.

**Questions / Discussion**

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator - SSM, asked if the second of the above is not a "hidden prerequisite," which departments were asked to eliminate.

Professor Burke said that this issue did emerge in discussions and the committee may return to it, but at this point the committee is mainly trying to nail down distinctions between prerequisites.

The Provost added that before fairly recent changes, it was difficult to tell from the catalog what courses a student had to take to complete a major because the hour count displayed did not reflect prerequisite courses that were built into the short listings. In the current catalog, all the courses that have to be taken are listed.

"This is a serious and significant problem for us to address," he said; "happily, we don't have to fix that one, too."

The Provost deferred at this point to Registrar Mary Bergstrom to speak to ongoing challenges.
We are trying to get to a place, she said, in which the courses that are truly required for a major are all represented in the same way. She said that she could provide examples of five different ways in which major GPA is calculated across campus.

There will need to be agreement as to what is truly considered a prerequisite. Is it a course that prepares a student for the major? Is it a course within the major required to be taken before another course in the major?

On the matter of hidden prerequisites, she said, the Registrar's office's transparency project on the catalog unveiled many credit hours that were missing in the calculation. If you examine the catalog, she pointed out, you will often find a credit hour number with a plus added: this is because we cannot truly arrive at a finite number because there are disagreements as to what counts as a prerequisite in major GPA and what does not.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, said that, while he understands the point of the language, he felt it is not very well written and would not, in its current state be helpful to students. "Required course," he said, needs to be defined because one might argue that a course not listed in the major but is a prerequisite is, in fact, required. At present, "requirement" simply means "listed in the requirements." "Requirement" needs to be explicit.

Andy Shedlock, Senator - Biology, noting that Biology has over 1,000 majors, suggested that the policy may create unintended consequences for enrollment and tuition revenue. If the major GPA in Biology is calculated by including particularly challenging classes like Organic Chemistry, many students may go to Trident Tech, instead, in the summer. He offered this as a caution.

Professor Burke said he appreciated Senators Shedlock and Krasnoff’s observations and will take them back to the subcommittee.

There were no further questions or discussion.

5. Old Business: None

6. New Business
   A. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual - Chair, Jason Vance

   Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Manual for Reapportionment of Faculty Senate (PDF)

   Professor Vance pointed out the Senate was reduced in the number of Senators to 50 in 2010; however, over the past six years, over half of the time, we have failed to meet that prescribed number. A challenge is presented by changes in the composition of the College in the relative number of faculty in the different schools, which may change due to growth or contraction (should there be attrition or cuts in faculty lines, for instance). There is presently no F/AM language governing the regularly with which the Senate needs to be reapportioned.

   The motion sets the reapportionment to occur under the supervision of the Faculty Nominations and Elections Committee every three years based on an assessment of the number of regular faculty in the College and establishes the method of
apportionment as Huntington-Hill. The language, he noted, sets the reapportionment cycle to begin in the fall of 2015 (reapportionment has already occurred for the current cycle). The language, he pointed out, also addresses the scenario in which seats might be lost and how apportionment operates in those cases.

Professor Vance noted that the way in which seats are distributed in the Senate is that if there are more seats allotted to a school than to the number of departments in the school, then each department gets a seat and the remaining seats are at-large seats. Conversely, if there are more departments in a school than the number of seats allotted to the school, then all the seats are at-large seats.

Professor Vance added that the committee sought the review and recommendations of the Faculty Nominations and Elections Committee and the Faculty Welfare Committee. He observed that the purpose of the motion is to address the reapportionment of the Senate only and not the composition of the Senate, which remains at 50 seats.

Speaker McNerney stipulated that as a motion brought by a Senate committee, it did not require a second.

There were questions or discussion.

The motion was approved on unanimous voice vote.

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

Professor Ewalt specified that the first two proposals (MAT Early Childhood and Elementary Education) make changes that bring the programs into compliance with the SC Read to Succeed Act, and she asked that they be considered for approval together.

1. MAT Early Childhood Education Proposals (PDF, pp. 1-36)
   - EDEE 617: change title, prerequisite change, edit description
   - EDEE 631: new course
   - EDEE 640: change title, edit description
   - EDEE 682: change title, edit description

2. MAT Elementary Education Proposals (PDF, pp. 37-61)
   - EDEE 633: new course
   - EDEE 695: change title, edit description

   There were no questions and no discussion.
   The proposals were approved on unanimous voice vote.

