Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 3 November 2015

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday 3 November 2015 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order: 5:05 PM

2. 6 October Regular Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.

3. Announcements and Information

Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney sought and received unanimous consent from the body to alter the distributed agenda to

- add a report by the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review (T&P) on “Motion on Administrators’ Roles in Faculty Evaluation” introduced by Senator Larry Krasnoff, Philosophy, at the September Senate meeting, T&P's report to follow that of the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC). The Speaker explained that prior to the Senate agenda deadline for this meeting (10/22), T&P had not had a chance to discuss the motion, but met shortly afterward and have a report they can offer alongside FWC’s.

- include in curriculum proposals under consideration in New Business (Middle Grades Education) the new course proposal for EDFS 436 already distributed to Senators in PDF form with the agenda but not listed on the agenda document.

- remove from consideration a deactivation of an International Studies course included in the PDF curriculum proposals in Latin American and Caribbean Studies distributed with the agenda.

The Speaker also announced that after the meeting agenda was distributed, the President announced that Brian McGee has been named Provost, so the title “Interim Provost” is no longer applicable and he said would introduce Brian McGee at the meeting as Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Applause followed the announcement.

4. Reports

A. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney

The Speaker reported that he attended the Board of Trustees meeting on October 22 and 23. He attended several committee meetings, and he mentioned that what transpired at each will be recorded in their minutes, which will be available when Board of Trustees meeting minutes are posted. The meeting agendas and binders are stored in the Faculty Senate’s office space in ECTR, and Senators and others are welcome to view these.

At the Athletics committee meeting, the Speaker said, renderings of the planned Patriots Point facility were shared (the Speaker shared these with the Senators and audience in the form of a single handout). Presentations were also made by the men’s and women’s soccer coaches, and, of particular note, men’s coach, Ralph Lundy, was congratulated on his 300th victory.

At the Audit committee, the Speaker learned that we have been under an IRS audit, specifically in the Budgeting and Payroll unit, but that nothing amiss has turned up. Quite the contrary, the Speaker said, “they keep noting how super Everett [McInnis, Payroll Manager] is.”

The Speaker reported that at the Academic Affairs committee, he learned that we are making modest progress in faculty diversity. The numbers will be available in that
committee’s minutes, but the Speaker did note numbers relating to gender: the female to male faculty ratio stands at around 44% to 56%, respectively.

The Speaker also reminded Senators at this point of the upcoming visit from College Reads author Bruce Watson (11/9 and 11/10) and the associated events, and he asked Senators to remind their constituents of these.

At the Budget committee, the Speaker heard reports on the College’s financial picture. He distributed to the body in the form of a handout (PDF) of college-wide cuts approved by the committee and then the full board. He also reported that he learned at the meeting of the Board’s institution of a new per-semester student fee ($50) for security, effective next semester.

At the Institutional Advancement committee, he learned of a change to the committee’s title to the Development Committee, with a modestly expanded charge of reviewing the policies of and monitoring the activities, goals, and outcomes of both the Development and Economic Development offices. He noted that the committee also heard a report on farms-to-school projects on campus.

He said that he also attended the Alumni Relations Committee meeting. With apologies to the Board and the Senate, he also noted that while he was present for the first hour and a half of the Board meeting on the 23rd, he had to leave early for teaching obligations, the need of which was made all the more acute by the recent weather-related closures.

Finally, the Speaker noted that the newly-announced QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan) on sustainability, a comprehensive initiative designed to benefit a large portion of our students, still needs much fleshing out, and this will require strong faculty participation. He noted that some faculty in the room may be asked to serve on a committee related to developing the QEP. Additionally, a survey on the QEP that can be filled out by all faculty will open on 11/10 and close on 11/18, and the Speaker asked that Senators, as faculty leaders, both participate and encourage their constituents to do so as well.

There were no questions.

B. Provost McGee (Topics - PDF)

The Provost thanked faculty who sent him congratulatory notes on his being named to the position. He noted that he is the first internally-appointed chief academic officer since 1968, and said he hopes that his own experience and institutional knowledge as a member of the Senate will be an asset to the College. He said that he is trying to schedule a meeting with former Provosts and Interim Provosts still living in the region in order to learn from them. He also announced plans for three open sessions for exchanges between himself and faculty and staff, to replicate, in part, the kind of frank exchanges such as occur during a national search process, the first session to be on Wednesday 11/11, 12:30-1:30.

Provost McGee preliminarily outlined some of his “institutional commitments and beliefs” as he assumes the position, speaking to three main topics: the liberal arts-infused curriculum, the public university, and the teacher-scholar model. Of the liberal arts in our curriculum, he asserted that the College has displayed over its long history a commitment to the liberal arts, but also, since the Harrison Randolph administration, the College has demonstrated a “spirit of experimentation with professional programs” desired by students and the community. Asserting that he does not view the twin mission of liberal arts and professional education as “a source of tension” or a “distraction,” the Provost cited former Provost Conrad Festa’s words from the 1988 undergraduate bulletin: “the College as a liberal arts
institution insures that the ideals of a liberal education inform, support, and enhance every aspect of its curriculum.” These words can be taken as a guiding principle, he asserted: the liberal arts infuses “every school, every department, every program, and every course.” The professional programs are not separate from the liberal arts but infused by them.

At the same time, the College is, he also said, a public institution and, as such, owes the state a “debt of service,” incurred 45 years ago, when the state’s taxpayers “rescued us from bankruptcy and oblivion.”

Finally, he added that he believes that we have not devoted enough time to discussion about the teacher-scholar model in recent years, yet it is a distinguishing feature of the College. He said he “would like us to spend more time thinking about the challenges of that model, whether it’s mentoring and developing faculty as teachers, as researchers, as mentors to students, as well as leaders in the service life of the institution.”

He closed these comments by saying that there is much more to say about these topics in the upcoming open sessions and in future conversations in the Senate.