3. MAT Special Education Proposal (PDF, pp. 62-65)
   EDFS 654: add existing course to requirements or electives.
   There were no questions and no discussion.
The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

4. **MAT Performing Arts Proposal** ([PDF](#))
   - PUBA 664: replace with MTL 648
   - New Courses: MUSE 501 & 685
   - MUSE 704: change title, edit description
   - New Courses: THRE 704 & 690

Professor Ewalt specified that this proposal, among other things, also responds, in part, to the SC Read to Succeed Act.

**There were no questions and no discussion.**

The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

5. **MS Environmental Studies Proposal** ([PDF](#))
   - EVSS 695: change credits/contact hours, edit description

**There were no questions and no discussion.**

The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

6. **MS Marine Biology Proposals** ([PDF](#))
   - Delete courses: BIOL 510 & 631

**There were no questions and no discussion.**

The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

7. **MS Accountancy Proposals** ([PDF](#))
   - New courses: ACCT 550, 538, and 589
   - ACCT 531: edit course description
   - Delete courses: ACCT 542, 543, and 545

**There were no questions and no discussion.**

The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

C. **Faculty Curriculum Committee**

Gibbs Knotts, Chair

**Speaker McNerney** pointed out the item number 10 (course renumbering in MATH and EVSS) below needed to be stricken from consideration at the meeting. The Math renumbering proposal has already been approved by both the graduate and undergraduate curriculum committees; however, the PDF distributed with the agenda does not include the materials. The PDF provided only has the EVSS materials, and those course re-numberings will not be discussed by the graduate curriculum committee until March 16. Thus, the item should be pulled, and will be on the agenda in April.

The Speaker also specified that item number 13 (on the Environmental Studies minor), in particular the name change proposed, will be singled out for separate discussion at the request of a Senator.
Professor Knotts then opened the floor for discussion of and questions about the remaining proposals, 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-23 below.

Senator (SHSS) and Faculty Budget Committee Chair Julia Eichelberger noted that item 7 (BPS Healthcare) has not been received but not yet reviewed by her committee. She requested that the item be pulled from consideration pending the budget committee’s review.

Senator Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) suggested that deliberation on all the BPS proposals (items 7, 8, and 9 below) be discussed separately from the others.

The Speaker then called for any other proposals that should be discussed separately. Seeing none, he asked for discussion and questions on the remaining proposals; 1-6, 11, 12, and 14-23 below.

There were no questions or discussion on these items.

All passed on a unanimous voice vote.

See beneath the proposal listing below for the discussion of BPS proposals (items 7-9) and the Environmental Studies minor proposal (item 13).

1. African Studies (PDF)
   Add HIST 272 and 273 to the electives in the AFST minor. Students are currently required to take one of those two courses, but aren't allowed to count the other as an elective. This was an oversight.
   This proposal was approved.

2. Art History (PDF)
   - Create six new courses and add them as options in the ARTH B.A.
   - Deactivate four courses and title changes for 14 courses.
   This proposal was approved.

3. Asian Languages (PDF)
   Creation of 0-credit discussion courses as co-requisites for Asian language courses.
   This proposal was approved.

4. Biology (PDF)
   Updating the various Biology programs to reflect the changes to the Honors Chemistry courses.
   This proposal was approved.

5. Geology (PDF)
   Change to some of the prerequisites for GEOL 291.
   This proposal was approved.

6. Honors Chemistry (PDF)
   - Deactivate HONS 191/L and 294/L and replace with a new 5-credit hour course.
   - Update the various Chemistry programs to reflect this change.
   - This will also affect the Biology proposal and the Geology 291 proposal.
   This proposal was approved.
7. **BPS Healthcare** ([PDF](#))
   - Create three new courses on healthcare
   - Create a healthcare minor within BPS.
   
   **This proposal was discussed separately (see below).**

8. **BPS Program Changes** ([PDF](#))
   - Add PRST 220 and PRST 230 as requirements in BPS.
   - Terminate the BPS Information Systems concentration.
   - Make numerous changes to the course lists for the other concentrations.
   
   **This proposal was discussed separately (see below).**

9. **BPS Project Management** ([PDF](#))
   - Create six new courses on project management.
   - Create a new project management concentration within BPS.
   
   **This proposal was discussed separately (see below).**

10. **Course Renumbering** ([PDF](#))
    The College has a new course-numbering policy, which is forcing programs to renumber some of their courses. Requirements for cross-listed courses are now stricter. Both EVSS and MATH are making changes because of this. (Stricken from consideration at this meeting. See the Speaker’s remarks above).

11. **Data Science** ([PDF](#))
    - Replace current system of 14 different cognates (basically a discipline-based system) with a system of 4 different emphases (basically a school-based system).
    - Add 6 hours of CSCI/MATH courses to the requirements.
    
    **This proposal was approved.**

12. **Elementary Education** ([PDF](#))
    Remove EDEE 327 from the EDEL degree requirements.
    
    **This proposal was approved.**

13. **Environmental Studies** ([PDF](#))
    - Change the name of the minor.
    - Make a corresponding change to the name of ENVT 200, the minor’s introductory course.
    
    **This proposal was discussed separately (see below).**

14. **Foreign Language Education** ([PDF](#))
    - Add EDFS 455 to the EDFL degree requirements.
    - Add TEDU 436 as an alternative to EDFS 326.
    
    **This proposal was approved.**
15. **History** *(PDF)*
   Create three new courses and add them to the HIST B.A.
   
   **This proposal was approved.**

16. **History 321** *(PDF)*
   - Create the HIST version of AAST 340.
   - Add this course to the HIST B.A.
   
   **This proposal was approved.**

17. **International Studies** *(PDF)*
   - Add INTL 100 as a prerequisite for INTL 350.
   - Change the wording of the INTL study-abroad requirement to better reflect the original intent.
   - Add flexibility to the language requirement in the INTL Asia concentration.
   - Add LTHI 250 to the INTL Comparative Literature concentration.
   
   **This proposal was approved.**

18. **International Studies Concentration** *(PDF)*
   - Add HIST 272 and 273 to the INTL Africa concentration.
   - Change the Europe and Latin America concentrations so SPAN 333 counts only when the content is relevant.
   - Add SPAN 494 to the Latin America concentration.
   - Add a restriction that most courses can’t be double counted between LACS and the INTL Latin America concentration.
   
   **This proposal was approved.**

19. **Linguistics** *(PDF)*
   - Create a new course.
   - Add it and ANTH 387 to the LING minor.
   - Change the title of LING 125.
   - Change the role of LING 101 in the minor.
   
   **This proposal was approved.**

20. **Physical Education Activities** *(PDF)*
   - Create two new courses.
   - Add PEAC 102 as a prerequisite for PEAC 132.
   - Update degree requirements.
   
   **This proposal was approved.**

21. **Physical Education Teacher Education (A)** *(PDF)*
   - Delete HEAL 216, PEAC 105, PEAC 117, EXSC 340+L from PE/TE major.
   - Add EXSC 210, PEHD 222L, PEHD 223L, EDFS 455, BIOL 201+L, BIOL 202+L to PE/TE major:
   - Add 1-credit lab (PEHD 222L) to PEHD 222. Add 1-credit lab (PEHD 223L) to PEHD 223
   
   **This proposal was approved.**

22. **Physical Education Teacher Education (B)** *(PDF)*
   - Change the GPA requirement.
This proposal was approved.

23. Theater (PDF)
   - Create a new course. Add some courses to the THTR electives.
   - Change all dance-related THTR courses to the DANC prefix.
This proposal was approved.

Discussion turned to the proposals not yet voted on, beginning with the Bachelor of Professional Studies proposals.

7. BPS Healthcare (PDF)
   - Create three new courses on healthcare
   - Create a healthcare minor within BPS.

8. BPS Program Changes (PDF)
   - Add PRST 220 and PRST 230 as requirements in BPS.
   - Terminate the BPS Information Systems concentration.
   - Make numerous changes to the course lists for the other concentrations.

9. BPS Project Management (PDF)
   - Create six new courses on project management.
   - Create a new project management concentration within BPS.

Speaker McNerney asked Senator Eichelberger if she thought only the BPS Healthcare proposal needed to be reviewed by the Budget Committee or if they might also need to review the Project Management proposal. Senator Eichelberger replied that the committee typically reviews only new program proposals, but not proposals for changes within programs.

Associate Provost Conseula Frances added that her understanding is that the Senate Budget Committee reviews new majors, does not review concentrations in majors, and has not typically reviewed new minors, though the committee did request to review the BPS Healthcare minor proposal.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, suggested that in the BPS, a concentration is functionally a major and, thus, might be reviewed in the same way the new majors outside the BPS are reviewed.

The Speaker suggested that each proposal might be discussed and acted on in turn.

Senator Krasnoff, instead, moved that all three proposals (items 7, 8, and 9) be remanded to the Budget Committee for review, after which the proposals might return to the Senate in the April meeting. The motion was seconded.