On the budget for 2015-2016, the Provost reiterated some of the the causes of our budgetary shortfall discussed in prior Senate meetings this fall. He noted that the budget information Speaker McNerney distributed (PDF) at the beginning of the meeting reflects permanent adjustments to the annual budget, and presumably going forward, as approved by the Board of Trustees. He said that unit budget cuts were apportioned in way that accounted for personnel expenses in the general and educational budget and does not include auxiliary spending. It does, however, include “all of the core services of the institution that are provided by Student Affairs, Business Affairs, Institutional Advancement, Marketing and Communications, and, of course most centrally, Academic Affairs.” The Provost noted that while on the percentages, the cuts in Academic Affairs, are not “an enormous part of the budget,” if your academic unit has had operating funds and faculty cut, then it “seems real and personal to you because those are fewer services you have to meet the needs of your students.”

He added that, as previously reported, Academic Affairs will have to locate another $250,000 in recurring budget cuts next year (that amount was to be cut this year but was deferred). Also, the Provost said that since he used $19,000 in nonrecurring funds to help balance the books this year, he will have to make $19,000 in recurring budget cuts next year as well. Additionally, a large proportion of the very large senior class are non-resident students and when they leave, unless there is an offset in recruiting, this will likely eventuate additional recurring budget cuts.

The Provost reported that the Deans and he have already been discussing options and are paying close attention to the first projections in enrollment from the Office of Undergraduate Admissions. Next year’s process for budget planning, he said he hopes “will not be the smash-and-grab of having to make cuts quickly in a few weeks,” but will be more deliberate, several weeks-long process that tries to do the least harm possible to our programming. That said, after next year, we may be able to stabilize at a lower total number of out-of-state students and break the cycle we are currently in, even as we continue with adjusted recruiting efforts to bring students who will pay higher tuition.

On adjunct faculty compensation and employment agreements, the Provost noted recent Yammer discussions on these matters, including new F/AM language on adjunct faculty titles (to be reported on by the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual). For their work on these provisions, the Provost
thanked the Senate and the faculty committees that were involved in vetting the language.

Noting a Yammer discussion on adjunct faculty compensation and contracts, the Provost suggested that the Faculty Welfare and Faculty Compensation committees, as they have done on compensation for roster faculty, might find ways to look at our multiyear trends for adjunct faculty compensation and, also, explore agreements to hire adjunct faculty for more than single semesters. We should try, he said, to find out where we are and where we are in relation to competitors on these matters as a step toward making headway on these matters ourselves.

**On the undergraduate catalog**, an item he pointed out that was not on his distributed list of topics, the Provost reported that we currently publish two separate undergraduate catalogs, one for the BPS and another for our AB, BA, and BS degrees. The two documents share information, since the BPS catalog has to reproduce much of what is in the other catalog. There are only 12 unique pages in the BPS catalog.

The reason there is a separate catalog for this program, the Provost said, has to do with the original proposal for the program, which specified that there would be two separate catalogs. The Provost stated that this commitment has been honored, but given the time and energy needed to produce two separate catalogs, he asked that Senators and faculty let the Speaker know within the next two weeks if there are any concerns about combining these two catalogs. Should be concerns expressed, the Provost said, then we can commit to a review of the issues, but if not, he expressed a desire to move ahead with combining the catalogs.

**On SACSCOC reaffirmation**, the Provost noted some strides in policy redevelopment, pointed to the announcement of the QEP, and thanked especially the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (Pam Riggs-Gelasco, Chair) for their development of a plan for a undergraduate program review that will be essential for meeting SACSCOC expectations.

**Questions/Discussion**

**Joe Carson**, Senator - School of Sciences and Mathematics (SSM), in connection to the Provost’s remark about continuing efforts to recruit higher-paying students, asked if the Provost was referring solely to non-resident students or also to full-paying in-state students.

The Provost replied that he was referring to two separate groups of non-resident students. The efforts include refining strategies for recruiting out-of-state students based out what has been learned over the past year, but the efforts also include targeting international students. He pointed out that we have 120-150 international students at any given time at the College, most of whom are exchange students, not degree-seeking ones. The students add diversity to the school and pay at a rate about the same as US non-resident students. He added that a modest rise in our international students would provide faculty with even stronger students to teach and help offset loses in US non-resident student numbers due to competition.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - SSM, asked if the combining of undergraduate catalogs might be extended from the two week time frame stipulated by the Provost until the next meeting of the Senate in December, when it might be discussed.

The Provost deferred to Interim Registrar Mary Bergstrom on the timing, who explained that two weeks was optimal in relation to the vendor they are working with, but she said the Registrar’s Office will comply with what ever directive they get.
Kasman specified that his question was not to ask for more time to, himself, look over the catalogs but to ask for a fuller consideration by his Senate and faculty colleagues.

The Provost said that he could also approach a committee on the matter, which would likely be Academic Planning.

Joe Kelly, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), noting that the Budget Committee’s report in October had questions about shortfalls two years running in the Athletics Budget, asked if their budget is connected to Academic Affairs. Specifically, he wanted to know if their shortfalls had implications for cuts in Academic Affairs’s budget and how the shortfall in the former unit’s budget has been made up.

The Provost replied that there is a “high, thick wall” that keeps the Athletics budget separate. Athletics is funded through many sources, primarily through the student athletics fee, but also from ticket sales and other revenue streams. In past years, Athletics has actually had a budget surplus that they rolled forward as a cushion, he said, while in recent years there has been a deficit. The Provost noted that, while he claims no expertise in the Athletics budget, he can assure the Senate that there is no back and forth between their budget and ours.

One benefit we derive from their budget, however, comes in the form of the scholarships they grant to academically-strong students.

The program is connected to us financially in one way, however, the Provost said, noting that this was also mentioned in the October meetings’s Budget Committee Report. The Athletics fee is a universal fee and thus is implicated in any effort to raise tuition: the total Athletics fee puts a limit on how much tuition can grow. However, as the Speaker noted at the last meeting, the Provost said, the Athletic fee increase this last year was reduced slightly to allow more of the total increase to go to other budgets.

Kelly followed up by asking about the new facility at Patriots Point: will the Provost be involved in discussions about paying for facilities like that one through the Athletics budget and what implications that may have on our ability to raise tuition?

The Provost replied that he has had a seat at all such discussions. The new facility at Patriots Point, he added, is supposed to be philanthropically supported.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, inquired what the Athletics fee is this year.