Dan Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, argued that item 8 (BPS Program Changes) proposes actions not ordinarily reviewed by the committee: adding requirements, terminating a concentration, and making other changes.
Senator Krasnoff replied that, presumably the termination of the concentration has to do with underperforming enrollment, while the new concentration proposal would seem to argue that it will do better in enrollment. They are both budgetary arguments, he said, and, thus, within the committee's domain.

The Speaker added here as a point of information that the Budget Committee is charged with reviewing deletions of majors, which fact might be considered if there is an analogy being made between BPS concentrations and majors outside the BPS.

There was no further discussion of Senator Krasnoff's motion.

The motion passed on unanimous voice vote: Items 7, 8, and 9 were remanded to the Budget Committee for further review.

Discussion now turned to the Environmental Studies minor proposal:

13. Environmental Studies [PDF]
- Change the name of the minor.
- Make a corresponding change to the name of ENVT 200, the minor’s introductory course.

Professor Knotts specified that the change in the name is from "Environmental Studies" to "Environmental and Sustainability Studies." He noted that in the Faculty Curriculum Committee there was lengthy discussion about the proposal related to whether or not the title change was advisable in relation to the still-formulating QEP. Ultimately, the proposal passed unanimously.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, said that, as a Senator, he was asked by a colleague to represent concerns about the title change. His colleague, he said, is on the QEP committee and has two objections to the proposal. He feels that it might be wise to wait on the proposed name change in the minor until it is known, as a consequence of the developing QEP, whether or not there might be a separate major in Sustainability. The minor change, in this regard, is premature.

The second objection is to the yoking of sustainability and environment in the proposed title: "Environmental and Sustainability Studies." In his colleague’s view, Senator Shaver said, the title confines sustainability's applicability to the environment. The Senator pointed out that the American Association for Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE), a secondary accreditation organization for Sustainability Studies, sets standards for "sustainability-related" and "sustainability-focused" courses. Colorado State University, which Senator Shaver said is a "star" according to the ASSHE, offers a wide range of sustainability-focused courses, some in expected areas, others in less obvious territory: Agriculture, Animal Sciences, Construction Sciences, Environmental Sciences, but also Business, Economics, English, History, Math, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology. This, he argued on behalf of his colleague, suggests the national
accrediting body's recognition that sustainability involves the environment, but also much more. The effect of tying Environmental Studies and sustainability together may be, he cautioned, to encourage the idea that sustainability is irrelevant outside that context.

Todd LeVasseur, QEP Interim Director, replied that each campus gets to decide what sustainability means. The courses in the minor include Natural Sciences (9 hrs.) and Humanities and Social Sciences (6 hrs.), the latter including courses in Anthropology, Economics, Entrepreneurship, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, and Religious Studies. The program is interdisciplinary, and the learning outcomes include sustainability literacy. He listed numerous (30+) colleges with minors or majors in "Environmental Sustainability Studies" or "Sustainability and Environmental Studies," offering the list as evidence in support of the name change in the proposal.

Senator Shaver replied that his colleague would recommend that "and" be deleted, so that the new title would read "Environmental Sustainability Studies," opening the possibility for other kinds of sustainability studies as well.

Senator Shaver moved that the proposal be changed, replacing "Environmental and Sustainability Studies" as the new name with "Environmental Sustainability Studies." The motion was seconded.

Discussion of the motion now began.

Brian Fisher, Senator - SHSS and Sustainability Director, Business Affairs, added as a point of information that the College is a subscriber to AASHE and, thus, we are part of AASHE. He said that he is currently doing an sustainability assessment for the College so that we can be rated as an institution.

He pointed out that over the last fifteen years AASHE has evolved in how sustainability is understood and practiced. Renewable energy, building efficiency, etc. were the main concerns initially and AASHE assessed schools along these lines. However, at present, he said, those measures (environmental indicators) only account for about 30% of the total assessment. Many of the indicators are social or curricular. He asserted that there is "a clear evolution of what sustainability is."

Senator Fisher argued that the title change as proposed would introduce an interpretation problem for students, who will already naturally associate sustainability with the environment. Students may assume that to learn about sustainability to is go to a particular place, "as opposed to the Business School or the Physical Sciences or even the Arts."

Senator Fisher argued that sustainability needs to be seen not only as interdisciplinary but as "integrative." It can serve as a "platform to bring all the disciplines together as a wholistic framework," allowing problem solving from a system-wide perspective.
Alex Kasman, Senator - SSM, stated that with or without the coordinating conjunction in minor's title, to his mind, there is not necessarily an implication that sustainability only exists in the context of Environmental Studies, just as, he analogized, a Math teaching track does not assume all teaching is Mathematics.