The Provost deferred to Julia Eichelberger, Senator - SHSS and Faculty Budget Committee Chair, who said that the fee is around $1200 annually. The Provost added that the fee accounts for about three quarters of the Athletics budget, not unusual for a school of our size.

Jon Hakkila, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, asked why Athletics-related information is not appearing in Yammer.

The Provost said he did not know but that he will inquire about it.

There were no further questions.

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

Jason Vance, Chair

1. Change in Faculty/Administration Manual for Adjunct Titles (PDF)
Vance noted at the outset that he was not aware of the Yammer discussion to which the Provost referred in his report and that his own report will only reflect discussion in the committee.

The Notice of Intent was forwarded to the Senate last April over email, Vance reported. At that time, there was some concern that time was not allotted for discussion in a Senate meeting. The Provost in the September meeting brought the matter up, but there was no discussion. He also sought feedback and received some from the Deans.

Vance summarized the changes: adjunct faculty will have the title of Adjunct Lecturer. The rank of Adjunct Senior Lecturer may be conferred on adjunct faculty having taught 30 or more course sections, taught at least eight separate semesters/summer terms, and been responsible for 500 student enrollments. These changes to the F/AM also provide for Deans conferring professor titles on adjunct faculty: Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. This is a common convention at other schools.

In a memo sent on October 17, the Provost said that at this time, Deans may begin assigning the Adjunct Lecturer rank to adjunct faculty, but directed Deans to delay assigning the title of Adjunct Senior Lecturer until the publication of the next edition of the F/AM. In that memo he further noted that there is nothing in the current F/AM that would prevent Deans from assigning adjunct professor titles at this time.

Questions / Discussion

**Jennifer Mantini**, Senator - Adjunct, sought clarification for her colleagues on what is meant by “half-time” on the second page of the document in terms of number of courses taught.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, explained that “half-time” is “old language” that needs to be changed in another edition of the F/AM. There are different notions of what is meant by full time and part time for different purposes. Generally, full time for adjuncts means 12 credit/contact hours per semester. With the Affordable Care Act (ACA), the mandate is that any employee who works an average of 30 hours a week is considered full time for purposes of qualifying for healthcare. For adjunct eligibility under the ACA, she explained, the College is using a multiplier of 3 to turn contact/credit hours into “average weekly hours worked.” Thus, 10 credit/contact hours equals 30 hours. Ten credit/contact hours, in the ACA context, is full time.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Marketing, expressed concern about one of the changes: “Adjunct appointments are for a specified period of one year or less for a single semester.”

He asked for the rationale for the change, his concern being that the single semester appointment doubles the work for the administrative staff and means other administrative duplication, such as an adjunct having to be put back on email in January, say, after losing her account in December at the end of fall term, even if it was known in August that the adjunct would be serving the entire year.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker replied that the modification to the language was made to align with current practice, even as we are seeking means of providing more than single semester contracts. Adjunct pay, she noted, in our current system works one semester at a time on one-semester appointment forms. This has been the practice at the College and gives chairs scheduling flexibility.
Adjunct’s email accounts do not, she said, get turned off in between sessions. If, however, adjuncts have not taught for a specified number of semesters, they are deactivated, provided that their department does not intend to employ them in the coming semester. While there have been glitches—people being activated and deactivated—this is not, she said, due to semester-to-semester contracting.

The Provost added that this particular language change is not to substantively change policy but to bring the F/AM into alignment with practice.

Hector Qirko, Senator - Sociology and Anthropology, inquired that when it is said of an Adjunct Lecturer who has taught 30 sections and had 500 enrollment, that this person is “eligible” for the rank of Adjunct Senior Lecturer, does it suggest that there may be other requirements? Also, he asked what the thinking was behind the delay in conferring such ranks until after the latest F/AM has been released.

The Provost replied that the language is permissive, giving Deans an option to confer the rank but it does not require it, even if an Adjunct Lecturer has met the objective requirements. This is consistent with the permissive policy allowing Deans to assign an adjunct professorial rank, if they wish.

On the second question, the Provost said that he felt that the F/AM language needed be fully in place before we move forward with the Deans’ elective appointments.

**At this point, the Speaker called for a voice vote to indicate the Senate’s relative support of the language change as specified in the notice of intent. The voice vote was unanimous.**

2. **Report** ([PDF](#)) on Motion to Reduce Redundancies in Standing Committee ([PDF](#)), introduced by Heath Hoffmann, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, at October Senate Meeting

Vance relayed the report of the committee ([PDF](#)), explaining that the first few bullet points are technical and might be answered by changes to the motion, but the remaining concerns require discussion.

The Speaker clarified that this motion would change the by-laws, the section of the F/AM over which the faculty has control. The Speaker explained that at this point, having been reported on by the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/ Administration Manual, it is up to the Senate to decide what to do with the motion.

**Questions / Discussion**

Rick Heldrich, Senator - SSM, complimented the committee on the report and said that he thinks the Senate should dismiss the motion.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, expressed agreement with Heldrich.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, thanked the committee for its work and expressed agreement with Heldrich and Worzala, adding that we need good communication between the Speaker, the Provost, and committee chairs about what is properly remanded to which committees, but the motion would raise too many complications.

At this point, the Speaker conferred with Parliamentarian George Pothering.

The Provost offered a point of information: the motion was made, seconded, referred to the committee, and now has returned and it is before the Senate.
The Provost then, in his capacity as an ex-officio member of the Senate, moved to table (postpone) the motion indefinitely. He explained that a later motion might be made to take it off the table. This would be courteous to Heath Hoffmann, who brought the motion to the Senate.

The motion was seconded.

Senator Krasnoff inquired if the motion is debatable. The Parliamentarian confirmed that it is.

Questions / Discussion of the motion to postpone indefinitely.

An unidentified Senator said that he would prefer a yea or nay vote on the original motion to the postponement.

Jason Vance, Senator - SSM, spoke in favor of the motion, since it would give Hoffmann the opportunity to address the concerns, and he might reintroduce the motion with revisions.

Senator Krasnoff suggested that if Hoffmann wanted to come back with a revised version of the motion, it might make more sense just to defeat the original motion. To change the tabled motion, it would require reviving it and then making amendments to it. If it is Hoffmann’s intention to revise the motion, it might be more a courtesy to defeat the original motion.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHSS, called the question on the motion to postpone. This was seconded.

The Parliamentarian offered a point of order. The motion is not to “table” but to postpone indefinitely, which “essentially kills the main motion. It would have to be reintroduced, but you can’t take this one off the table. It’s putting a dagger through its heart.”

Rick Heldrich, , Senator - SSM, said that he made a motion to dismiss the original motion and it was seconded, and he asked if the Senate cannot simply vote on the motion to dismiss the original motion.

The Speaker replied that he did not hear an actual motion. Worzala added that she agreed with Heldrich, but did not offer a second, per se.

The Senate voted on calling the question, and this passed on a voice vote.

On a voice vote (not unanimous) the Senate approved the motion to postpone indefinitely Motion to Reduce Redundancies in Standing Committees.

D. Faculty Welfare Committee

Chair, Emily Skinner

Report (PDF) on Motion on Administrators’ Roles in Faculty Evaluation (PDF), introduced by Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, at September Senate Meeting

Skinner summarized Senator Krasnoff’s motion. If a Dean holds an academic appointment in the department of a candidate for review, the Dean must select an Associate Dean outside the candidate’s department or another Dean to conduct the review. The case is similar regarding a Provost in the same department as the candidate under review. An Associate Provost with an academic appointment outside the candidate’s department would need to be appointed.
She explained that Faculty Welfare (FWC) discussed the motion over three separate meetings and sought feedback from committee members’ departments and other faculty, and includes in their report a letter representing the Deans’ position on the motion.

The committee, she said, does not support the motion for the reasons provided in the report (PDF), which she read. Notably, while the committee does not support the motion, they agreed with its spirit and raised some concerns that might be discussed and addressed apart from the motion.

The Speaker suggested that, unless there were questions directly for FWC, that the next report on the motion be given. There were no such questions.

**Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review**

Chair, Irina Gigova

Report (PDF) on Motion on Administrators’ Roles in Faculty Evaluation (PDF), introduced by Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, at September Senate Meeting

Gigova read the report (PDF), which agrees with reservations about the sweeping coverage of the motion, but also agrees with the intent of the motion and suggests an alternate means of eliminating the appearance of conflict of interest by preemptive discussions between department chair, Dean, and Provost in the rare cases covered in the motion, during which alternate reviewers could be located.

At this point, the Speaker reminded the body that this motion is to change a portion of the F/AM over which the faculty do not have direct control. He called for discussion and questions to the committees.

**Questions / Discussion**

**Roxane DeLaurel**, Senator - Accounting/Legal Studies, asked if the motion presumes that a Dean or Provost’s being in the same discipline as the candidate will automatically lead to a conflict of interest.

The Speaker asked Senator Krasnoff if he would like to reply, but, noting that the Speaker asked for questions to the committees, he declined until after the committees had a chance to answer. Senator DeLaurel redirected the question to the committees.

Gigova replied that it is not a concern about bias so much as one of level of review. At the level of the college-wide committee, she said, as an historian, if she reads a case in the sciences, she is relying a great deal on the departmental, disciplinary review. But the review at that level would be qualitatively different were she reading a case in her own discipline, even if she did not intend it to be different.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - SSM, suggested that the ideal would be to have a reviewer with broad enough knowledge to carefully judge candidates in all disciplines. “It seems strange to say,” he added, “they’re giving good scrutiny in one case, so we need to eliminate them so they’re equally bad in all cases.”

Gigova replied that the Advisory Committee is purposefully composed of faculty from different disciplines.

Kasman clarified: he meant at the Dean or Provost level.

**Larry Krasnoff** responded at this point to raise a concern that he said did not emerge in discussion at the September meeting. The point has been raised, he said, that it does not make sense to take a Dean with expertise in the candidate’s field out of the review because that expertise can be helpful. However, Senator Krasnoff
argued, the nature of the Dean’s and Provost’s review is procedural, to provide checks on the department and college-wide committee’s reviews.

If a dean does a *de novo review* of a candidate’s materials, this is a misunderstanding of the dean’s role in the process, and tying into Gigova’s comments, Krasnoff added that it would be difficult for a Dean in the same discipline as the candidate to not do a disciplinary review.

He asked the Senate to imagine a case in which a departmental review committee and the college-wide T&P committee voted strongly in the same direction, but are reversed due to a Dean or the Provost’s disagreement. This can happen, but it doesn’t very often because if the faculty committees do good work, their verdicts stand.

He added that he agrees with the FWC’s objection that the motion covers too many cases, but a rule of some sort is needed. There may be other means of writing language into the *F/AM* or adopting a policy such as described in T&P’s report if a more narrow target is desired, he said. The motion as is, though, provides an easy way “to make the cut,” he said. Additionally, he said the policy articulated in the motion would not be too costly, given that the number of controversial cases is low and the procedural review done by an outside Dean or an Associate Provost would not be terribly time-consuming. Even so, he said he would welcome any amendment that might lead to better targeting.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator - SSM, said that one thing not mentioned in the committee reports or in the prior Senate meeting at which this motion was discussed is that the Dean has a supervisory role. When a Dean is replaced in the process with an Associate Dean, you may be replacing the Dean with someone who is in the position for reasons other than those for which a Dean has the position. You would be raising the Associate Dean into a supervisory position, which seems unfair to the Associate Dean and, also, inconsistent. The level of scrutiny a Dean can supply may be far different from that an Associate Dean can.

Senator Krasnoff replied that the motion allows that option of using another Dean.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator - Mathematics, objected to the idea that the Deans have largely a procedural role in tenure and promotion. She asserted that the Dean’s role is to conduct an independent, rigorous evaluation, including of the candidate’s research. She also asserted there’s consistency to consider.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Marketing, asserted that the motion seems to be saying that what the Deans do is unimportant.

Krasnoff objected to the characterization, arguing that to say that their role is procedural is not to say it is unimportant. To make sure the departments have paid due diligence to the evaluation procedure is a very significant job.

Shaver asked in reply that if the Dean's role is completely or largely procedural, then why should their discipline matter?

Krasnoff said that this is his point, and explains why other Deans serving in cases where it is needed is not a terribly costly endeavor.