He asked for a clarification: will the minor address sustainability only in the context of the environment? If so, he said, he might agree with Senator Shaver's motion to drop the "and."

Professor LeVasseur reiterated that the minor is interdisciplinary. In order for a class to count for credit in the minor, it must have at least one-third of its content related to sustainability or Environmental Studies. The introductory course also has a name change in the proposal to reflect the new emphasis on sustainability, and it has a final unit called "What is Sustainability?" He added that Senator Fisher's Political Science course in Sustainability fits the minor. The minor's name, Professor LeVasseur asserted, captures the focus on sustainability in contexts other than Environmental Science, but the minor is built on the core strength of the nine hours of Natural Sciences. Other courses that students might take include Ecoreneurship; Environmental Economics; Nature, Technology, and Society; Environmental Ethics; Sustainability; Environmental Policy; even a special topics course in the relationship between the psychology of social change in relation to sustainability, such as Jen Wright is teaching.

The emphasis on sustainability as such, he also noted, is reflected in the minor's student learning outcomes.

The Speaker, at this point, reminded the Senate that the motion on the floor was to remove "and" from the proposed new title for the minor and called for further discussion.

Hector Qirko, Senator - Sociology and Anthropology, asked Professor LeVasseur, asked how many of the numerous schools he listed earlier had an "and" in their program titles.

Within the 45 schools he found, Professor LeVasseur said, titles are either Environmental Sustainability Studies or Sustainability and Environmental Studies.

"So," Senator Qirko followed, "you wouldn't worry about taking 'and' out?"

Professor LeVasseur replied that the proposal was discussed by a steering committee of six faculty, including persons in Psychology, Sociology, Political Science, Geology, Biology, and Chemistry. There was discussion also with Deans. No one in those discussions, he said, had a problem with the name.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, said that to remove the "and" would imply that there's no Environmental Studies in the minor. "Are there," he asked, "Environmental
Studies going on in the minor, apart from sustainability?" If the answer is "yes," then the word "and" should be there, he observed.

Professor Levasseur said that there is a focus, from a Natural Sciences point of view, on Environmental Science separate from sustainability.

Provost McGee at this point asked if there was still a quorum.

The Speaker asked that the conversation continue while he ascertained whether or not there is a quorum.

Senator Fisher (SHSS) observed that courses alone do not lend a sustainability focus to a program. There is a methodology to sustainability that relies on holistic thinking, and simply adding courses, even if they represent perspectives outside of the Natural Sciences, does not get at the methodological focus. There is more to it, he said, than course lists and whether or not an "and" is in the title. He said the real question is whether the program is going to be built with these methodological questions in mind, and "if it is, are you then ignoring the Environmental Science side of things?" Will the minor "evolve toward a holistic, integrated, assessment, problem-solving framework, or is it going to attempt to do that along with the study of environment, which is what the name implies?"

Professor Levasseur replied that he does not think the name implies that Environmental Studies and sustainability are separate but, rather, "what we've been doing, our strengths, where we see ourselves moving towards," and, he asserted, given budget realities there is uncertainty regarding how much the program can be built moving forward.

Senator Fisher asked Professor LeVasseur what his vision for the program is.

The Speaker interjected, indicating that he needs to ensure there is a quorum, and he asked Senators to show hands in order to verify his count.

**Beth Meyer-Bernstein**, Senator - SSM, asked Professor LeVasseur if there was discussion of having a separate minor in Sustainability, instead of putting it together with Environmental Studies. She agreed that the name as proposed may produce a lack of clarity. A separate, interdisciplinary minor in Sustainability would address this.

"It's not on me," Professor Levasseur replied, "what to develop and what our ability to develop new programs is." He added that the name was discussed in the committee, and some in the discussion felt that calling the program "Sustainability Studies" did not capture what the program does and were not comfortable with it.

Senator Meyer-Bernstein asked why there can't be two separate programs. Sustainability Studies as a minor could have some of the Environmental Studies courses but would also have other interdisciplinary courses. She added that she is
worried that the change to the minor might preclude other programs that might be developed in sustainability, such as a Sustainability major.

Professor LeVasseur replied that the courses in the proposal do offer multiple perspectives.

Senator Shaver (Management and Marketing) asked, on behalf of his colleague, if any new courses were added to the minor prior to the name change. Or is this, he asked, adding that the phrase is his, not his colleague's "putting old wine in a new bottle"?