**Senator Anguelova** reiterated her point in the form of a question: “is the Dean’s role procedural?”

**Fran Welch**, Dean of the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance, replied that her role is not solely procedural. Her *F/AM*-sanctioned role, she said, is to conduct an independent review, separate from the departmental review.
Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, suggested that the Dean’s role is critical in evaluations in part because the schools are so different. She added that she would not like to be reviewed by a Dean outside of the School of Business.

Jason Vance, Senator - SSM, asked if there could be a kind of “William Tell rule” as part of the motion that would allow the candidate to decide. According to the motion a Dean in the same department as a candidate would automatically have to recuse: a “William Tell rule” would allow the candidate to chose to be reviewed by a Dean in the same discipline.

Krasnoff said he likes this option better than one in which the candidate has to ask for a recusal: in the case Vance describes, recusal is presumed, but the candidate can waive it.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost for Faulty Affairs, added to the discussion of the Deans’ role by reading from the F/AM: “The Dean will provide the candidate and the chair of the departmental evaluation panel a copy of his/her assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the Provost” (emphasis added). She also said, according to the F/AM, the Dean can ask for “information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation.” The Dean, then, she argued, is not just doing a procedural check but is looking at the merits of the case.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker also asked if the committees vetting the motion had checked into how other schools handle the situations the motion hopes to address.

Gigova reported that members of T&P did their own research on this and found that there are no consistent approaches across other colleges and universities. T&P did not take these other schools’ experiences into account, focusing instead on our internal situation.

Skinner reported that FWC, similarly, focused on the internal situation at the College.

Rick Heldrich, Senator - SSM, said that he doesn’t understand the motion and its intent. It strikes him, he said, as lack of trust for Deans and the Provost specifically. If this were not the case, chairs would be suspect, too. One could argue that chairs have been involved in annual reviews and so should not be able to vote in evaluations. Similarly, you might ask why a President who happens to be a biologist, for instance, should be able to vote on whether or not a biologist be granted tenure. The motion is not consistent at all levels.

Senator Krasnoff replied that, for him, consistency at all levels, means that the disciplinary review is conducted at the disciplinary level. The other levels, he asserted, are not doing disciplinary review. The principle that attains is of one disciplinary review. As to what Heldrich said about the department chair, Krasnoff said that he thinks the chair should have an equal vote and should be sharing annual evaluations all along.

As to lack of trust, he said that things happened last where he expected recusals and they did not happen. He added that what the motion does seems natural. Were he appointed Dean, he would never participate in a review of a Philosophy faculty member. He reiterated that the basic principle is a simple one: one disciplinary review at the departmental level.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, observed that there appear to be two justifications for the motion. One is that with a Dean in the discipline, there can be an over-scrutiny of a candidate. The other justification seems to be that simply being in the same discipline creates conflict of interest. He said “I don’t buy either one of those.”


**Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker** argued that there seems to be a simplification afoot in the idea that a review is disciplinary or it is not. In a review, you are given much qualitative information that does not require disciplinary expertise to understand, such as external reviews of research, information about journals, review process information, and we develop an expertise in using that information. There is no easy dividing line between what is a disciplinary review and what is not.

**Roxane Delaurel**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, said that Senator Krasnoff is struggling with the very important issue of trust, and often, she asserted, there is no trust. A faculty member that lacks trust in a reviewer should have some means of asking for a different reviewer. But she said she disagrees with the implication of the motion that a reviewer’s being in the same discipline as the candidate results in an automatic conflict of interest, which almost trivializes, she said, departmental colleagues’ work.

While she did not support the motion, she said that we should have some kind of mechanism of petition for cases in which a candidate can ask for an alternate reviewer:

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHSS, called the question and it was seconded, and carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Speaker McNerney pointed out that the motion about to be voted upon seeks changes in a section of the F/AM over which the Senate and faculty have no control. The vote, thus, will merely express the Senate’s relative support or lack of support for the motion.

**On voice vote (not unanimous) the Senate voted against supporting the motion.**

5. **Old Business** (none)

6. **New Business**

   A. **Curriculum Committee**
      Gibbs Knotts, Chair

      The discussion and voting on the proposals below was conducted by group under arabic numeral headings, unless a Senator requested that the proposals be split and considered separately.

      1. **French and Francophone Studies**
         Allow FREN 496 and FREN 499 as alternatives to the capstone course FREN 495 ([Proposal PDF](#)).

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

      2. **Middle Grades Education**
         Creation of two new courses (TEDU 325: Foundations of Language and Literacies Development Grades 5-12 and EDMG 335: Teaching Writing/Design with Adolescent Literature and Multimodal Texts 5-8), adding them to the degree requirements, replacing EDEE 325, and replacing the current entrance requirements with the College’s Gen Ed requirement ([Proposal PDF](#)).

         **Questions / Discussion**
         Bob Perkins, Interim Chair - Teacher Education, explained that in the documentation provided the same course appears under two different acronyms
(but the same number), EDFS 436 and TEDU 436. He said that the course should appear only as TEDU 436.

Curriculum Committee Chair; Gibbs Knotts made corrections to the hardcopies of the proposals.

The proposals were approved on unanimous voice vote.

3. Political Science
Change the titles of POLI 294 and POLI 395 (Proposal PDF)

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

4. Studio Art
Proposal for three new courses (ARTS 295: Photography in Context: History, Theory, and Practice; ARTS 316: Digital Photography I: Portrait and Documentary Photography; and ARTS 349: Digital Photography II: Landscape Photography) and also changes to the titles of ARTS 215, ARTS 315, and ARTS 327 (Proposal PDF)

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

5. Urban Studies
   a. Junior Student Ambassador Proposal (Proposal PDF)
   b. Senior Student Ambassador Proposal (Proposal PDF)
   c. Proposal to add a new concentration in Sustainable Urbanism (Proposal PDF)

Questions / Discussion

Brian Fisher, Senator - SHSS, said that as Director of the Office of Sustainability and a member of the Department of Political Science, he would like to raise some concerns about the proposal to add a new concentration in Sustainable Urbanism. In reply, Speaker McNerney suggested that the concentration be considered separately.

The Speaker then called for questions about the Junior and Senior Ambassador proposals.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, inquired of Kevin Keenan, Director of the Urban Studies program, how the pipeline for students in the ambassador program works.

Keenan said that students will start in their sophomore year, taking URST 250 & 251, and would continue, with the approval of these proposals, through their junior year, taking URST 350 & 351, and compete the program in their senior year, taking URST 450. The program is designed to provide foundational knowledge in urban policy and Lowcountry issues, experiential learning, and, ultimately, an internship.

Krasnoff asked what the target number of sophomores is. Keenan replied ten.

There were no further questions or discussion on the junior and senior ambassador proposals.
The proposals were approved on unanimous voice vote.

Questions / Discussion on the proposal to add a new concentration in Sustainable Urbanism

Brian Fisher, Senator - SHSS, raised concerns about the proposal related to the sustainability QEP, which he worked on. A central principle of the proposal is the infusion of sustainability principles through a wide range of courses and to encourage departments to take ownership of this. Fisher said that his concern about the proposal relates to the timing of it. He would like to see the QEP be allowed time to develop and the community time to develop their ideas about sustainability and what it is going to look like, how it is going to operate in departments, what kind of new courses are developed and interdisciplinary pathways established.

He added that many courses in the proposal are environmental courses, whereas sustainability is broader than that, encompassing economics and the social dimension as well.

Keenan expressed disagreement with Fisher’s concerns. He noted that there are economics and sociology courses in the concentration. He also argued that the concentration does not preclude action on defining the QEP.

Fisher further specified that he hopes the QEP will bring sustainability thinking into every department. Keenan agreed with this goal and said that the concentration could feed into that effort.

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, said the proposal already demonstrates the infusion of work in other departments, a process which can continue. Additionally, he said approving the proposal will not negatively affect the work of developing the QEP.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, agreed that the proposal will not preclude other work on sustainability, developing classes, and so forth. Given issues like 1,000 year floods, she said, the sooner we get programs like this on the books, the better.

Senator Krasnoff asked a general question about concentrations (both to Keenan and Knots). This is a third concentration in the major: could it dilute the others? Also, this concentration is more of an individual student experience, and thus it may work against one idea of a concentration, that it groups students together. He stipulated that this is not necessarily a problem, but it does raise a question of what a concentration is.

Keenan replied that there is in the Urban Studies major a core. Also, in this and the other two concentrations there is a core of a small number of courses and students are likely to encounter each other there.

Conseula Francis, Associate Provost for Curriculum, observed that there is only one definition for a concentration: 18 or more hours of focused coursework inside a major.

The proposal was approved on unanimous voice vote.

6. Latin American and Caribbean Studies (LACS)
Reduction in the number of required credit hours by reducing the number of
electives required and by eliminating the required course INTL 300 (Proposal PDF)

FCC Chair Knotts specified that the deactivation of INTL 300 included in the proposal paperwork was specifically off the table, per the Speaker’s unanimously-approved request at the beginning of the meeting that it be removed from consideration since LACS does not have jurisdiction over the course. The vote on the proposal, therefore, did not include a vote to deactivate INTL 300.

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

7. Professional Studies
Changes to admission requirements, specifically: lowering the age requirement, adding flexibility to the required course content, and decreasing the number of required credit hours (Proposal PDF)

Questions / Discussion

Roxane DeLaurel, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked if the Faculty Curriculum Committee (FCC) has approved the proposal. Knotts replied in the affirmative. Senator DeLaurel asked if the committee was comfortable with the lowered age requirement.

Knotts replied that there was considerable discussion on that issue, but the committee arrived at consensus after discussing it. He added that some, however, felt that the change represented a turning away from the original proposal. Knotts asked Dean of the School of Professional Studies (SPS) Godfrey Gibbison if he would like to comment.

Dean Gibbison thanked the FCC for their work on the initial proposal, but said having now been implemented the the program for about three years, we have, he said, more information and experience. We also, he added, now have data from around the country relating to degree completion programs and the body of students that would be candidates for programs like ours.

On the practical side of things, Dean Gibbison pointed out, current BPS admissions criteria eliminate some 98% of prospective students.

Many potential students under the age of 24 have some college, are not living with their parents, are functioning independently, like older students, and on the whole, have a higher level of maturity than the typical 21 year old student at the downtown campus. Furthermore, these students are not seeking BA and BS degrees and as such do not represent a population over which the downtown and North Campus might compete.

Senator DeLaurel stated that one her concerns on the age requirement stems from the original proposal's citing 38 as the average age of the students the BPS is seeking, but the new proposal asks for the 24 year minimum to be dropped to 21, which seems inconsistent.

A second concern about the lowered age, she said, is difficulty we will have in maintaining a separation between the BPS and other degrees.

Additionally, she said that she feels that the BPS was represented initially in a different way, and now there’s an attempt to lower the admission age and
combine the undergraduate catalogs: the BPS is finding its way into the College. She expressed concern that this will water down the education on the downtown campus with the different admission requirements and the impression that the BPS is a business degree. She fears that this will harm existing students and alumni, as the firewall between the BPS and downtown seems to be melting.

She added that she will vote against the proposals, which she characterized as marginally deceptive since they depart from what the faculty agreed to in the original proposal.

Dean Gibbison replied and reitered strongly that the BPS is never represented as a business degree. In fact, there is, he pointed out, a BS in Business Administration offered in its entirety at the North Campus for students who have an interest in that.

He added that the downtown undergraduate and BPS catalogs only differ slightly.

On the charge of misrepresentation, Dean Gibbison asserted the process for proposing the changes has been a transparent one. He said that he is asking for the Senate to make the changes. Nothing is cloaked in secrecy.

It was the intent of the faculty to serve a certain population of students, but we cannot, Dean Gibbison said, under the current rules. If you want to serve these students, he said, vote yes on the proposal.

Idee Winfield, Senator - SHSS, asked if a student on the downtown campus, meeting the age and other BPS requirements, could shift over to the BPS program.

Dean Gibbison replied that this could happen right now, since about 1,000 students on the downtown campus are 24. But it doesn't happen. Students who come to the College to pursue a BA or BS come for a specific major, not the BPS.

Elaine Worzala, Senator - Finance, expressed concern that if we lower the age requirement to 21, some of our out of state students could stop going for a while, establish residency for in-state tuition, and go back and finish the degree.