Professor LeVasseur replied that courses in urban sustainability will be added.

Senator Shaver: "but they haven't been yet."

Professor LeVasseur noted that currently all the minor can do is to work with faculty whose courses offer a third of their content in the area of the minor. There are plenty of Math and Science faculty who can do this, but currently there is a limit as far as Humanities and Social Science faculty who can. Right now, he said, there is a special topics course being offered on women, gender, and the environment, which could become part of the program should it become a permanent course.

Senator Shaver added, "the answer is still no."

Professor LeVasseur countered, "because there's not faculty to generate the classes."

Shaver: "but it's still no."

LeVasseur: "yes."

Adem Ali, Senator - Geology, asked if there is flexibility in the requirements because, he said, the program is heavy in the Earth Sciences.

Professor LeVasseur said this reflects the history of the program, but he said, they would like to grow the program through faculty that can teach the courses. He said that the program is very flexible and invites contributions from anybody from any department to teach courses meeting the student learning outcomes of the program.

Beth Meyer-Bernstein, Senator - SSM, asked for a clarification. Each course has to have a third of its content in the area of the minor. Given that the title proposed is "Environmental and Sustainability Studies," does the third of the content need to be either of those things or both?

Provost McGee at this point expressed concern about the Senate's potential modification of a name change that is the product of work in a steering committee.
While the Senate may wish to reject the proposal, he said that the modification of the name, given the situation, is discomforting, and he urged caution.

He noted that the discussion has disclosed hesitation about setting a frame for both Environmental Studies and Sustainability Studies. There could be long term consequences that might need a fuller exploration and debate.

He counseled defeating Senator Shaver’s motion and postponing the discussion of the proposal until the April meeting to allow the steering committee to digest the discussion and return in order to discuss the framework for the proposed change to the minor name, which does need a "tidy answer" to questions of how the two sides of the proposed title fit together.

The Speaker reminded the Senate Senator Shaver's motion is still on the floor.

**Provost McGee called the question;** this was seconded, and it carried on a voice vote.

**Senator Shaver's motion to drop the "and" from the proposed title in the motion of "Environmental and Sustainability Studies" was defeated on voice vote (not unanimous).**

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, said that he intended to offer the postponement motion that Provost McGee suggested, but stated that he had concerns about bringing the motion back immediately in the April meeting. He expressed agreement with Senator Meyer-Bernstein's idea of a separate Sustainability Studies minor and echoed her concern that the minor might preclude program development emerging from the QEP. He said that the proposal is on the right track, but the question of what will come out of the QEP is still an open one and may suggest the need to slow the proposal down somewhat.

**Senator Krasnoff moved that the proposal be postponed.** The motion was seconded. The Parliamentarian suggested that the postponement be until the next meeting. Senator Krasnoff left it open-ended, leaving it up to the steering committee to decide when to bring it back.

**There was no discussion of Senator Krasnoff's motion, which carried on a voice vote (not unanimous).**

The Speaker moved on to Constituents’ Concerns, postponing the following two motions until the April meeting.

C. **Motion for a Faculty Representative in the Budget Process** ([PDF](#))

Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences

D. **Motion to Increase the Number of Years Faculty May Serve on Committees** ([PDF](#))
7. **Constituent’s Concerns**

Simon Lewis, Professor of English, expressed concern about sanctions levied on Professor Robert Dillon (being shifted from his lab and reassigned to other, non-teaching duties) for his alleged insubordination. He pointed out that Professor Dillon’s case "escalated very rapidly," to the point of a possible suspension this coming August. Professor Lewis stated that at no point before the assignment of other duties was Professor Dillon given a hearing. While an investigative hearing is now underway, this has only come after the reassignment. Nor was an ombudsperson called in, nor does there appear, Professor Lewis said, to have been efforts made at mediation. Professor Lewis read into the record the AAUP’s response to the case:

“In general, the AAUP views ‘alternative assignments in lieu of teaching’ to be a suspension and, further, suspensions to be a major sanction that can only be imposed after an adjudicative hearing before an elected faculty body in which the administration has the burden of proof to establish that cause for the sanction exists. As such, the treatment of your colleague appears to fall short of AAUP-supported procedural standards.”

Professor Lewis connected Professor Dillon’s case with the Speaker’s discussion early in the meeting about the need to look into the grievance and hearing systems, and he added that, to his mind, the ombudsperson system at the College is broken. The hearing system, he asserted, is stacked against faculty and is ineffective.

8. **Adjournment: 7:45PM**