Dean Gibbison replied that, as he said above, nothing is stopping students from doing that now. Worzala replied that now they have to wait until they're 24. Gibbison replied that he considers it an extremely unlikely scenario, since students who come to the downtown campus come for specific reasons, and earning a BPS is not among them.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Marketing, noted that the discussion so far has concentrated on age requirements, yet the proposal calls for more than that. He inquired if the FCC considered splitting up the proposal to consider age as a separate concern.

Gibbs Knotts replied that they did not.

**Shaver moved to divide the proposal, and this motion was seconded.**

Associate Provost Francis noted at this point that the proposals were in fact presented to Academic Affairs as separate.

The Parliamentarian inquired of Shaver how he would like to split the proposal. Shaver replied that he would divide it into age and everything else. The Parliamentarian specified that the motion to divide could be amended to adjust how the proposal is to be broken up.
Senator Krasnoff moved to amend the motion to split age, minimum hours, and core admission requirements. Shaver accepted the amendment.

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

**Discussion of the age requirement proposal**

**Mark Witte**, Senator - Accounting, addressed Senator Worzala's question. Any non-resident student over the age of 18, he said, could take a year off from school, secure a driver's license and register to vote, become a citizen of South Carolina, and get in-state tuition.

Additionally, he speculated that it may not even be legal to have an age requirement for entrance into the BPS program.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHSS, spoke in favor of lowering the age requirement. It meets the market. Many of these potential students are working full time and do not have the access they need to complete a degree in our traditional program. She said she sees no reason to deny access to 21 year olds. Nor does it not dilute the quality of education downtown, she said.

**Daniel Greenberg**, Senator - Psychology, agreed, adding that some of the language being used to describe these students seems peculiar; “they might become part of the school” or “they were part of the College of Charleston, and then they went to the BPS program.” All these students, he stressed, are at the College. They are all our students.

**Tom Baginski**, Senator - German and Russian Studies, asked Dean Gibbison to clarify what he meant by “we cannot serve these students.”

Dean Gibbison explained that the admission requirements for age and number of credit hours, eliminate about 95% of potential applicants for the BPS. We cannot serve this population if they cannot gain admission.

**Brian Fisher**, Senator - SHSS, asked Dean Gibbison what the age requirements are for our competitors.

Dean Gibbison replied that our competitors have no age requirements. In many cases, they are taking transfers from technical colleges.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator - Mathematics, said that he is uncomfortable with an age requirement that would keep out people who might benefit from the program, provided the program is a good one. But he said that he is also having trouble seeing the BPS as just another part of the College. Mentioning the Provost’s comment that the College is unified in its liberal arts infusion, he said he doesn’t see that extending into the BPS. So “is it part of the college or isn’t it?,” he asked.

The Provost said that the committee that designed the BPS deserves full credit. They designed a unique degree-completion program notable for its integration of the liberal arts experience. The Provost said it is a good program and one to be proud of, yet there is a core problem of access, as Dean Gibbison has laid out. On the age issue, the Provost, referring to his own experience teaching in a degree completion program, noted that such students have a different set of life experiences than those of our continuously enrolled students. He also said that the experience of other programs is that they often started with age restrictions and then rolled them back. Most have an age requirement of 21 or 22, some with no age requirement at all. “24 is simply too high,” he said, given our experience and programs elsewhere.
Senator DeLaurel said that her comments should not be construed as meaning she is “trying to keep people away from the body.” Rather, she called attention to assurances at the program’s development that the reasons the BPS did not have the same requirements and liberal arts experiences as the AB, BA, and BS programs is due to a special educational circumstance, meeting a special market, the non-traditional, older student returning to school. Given the market and the students’ circumstances, many faculty at the time, she said, were not as stringent as they were in vetting other programs.

Now, she said, the BPS has not been successful with that targeted market, and, she said, we are asked to make changes for which “age is just a proxy to reintroduce these students” in a way that might threaten the integrity of our liberal arts public institution. We are not, she stressed, “a for-profit institution designed to compete with Strayer,” which competition was noted, she pointed out, in the BPS proposal. Far from it, she asserted, we should not be competing with Strayer. We should serve non-traditional students, but maybe, she asserted, the age issue is “a proxy for a certain philosophy,” and “our goal should not be to be better at Strayer than Strayer.” These, she said are the issues, and they do not imply that she is not receptive to non-traditional students.

Lynn Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, speaking, she said, on behalf of original committee that designed the BPS, pushing back against what she called “an air of bait-and-switch,” argued that the committee did their best to design a program for adults seeking a high-quality education with the flexibility and acceleration they need. The College was not equipped to do this.

The BPS is not designed to be like Strayer, she said, though we do compete with them. The committee was intentional in making the BPS a College of Charleston program, such as in creating the research-based liberal arts seminars. The committee was also intentional in applying the research on what employers are looking for in graduates, “a certain set of dispositions that come from the enrichment of the liberal arts,” she said. Nevertheless, the designing of the BPS took place in somewhat of a “vacuum,” looking to other institutions’ examples and in a context of two wars and a changing economy.

As we are trying to attract a much more diverse population of students, such as returning veterans, she said she is not concerned about the age requirement so much as that we make intentional programmatic decisions across the board.

“We are very intentionally not trying to be Strayer,” but hope to provide an alternative. Three years of experience, under a capable Dean, have imparted lessons. “We have to be as nimble as our competitors in the for-profit sector in order to capture and serve well those students who are not being served by Strayer and a whole host of others.”

Jason Vance, Senator - SSM, thanked AVP Ford for her comments. He said he, too, is not concerned about age, nor about the potential for students to switch from a BA, BS, or AB program to the BPS. Should such happen, it is the choice of the student and there’s no need to stand in the way of a student making a decision as to which program is better for her personal interests. Our goal is to serve students.

Dean Fran Welch, Dean of the School of Education, Health, and Human Performance, told of a recent dinner with Mary Thornly (President, Trident Technical College), Geritta Postlewait (Superintendent, Charleston County School District), and Lucy Beckham (Executive Principal of District 2 Schools, Charleston County). They asked her, she said, why the College of Charleston is not admitting non-traditional students who are forced to go to the for-profits.
While we are graduating some of these students from the College, there is a wealth of such students we are not reaching, and others, external to us, are seeing this and wanting us to step in.

There was no further discussion on the age requirement proposal.

On a voice vote (not unanimous) the proposal was approved.

Discussion on modifying number of hours for admission

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, commented on one of the arguments for this part of the BPS proposal, that the change respects the students we are recruiting. Senator Krasnoff took issue with this, since currently 60 hours is required, and we are not, thus, disrespecting students with fewer hours since we cannot recruit them until they reach 60.

He also asked a question about whether or not the curriculum would need to be changed for students coming in under the new requirement.

Dean Gibbison replied that the curriculum would not have to be altered because, presumably, such students, would be taking core requirements to fill the gap between 30 and 60 hours.

**Senator Krasnoff** also asked if going to a 30-hour requirement, and taking the entrance requirements down from 60, might have implications for 2+2 arrangements with schools like Trident. Could the new 30-hour requirement make it harder to negotiate agreements with two-year colleges, since they might perceive the BPS as “poaching” on their turf?

**Dean Welch** replied that Mary Thornley (President, Trident Community College) has said that she is for what is best for the students, even if that should mean that a student leaves Trident after 30 hours to pursue a BPS degree at the College.

Senator Krasnoff noted that President McConnell has talked about trying to develop more 2+2 agreements.

Dean Welch said that we have a robust 2 + 2 program for teacher education students from Trident, a smooth transition to the College. But, she emphasized, since students differ in their needs, we may want to look at it from that perspective.

Dean Gibbison pointed out that right now many students do not wait to complete an Associate’s degree at Trident before coming to the College for a BA or BS because they see no advantage to securing the Associates degree.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHSS, asked for a clarification: under this proposal, students who join the BPS with 30 hours will need to complete 30 more hours?

Dean Gibbison replied, for a degree at the College, they would need a total of 92 more hours.

Eichelberger speculated that this could add more rigor to such a student’s coursework, since coming in with 30 hours means more coursework at the College.

There was no further discussion on the proposal to modify number of hours for admission.

On a voice vote (not unanimous) the proposal was approved.
Discussion on the proposal to add flexibility

Gibbs Knotts, Chair - Faculty Curriculum Committee asked Dean Gibbison to sum up the proposal to add flexibility in admissions.

Dean Gibbison explained that, currently, admission requires that students shall have completed the typical courses in the core curriculum, including courses in the humanities, social sciences, math, natural sciences, and English.

The changes would do two things.

The humanities requirements are rigid, owing to the history of the development of the proposal. The proposal would change the humanities requirements so that it replicates the current social science requirements: take two courses from two different disciplines from a list of available courses.

Currently students are supposed to come in with six hours of math and eight hours of sciences. The second change, would have students responsible for entering with a block of 12 hours of science and math which must contain three hours of science and six hours in math. The remaining three hours could come from science or math. The rationale is to align with what we would expect from students coming out of a two-year school.

Daniel Greenberg, Senator - Psychology, inquired if students in the BPS under the new proposal would be completing the degree with no laboratory science.

Dean Gibbison confirmed that under the proposal BPS students would not be required to have laboratory experience.

Senator Greenberg pointed out the difference between this and the typical BA and BS. He further asked if there is among the BPS concentrations any that require laboratory science. Would BPS students be able to complete their degree without taking any lab science?

Dean Gibbison replied that there is not a single concentration in the BPS that requires students to have a lab or heavy science background.

Senator Greenberg expressed concern. CofC BS, BA, and AB students all take laboratory science. The proposal is a significant change, he said.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, asked for a clarification. The proposal seeks a change in admission requirements, not degree requirements. Are there currently admission requirements, he asked, that are not degree requirements?

Dean Gibbison confirmed this: all of the BPS requirements are admissions requirements.

Kunkle asked if we change requirements to be accepted, are we also changing what they have when they graduate?

Dean Gibbison replied yes, de facto.

The Provost asked, at this point, for Dean Gibbison to share the gist of his conversations with SSM Dean Auerbach on the science and math admission requirements.

Dean Gibbison said that Dean Auerbach felt comfortable with the fact that under the plan, students will come in with either nine hours of math and three hours of science or they will enter with six hours of math and six hours of science. Also, these students will not likely pursue sciences.
Senator Greenberg asserted that while he gets the logic, the purpose of having a lab science requirement is not to line up with a plan to go into the field but to offer broader preparation.

Rick Heldrich, Senator - SSM, said that while he “loves labs” and “loves science,” BPS students are not the same as BA, BS, or liberal arts and science students. They are seeking a professional degree for their careers, a very different thing than the students of whom we require our general education of here.

Hector Qirko, Senator - Sociology and Anthropology, said that he thinks “we are giving ground.”

Heldrich rejoined, “I agree, and so is Georgetown and so is Hopkins and so is University of Miami and so is Harvard, and so are a million other really good schools and it hasn’t ruined their reputation and stature.” He continued, saying that we are serving the needs of clients that do not need the general education in the same way as our other students.

Qirko responded that he is not worried about reputation so much as about our mission with respect to the students.

Senator Krasnoff, said that he thinks the proposal is watering down the science, but he commented that our lab science requirement for BA and BS students is steep and could be pared down.

There was no further discussion on the proposal to add flexibility to the BPS admissions prior coursework requirements.

On a voice vote (not unanimous) the proposal was approved.

8. Physics and Astronomy
Proposal to require ASTR 377, move PHYS 230 from being a requirement to an elective, and add a few courses to the list of electives (Proposal PDF)

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

9. Teacher Education
Creation of a new course (EDFS 402: Education, Health and International Development) that has previously been offered as Special Topics (Proposal PDF)

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

At this point, a motion to adjourn was made and seconded.
The question was called on the motion to adjourn and seconded.
The question was called successfully on a voice vote, and a vote taken on the motion to adjourn passed at 7:32 PM.

Items remaining on the agenda were as follows and will be put on the agenda under “Old Business” for the December meeting.

Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs
Chair, Jo Ann Ewalt
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1. Environmental Studies
   New Course Proposal: EVSS 606 – Wildlife Law (PDF)

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

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary