Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on 6 December 2016

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 6 December 2016 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order, 5:07 PM

2. Approval of the 1 November, 2016 minutes (pdf).

A change to the minutes was proposed and accepted. Richard Nunan asked if the minutes could be modified to clarify his comments found on page 14.

The modified language follows: Is it not the case that we could set a group of courses to be the ones used to do GenEd assessment for a four-year period without instituting a freeze on new GenEd courses?

Lynne Ford replied that this would be an option to explore.

No other additional request. The minutes were approved with the friendly amendment.

3. Announcements and information

None.

4. Reports

a. Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney

The Speaker introduced the new faculty secretariat: Megan Gould. Megan has been serving as Interim Secretariat for the semester. The Speaker announced this is a shared position with Academic Affairs. Some of her duties include maintaining Senate webpages, assisting committee chairs, and reserving the conference room in ECTR 228. There is a networked printer in the faculty secretariat office, located in ECTR 227.

The Speaker announced another round of meetings with faculty and Chamber of Commerce coming up in January. Contact the Speaker if you want to participate on January 6. The Chamber will provide updates on their workforce strategies and will begin a conversation with College faculty on internships.

The Speaker's last item of business was to call for a moment of silence for the passing of Trustee Dr. Eddy Thomas in November. The Speaker recognized Dr. Thomas for his commitment and great caring for the College of Charleston.

b. Provost Brian McGee (pdf)
Provost McGee thanked the Senate for recognizing Trustee Thomas’s passing and expressed sorrow that he did not have a chance to serve longer.

The Provost thanked the Faculty Senate for all those serving on T & P panels, recognized the Dean's work with T & P letters, and recognized the difficulty of working with the compressed academic calendar.

The Provost shared the first stage of reaffirmation from SACSCOC: the off-site review. SACSCOC reviews over 80 standards for compliance. The Provost was pleased to report that the majority of materials was favorably received by the off-site team. They did flag some policies and procedures outside of Academic Affairs, some materials relevant to assessment, and a handful of faculty credentials issues.

The Provost reported the next steps will be to provide lengthy documentary evidence in the form of a focused report.

On March 27-30, the SACSCOC on site team will look at the items flagged by the off-site team’s report, and will be able to call on anyone to answer questions at any time during the business day during this time.

After the onsite review in March, we will receive a written report, have an opportunity to respond, and then by the middle of 2017, we expect to receive the final accreditation report.

One item flagged as a result of an earlier review of the SACSCOC Compliance narrative concerned the new intake process for student complaints. (pdf)

One of the over 80 SACSCOC standards states that the institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints.

This is not a new standard, the Provost stated, but has been around in its current form for over a decade.

The Provost shared examples in his PowerPoint (pdf) of other institutions' policies and examples of similar requirements from other accrediting associations.

By long-standing federal requirements, students have three opportunities for pursuing a complaints process: the institution, CHE (state), and the accrediting agency (federal).

There are three approaches to documenting student complaints:

1. a fully decentralized approach, in which every office intakes complaints and processes them according to institutional policies or procedures, then deal with them, resolve them, and document them. This approach was taken in 2006 to demonstrate compliance and it essentially the approach taken this time to demonstrate compliance. The Provost explained that under fully decentralized approaches, it may be a challenge to demonstrate
compliance when the on-site team comes, since offices are randomly selected for their log of student complaints.

2. the centralized approach is the model we are adopting now. In this approach, there is a formal source to receive complaints.

3. The third approach, as seen at James Madison University, leaves the process decentralized, but requires all departments to use a standard form in processing complaints, and every spring, a report is required detailing complaints received and how they were resolved.

In deciding to adopt the centralized approach, a committee made up of employees across the institution decided on the process that caused the least stress for chairs, program directors, Deans, and other administrators.

In the new process:

- Students Directed to Website;
- Student fills out a web form;
- the Complaint is directed to the Appropriate Personnel (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources-currently Lynn Cherry);
- the complaint is pushed down to the lowest level it can be resolved at (usually Department Chair or Program Director)

At every point, the student is pushed back to our published and existing process.

Management of Academic Complaints is the Sole Responsibility of Academic Affairs.

We’ve been required to track student complaints for years; we have just changed how we address complaints to make it easier to track and monitor in order to satisfy the requirements of the federal government, state government, and our regional accreditor.

The previous process did not require units to keep track of complaints.

The Provost went on to assure Senators that this is not a building of a master database of tracking faculty behavior, this is merely an attempt to comply with regulations.

The Provost asked for questions.

Bob Mignone, Guest (Mathematics), asked where can we get a definition of when a student concern becomes a complaint? If a student comes in to talk, how do we know when the student moves from discussing a concern to registering a complaint?

The Provost said we can continue to keep an informal log of students coming in to talk, but this process exists for that student who wants to pursue a formal complaint.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS), offered one reason that this policy set off warning bells for some was due to not having the complaint process in any context other than an email
received from President McConnell. Senator Nunan pointed out that the email came out atop the national election, national media coverage about threats to higher education, and a memo sent to the Deans from the Provost about the reminders, in Nunan's words, to "cool it about politics in the wake of the election," and the President's memo suggesting that "everybody should remember to be tolerant of all opinions, which itself is a kind of problematic statement."

Nunan declared that receiving the message about student complaints was worrisome on top of everything else. He commented that it's good to hear there is no master list being built of complaints. Nunan suggested that it would be helpful for the President or the Provost to speak about the new student complaint process publicly to alleviate concerns.

The Provost explained that the email send from the President concerning tolerance was at the request of Chairs and Deans, who had said that such a note would be helpful to our campus climate.

There was further discussion between Senator Nunan and Provost McGee.

Senator Nunan returned to the subject of the formal complaint procedure with the opinion that a student going to the department chair if they have a complaint against a faculty member works pretty well most of the time, and he worries that this procedure will encourage student complaints to some degree.

The Provost wanted to clarify that in his email sent to Deans and Chairs on November 10, 2016, his intention was not to warn people to "cool it on politics," but to address student concerns who reported “crudely partisan” opinions expressed. The students expressing this concern wanted to insure that the tone of discussion remained respectful.

Kevin Keenan, Senator (Political Science) asked if the faculty member be able to see the complaint a student lodges?

The Provost stated that in most cases, he would anticipate that would be necessary.

The Provost next addressed several newly published policies and procedures and welcomed any suggestions for improvement, or corrections to mistakes in the text.

On the topic of academic administrative vacancies, one of the line Deans will step down in the next few months and pursue opportunities at another institution. The Provost wants open dialog with faculty from that school on the process of securing leadership for the school. The dialog thus far has consisted of two meetings and a call for letters from faculty of that school. Since Deans are important academic leaders, feedback from faculty colleagues gathered in this way will be part of the consultative process for filling future Dean positions.

Heath Hoffman, Senator (Sociology and Anthropology) asked which school is this?

Provost McGee affirmed it is the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs. Dean Tillis has publicly announced he has accepted position at another university.
In regards to admissions and enrollment, Provost McGee said that it appears that our enrollment for new students in the Spring has exceeded projections and the students are good quality. There are strong applications for Fall 2017.

Provost McGee said that they continue to experience success with the international bridge program called iCharleston, and continue to work with Trident Technical College on the possibility of a larger bridge program than we have had in the past.

On the subject of several Ad hoc committees and several task forces, Provost McGee stated they are doing ongoing work. The latest committee formed is the ad hoc committee on the organization of the Graduate School.

The Provost introduced the motion regarding December graduates, "Resolved, the Faculty Senate approves the list of December 2016 degree candidates for graduation as certified by the Office of the Registrar, subject to review and termination by the College of Charleston Board of Trustees."

The Provost asked that the resolution be removed from New Business and considered and voted on. The Senate gave unanimous consent for the change to the agenda order.

The Provost moved for adoption of the resolution. There was a second of the motion. Without discussion, the Senate voted on and passed the motion.

The Provost offered comments on the agenda.

As a result of conversations with Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, there will be some new contributions from the Registrar and the Provost regarding the Major GPA when we reach that point in the agenda.

The Provost will share any news of how Governor Haley's move to new duties in the Trump presidency, resulting in a new Governor of South Carolina, will affect us.

The Provost asked for questions.

Heath Hoffman, Senator (Sociology and Anthropology) spoke on behalf of his colleagues. They have concerns about the mandatory requirement to have a REACH student in the class, whereas in the past, faculty were invited to participate and once they agreed to participate, they agreed to go through training.

He spoke of concerns over the organization and administration of the REACH program that seemed to be continuation of complaints about the program that were published in the Post and Courier article from May 2015. He asked what role do faculty play in overseeing and advising the REACH program and its administration of services to intellectually disabled students at the College?
The Provost said that faculty have been centrally involved with the Reach program and with REACH students in structural and in other roles since its inception. The REACH program is faculty driven in terms of the ideas for an initiative for it.

The Provost asked for time to become more informed about the dialog between Sociology and Anthropology and Director of REACH, Edie Cusack.

Senator Hoffman asked the Provost to comment on how faculty were alerted to mandatory participation?

The Provost stated that the decision came from an Academic Council meeting two months prior, in order to make equitable educational opportunities for all students.

The Provost asked Lynne Ford to contribute any critical points to the conversation.

Lynne Ford, Guest (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) shared that the REACH program has become a national model for academic programs for students of intellectual disability for full inclusion. Universities around the country are looking to what we do. Once admitted to the College, students in the REACH program take two academic courses every semester, and those academic courses are taken in pursuit of a concentration, in place of a major. If a student has an area of interest and faculty in that department are not willing to accept all students, then that student cannot pursue their area of interest. As an institution, we cannot do that. While not sure they have used the word, "mandate," Ford affirmed that her department did begin a conversation with Deans and department chairs, starting with Dean Hale and Humanities and Social Sciences.

Their plan is to transition from the building phase of the program to providing 10 students with intellectual disabilities a year full access to educational opportunities.

Dr. Ford said she welcomes feedback from colleagues about what sort of language could be used, but the expectation is that faculty are not able to exclude students from their classroom.

Senator Hoffman asked if other Senators were familiar with the REACH program? He observed that many people were not, and wished for better communication in the administration of the program. What came from the conversation with Director Cusack was that participation is mandatory, but Senator Hoffman offered the opinion that the program could be better managed, since of the faculty in his department who had REACH students, none had been contacted to date about receiving training.

Senator Hoffman stated that the difference in group training for 4 hours and one on one training, which lasted from 30 to 90 minutes, seems problematic. His colleagues report that they do not feel prepared to work with REACH students. He reported that they have received mixed messages about whether faculty must modify assignments to be appropriate for students with intellectual disabilities or to not change anything, just do what you do normally. Dr. Hoffman reported that one professor expressed that they have not heard from the tutor assigned to the REACH student.
Dr. Hoffman stated there is a problem with REACH students taking a 300 level Sociology class, and being helped to reach at least a 40% completion rate of the class material by a tutor who is not in the class, and is often not a Sociology major.

A final point expressed by Senator Hoffman is that faculty receive a one-time stipend of $1,000 for training, but are not given additional funds when facing increased levels of work for multiple REACH students many years after initial training.

Senator Hoffman stated that his concerns and that of his colleagues is not about denying access, but about administration and organization problems.

The Provost appreciated the set of concerns, and asked for time to examine the issues. The Provost expressed that it is appropriate to bring REACH program back to the attention of the Academic Planning Committee for an update.

Meg Cormack, Senator (Religious Studies) echoed concerns with the REACH program.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) appreciated the concerns Senator Hoffman expressed and expressed that in his view, REACH is one of the things that College of Charleston should be bragging about and should be really proud about. Senator Kelly stated that it behooves us to address problems with the program responsibly to assure the success of the program. He expressed that having REACH students in his classes has been a terrific experience, improving his teaching and classroom dynamics. Senator Kelly stated that we need to commit ourselves to the success of the REACH program by solving any problems that we have.

There were no other questions.

5. Old Business

a. Quinn Burke, Chair of the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid introduced four proposals.

   i. Proposal that the International Test of English Proficiency (ITEP) be added as a qualifying exam to meet the admission criteria for undergraduate candidates for whom English is not their first language (pdf)

This item was introduced in November, but could not be discussed due to loss of quorum.

Dr. Burke reminded the Senate that the ITEP will not replace TOEFL or any other test Su Frost from Admissions was available to answer any questions. The test is on demand and recorded. It is less expensive than competitors. About 640 universities are using this for admission.

Speaker McNerney stated that a Motion from committee does not require a second and asked for any discussion?

There was no discussion. The Senate voted, and the Motion carried.
Proposal that the language associated with **Restriction #4 of the College’s Pass/Fail Option** (as outlined here in the current catalog) be amended to be more clear and make the distinction between coursework that counts toward the completion of the major/minor and that which does not.

Burke stated that the proposal originated the proposal for Biology 381 as a course. The course is an internship that would only be available to Biology majors, but it would be graded as a pass/fail. The course is repeatable up to six credit hours and would not count toward the major GPA and would not be included on the Biology elective list.

Based on the current language, the course could not be approved as a pass/fail.

Burke read the current language, then read the amended language.

He explained that the amended language is to reflect that the Biology pass/fail course used as an example is not being used to fulfill a requirement.

Burke welcomed discussion to clarify.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked for a distinction between requirements for the major.

After some discussion between Kasman and Burke, it was clarified that any course required for the major could not be pass/fail.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) offered a point of clarification and said this policy is a business process when students wish to take a course that originates as a gradable course for pass/fail. Adding the language does not solve the Biology problem. This policy addresses a student requesting a pass/fail grade for a class that is normally graded. There is not a policy regarding "birthing" classes as pass/fail.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked Bergstrom is she meant to say audit, because he thought pass/fail was different than audit.

Bergstrom said it's in that section of catalog: pass/fail.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked if there is a procedural process to creating a pass/fail course and asked if there were any rules against doing this.

The Provost said that we don’t have much language about the creation of pass/fail courses.

The Provost suggested that the Senate clarify whether it wishes to permit pass/fail courses, and suggested the Curriculum Committee be involved in the larger discussion.

The Provost commented that the change in language will not solve the Biology problem, but clarifies what can be done with courses that are created with the intent of assigning a letter grade.
Krasnoff asked what are the courses on the list of exceptions and why are they on that list.

**Bob Perkins**, Guest (Teacher Education) explained that the courses offered as clinical practice courses or student teacher courses are not graded and are not required for the degree, but are required for the teaching license.

Krasnoff asked if every student submits a petition to take these courses pass/fail?

There was affirmation from Perkins and Mary Bergstrom that these courses are the exception.

The Provost said that the Senate created space for these courses.

Krasnoff is in favor of making this change, allowing students to take an extra pass/fail course. If a student has already taken all the courses in the major, what is the harm in taking an extra course that is pass/fail?

**Gayle Goudy**, (Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee) added that the course in question is an internship. Most of the internships offered at the College of Charleston are graded, so the Biology course is different from other internships.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator (at large, HSS) asked for Burke to the confusion about requirements. Is the intent here as Senator Krasnoff said that if a major requires 36 hours and a course is counted toward that 36 hours, it cannot be taken pass/fail?

Quinn Burke affirmed this is how the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid read it.

Speaker McNerney asked for any additional discussion?

There was none.

The Speaker said since this proposal comes from a committee, it does not need a second.

The Senate voted and the motion passed.

iii. **Proposal, Major GPA Policy with amended language** (doc)(pdf)

Quinn Burke reminded the Senate that the GPA proposal was seen by the Senate in October, 2015, and was remanded back to the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, which voted unanimously to keep the major GPA.

The proposal includes revised wording.

Burke asked for questions or discussion.
Pam Riggs-Gelasco, Senator (Chemistry and Biochemistry), asked about the new wording in the context of an internship that was not a requirement of the major. Is it correct that this internship would not count toward the major GPA?

Burke affirmed.

There was further discussion from Riggs-Gelasco using the example of required Bachelor essays. Many departments don't have the Bachelor essay as an option to fulfill a degree requirement, so is it correct that the Bachelors essay course is not going to be counting in some departments?

Burke affirmed that yes, the course described is not going to go toward the major GPA.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) said he is not sure that is correct. That it depends if the Department allows the Bachelors essay to count as an elective course.

The only case where the Bachelors essay wouldn't count is where the Bachelors essay is already excluded as an elective.

Krasnoff said he thinks it would still count.

Riggs-Gelasco said that she didn't think it would count in her department and her department does not have a large list of electives. In English, for example, it looks like every possible class is on the list. So a student taking courses with the English acronym would be able to count those courses. Departments that have a much more prescriptive list, like Chemistry and Biochemistry, if the proposal passes, will have to add a requirement for an additional elective to add to our 72-hour credit major. They will have to list every class that is not already a requirement. Riggs-Gelasco said she thinks hers is not the only department which would be affected. For example, Communication has quite a few upper level classes that are currently being counted in the major GPA. There will possibly be less incentive to take those classes. She expressed that she has more concerns, but allowed others to speak.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS), still confused about the language, and if he is confused, a student would be confused. A course taken to satisfy the number of hours in a major but not to satisfy any requirement in the major counts to the GPA.

Senator Kelly said that this language means that what Senator Krasnoff is calling a required elective would count.

Senator Krasnoff affirmed and said if it says, okay, now take 9 more hours. That's a requirement that you choose an elective from a large list, so it is to fulfill a requirement and even if you take 6 courses to do that, that counts.

Krasnoff asked if this would be understandable to the student?

Provost McGee said this problem had come up before and asked what is our theory of requirement? Provost McGee complimented the committees who had tried to take the enormous
complexity of curriculum as designed by the College over decades and tried to articulate a set of principles. He said he doesn't think we are quite there yet. Some departments are simple, like German with a 27 hour major, and the complexity of the 72-hour major in Chemistry or Biochemistry. The Provost mentioned the additional challenge of the courses that can fulfill requirements for the International Studies major. Those of us who have advised students are familiar with the incredible range.

In the challenge to provide transparency to students, a requirement was a course you had to take no matter what its course prefix was, or the options for fulfilling that requirement.

The Provost stated that if we cast the term requirement expansively, it means pretty much everything, regardless of prefix.

That may or may not be the intention of the committee, but speaks to how we would scribe this in software.

The Provost said that Mary Bergstrom and he would make a different suggestion to get us to the point of a calculable major GPA, and have discussed it with Bob Mignone and Quinn Burke.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) told of an informal sampling of students in which she asked them to read the language of the proposal and they had the same questions as expressed at the Senate.

Bergstrom offered for consideration going back to the "original thought." We currently have several different ways in how people calculate and what courses make up that calculation in each of your departments.

As part of SACSCOC process, they wanted to know the definition of how the GPA is calculated. Each department does set how the GPA is set in their major.

We would list in the catalog all of the courses that could count in the major GPA in order to achieve transparency. There would not be a definition of requirement, or a prerequisite for a required course, or a prerequisite for an elective course. Those definitions are not familiar to students.

What the Registrar and the Provost propose is returning to a simpler approach. She read the proposal, copied below:

**Calculation of Major Grade Point Average**

**Proposed Undergraduate Catalog Change Regarding Degree Requirements**

College of Charleston

*Prepared: November 1, 2016*

**Current Undergraduate Catalog Description:** Complete all of the requirements for at least one major with a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 2.000 in all major courses
(or for interdepartmental majors such as Urban Studies, all courses in the area of concentration). Some programs require a GPA greater than a 2.000; see specific major requirements in the “Schools and Colleges” section of the catalog.

**Proposed Undergraduate Catalog Description:** Complete all of the requirements for at least one major with a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 2.000 in all major courses identified by the department or program. See specific major requirements in the Programs of Study section of the catalog for a list of major GPA courses and exclusions. Some programs require a major GPA greater than a 2.000; see specific major requirements in the “Schools and Colleges” section of the catalog.

*Note:* Any course approved through exception management or identified by the department in the special topics selection process that will be used as a substitute for a course within a program of study’s exclusion list will not be calculated in the major GPA.

**Mary Bergstrom** (Registrar) said what the proposal is basically saying is that you calculate the major GPA in a certain way. Tell us how you're calculating it and what courses would count in it. Let us be transparent about it. She said that it is in the audit, but if a student fails a course, the audit breaks down to the work not applicable area because it doesn't really apply but still counts towards the major GPA.

Bergstrom said the catalog can serve as a source for letting advisors know how this works and for students. They would see all the requirement for your course and we can build in a section at the bottom that says, "These courses, when taken, will count in the major GPA."

Quinn Burke, Chair of the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, said that's how USC does it, and other schools have just gotten rid of it altogether.

Provost McGee summarized that the Senate has three options:

1) Get rid of major GPA (rejected by Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid);

2) Cast a wide net and count everything listed in the catalog as a course that could fulfill major requirements gets swept into the major GPA;

3) Give students clarity and transparency, but have the academic majors through their faculty designate the courses that count toward major GPA and publish them in the catalog with the major and any course that does not count for major GPA does not count.

The third option is easy to program and easy to show and explain. There would still be significant variation from one unit to another, which is what we currently have. The difference is that we would be transparent about it.
The Provost said the Senate could vote on this proposal or push it to the January meeting. He mentioned the handout that is reproduced above, and said there would be time to read the options and think about them before the January meeting.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator (Mathematics) was in favor of the third option.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator (at large SSM) wanted to clarify that each academic major would set their own requirements? Would committees have oversight?

The Provost stated that in the initial exercise, they would go to each undergraduate academic major and say tell us (within the minimum of 27 credit hours). After the initial process is complete, it would be part of curriculum approval with the Faculty Curriculum Committee. Part of proposing a new major would be proposing a list of courses that allow for major GPA calculation. It would be regulated in the normal way, through existing committee structure.

**Scott Peeples** (Guest) spoke as a member of the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, and expressed one other concern about the constant updating required from departments. Any time a course is added or removed from the curriculum, that list also has to change. Peeples asked Mary Bergstrom if this presented a serious obstacle and acknowledged that inconsistency also seemed like a serious obstacle. Peeples stated that the Committee might have gravitated to the third option had they not tried to accomplish an institution-wide consistency. Peeples asked if the Registrar's office was really okay with every department setting its own rules and asked about keeping up with the changes in curriculum.

**Mary Bergstrom** said that their hope is since the departments set it, they are okay with locking it down. She reminded us that this will be catalog based, so if we continually change how the calculation is done, then we have to match up the student with how the major GPA was calculated in that student's catalog year. Bergstrom expressed hope that it remains relatively static.

Peeples asked if departments will be able to easily add new courses to the major GPA requirements? He wanted to make sure that the Registrar's office and the departments would be able to do that type of maintenance, so that courses don't get lost in the cracks and not count towards the major GPA.

**Provost McGee** said the original problem we tried to solve was to find a consistent and transparent method to make it clearer to students how major GAP is calculated.

Since we can't seem to achieve both, as Chief Academic Officer, the Provost would choose transparency for students over consistency.

**Bob Mignone** (Guest) asked if it would be parliamentary consistent if the Senate chose to replace "this with that." He asked George Pothering, Parliamentarian, if it would be possible to go back or is that too much of a change?

Speaker McNerney said he believed the motion would have to be voted on.
George Pothering (Parliamentarian) said it could be solved by strike and replace.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) had two questions. He clarified that after we come up with the initial list of courses that count for the GPA in each major and in each department, changes to that list will come through the Senate. He used the example of a course that will stop counting for the major GPA, but you are not deleting that course, you would have to fill out a change of course form, and go through the Curriculum Committee and go through the Senate.

Kelly's second question was if the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid was happy with the proposed solution?

Quinn Burke, Chair of Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid said no, but agreed with Provost McGee that transparency was desirable, and all three options are better than what we have now. He gave the example from the School of Education that it is mandated by the State of South Carolina that education students need to have a minimum GPA in the major.

George Pothering (Guest) asked if you had an English major, who was a Junior, and English proposes a new course that goes into effect the following year, a 400 level course, if the Junior student takes that course, does it count towards the GPA?

Bergstrom and others said no, it would not be part of the catalog year for that student.

Susan Kattwinkel, Senator (Theatre and Dance) expressed her difficulty with all options as based on fear that departments will put a higher than 2.0 GPA in their major, and risks students not being able to get higher GPA. She offered that this is a potential real problem which would be exacerbated by the long list of classes that count, so there are fewer classes that students can use within the department to increase their GPA.

Quinn Burke said that Clemson doesn’t do major GPA, but there is a minimum cumulative GPA that is required to get into many programs.

Jason Vance, Senator (at-large, SSM) expressed that the department of Biology was not in favor of option 2. He believes his colleagues would support the third option.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked if the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid has talked about third option?

Bob Mignone (Guest) spoke as a member of the Committee, and said he considered an option like Option 3, but it didn't solve the need for institutional consistency.

Mignone asked Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) if a new course was started, and a student takes it the year after they declare a major, if that course satisfies the requirement, then why wouldn't that course be part of the major GPA? If the calendar year doesn't determine what course the student can take to satisfy the major, then why should it determine what counts toward the major GPA?
Senator Krasnoff added that the good thing about the other proposal is that it wasn't a list of courses specified by the department, it was a rule. So when you added a new course, the rule applies to it.

There was some discussion.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest** (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) attempted to explain the questions. She explained that every set of degree requirements has to be scribed in Degree Works for auditing, and the scribing is based on lists. And they're based on the list of courses for that catalog for that catalog year. So if you have nine hours at the 300 level and above of a MATH course, then if I was a student under the 2015-16 catalog and a course appears in 2016-17, and it is not in the 2015-16 catalog, but it's a MATH 300 level and above, that is not going to count for my major because it is not scribed in Degree Works and it won't get picked up in the audit, unless I change to the next year's catalog.

Senator Krasnoff said the Senate thinks it's legislating according to rules, but we are not, we are legislating according to lists.

Provost McGee stated that the rule was set by the Senate as a catalog year base, which was healthy for students because it gave them certainty that when they choose a major in a catalog year, they know what courses fulfill requirements and which do not. They are listed there. If a student wants to switch to a catalog year to pick up the new course added, they can do that, but they have to intentionally do so. The student can change the rule on themselves; faculty do not change the rule on the student. The calculation of the major GPA is student friendly. When you add a new course to your catalog, it affects the people on that year's catalog.

Senator Krasnoff claimed that the programming could be rule based.

Provost McGee reiterated that the choice was one made by the Senate.

Senator Krasnoff next said that it would be hard to argue against letting every department do it the way they want to. He said that consistency does matter, and does not think we are far away from transparency. He stated that adding the parenthetical language of including courses that could fulfill an elective requirement as a modifying phrase is pretty good.

Senator Krasnoff expressed that it is good to decide the question on the basis of whether it's good to have common rules and not on the basis that it's simply impossible to write the language clearly and transparently. He said with good writers and good legislators on campus we could get it done. Krasnoff preferred the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid to consider the three options, bring the Senate a report, and then we really debate about the three options.

Quinn Burke said that everyone thinks in terms of their department, not necessarily in terms of the College, but will do what the Senate recommends.
Iana Anguelova, Senator (Mathematics) said that even though the language appears consistent, it will be read differently by the different departments, so reaching consistency is not an option. Is it possible to program based on rules, not on lists? Each department can set their own rules. For example, Mathematics could set the rule that all 400 MATH courses count. Can we program so each department makes their own rules?

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) said as an example that Chemistry could say their major GPA is calculated. We require Organic, but we don't count it in our major GPA. Isn't that what we are saying in the third model?

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said the problem is that it would violate the transparency principle.

Using a notation on every course description or on the list of major requirements so that someone can easily see what is counting and what is not counting instead of students and faculty having to interpret rules achieves one of the two principles, which is transparency.

There was brief back and forth discussion between Caveny-Noecker and Anguelova.

Simon Lewis (Guest) said that trying to get consistency is nuts. Option 3 seems to be a sensible way of dealing with it, especially since students have an option of opting in to another catalog year.

Meg Cormack, Senator (Religious Studies) asked if a student could petition to have a new course count both for their requirements and for their GPA?

Speaker McNerney said that currently, students can change their catalog year.

Provost McGee said that there are limits on how much we can customize the student experience. In this case, he would recommend that we force a choice of catalog year rather than customize options.

Godfrey Gibbison (Guest) asked a "rare" question, could someone explain to me the attachment to the major GPA? He used the example of when applying to graduate school, he picked courses that he thought applied to his major and calculated a GPA based on that, that the program director probably looked at his transcript and picked some course that they thought were the major courses and calculated a GPA.

Bob Mignone (Guest) explained that it determines who can graduate and who cannot in the major. It doesn't show up in the transcript, but if you don't have a major GPA, then students can potentially graduate with a .7 average in the major.

Gibbison said why not select the simplest rule you can select which is: the department sets the rule, and the department sets the list, whether the rule is 2.0 or 2.5 and you're done.
The Provost made a motion to remand the question to the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, to force rank the three options in the preference of the committee, then to bring that back to the Senate with the presentation of each option to the Senate for an up/down vote, and if one gets a majority, we would have a change, if none gets a majority, we would have no change.

Senator Krasnoff seconded.

**Bob Mignone** (Guest) asked a procedural question.

**Pam Riggs-Gelasco**, Senator (Chemistry and Biochemistry) asked if just one committee would be looking at this?

Quinn Burke will take the options back to Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid, will rank, and bring back in January.

**Heath Hoffman**, Senator (Sociology and Anthropology) asked if one of the three options will be to eliminate the GPA?

The Speaker and Burke said yes.

The Speaker asked for additional questions on whether to remand the options back to Committee.

**Jim Young**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked about who the consistency was for, the student? If so, he doesn't see how consistency between departments in how the GPA requirement guidelines for a major matters to the student. As long as each department has a very clear set of guidelines, he believes that clarity is better than consistency.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) said that student really care about their major GPA.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator (at large, HSS) said he would like to call the question. That motion was seconded.

Next, the Speaker asked for a vote to remand the question to committee.

The Senate voted and the question was remanded to committee.

6. **New Business**

a. **Christine Finnan**, Chair of Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs, presented three proposals.

   i. EDEL-Course Deletion (pdf)

Bob Perkins clarified that the course is taken out of the requirement, not the catalog.
The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

ii. ESOL-Certificate Termination (pdf)

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

iii. LALE-New Course (pdf)

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

b. Gayle Goudy, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee presented five proposals.

i. Professional Studies: HMSM prerequisite changes (pdf)

Godfrey Gibbison (Dean, Professional Studies) spoke to the changes as a change to prerequisites, adding permission of department or junior standing.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

ii. Finance: Prerequisite changes to FINC 360 and REAL 360 (pdf)

Weishen Wang (Chair, Finance) spoke to changes in an attempt to become consistent with other departments that specified Junior standing or permission of instructor.

The Provost appreciated the explanation and asked about the management of a list of "ghost prerequisites."

Wang specified that the list of prerequisites will be removed, and junior standing or instructor permission will be the criteria for admission to the classes.

The Provost asked that the clarification appear in the minutes.

The Senate looked at the Finance curriculum change forms and the Provost noted that the strikeout initialed by Wang on page 2 of 4 should be taken as a modification of the language on page 1 of 4.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

iii. Economics (pdf)

1. Prerequisite changes to ECON 200 and 201

Beatriz Maldonado (Economics) explained that the intent is to have students brush up on their math before taking these ECON classes.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked about the requirements.
Maldonado explained that the South Carolina student can finish their math requirement in their sophomore year in high school, so by the time they get to the ECON class, it may have been several years without seeing any math. The department finds they are better prepared for ECON by brushing up on basic math.

Krasnoff said there seems like there should be an exception for the student who takes math all along.

Jim Young, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if the department would consider a simple diagnostic test in lieu of taking a math course?

Maldonado said that the department has looked at lots of options, and the Math department changing the math placement test a couple of times in the last ten years makes it hard to make that rule. They are trying to make this the least obtrusive prerequisite.

Young suggested that the ECON department could address this within itself, instead of requiring a math course.

Doug Walker (Guest, ECON) stated that the department is trying not to make this overly complicated. They want to discourage students from taking this their first semester of College. The ECON classes plus Math destroy these students in their first semester.

Godfrey Gibbison, (Guest, ECON) spoke to the administrative burden if a test is required.

Jason Vance, Senator (at-large, SSM) spoke at a faculty member in SSM in support of this prerequisite.

Pam Riggs-Gelasco, Senator (Chemistry and Biochemistry) and Bob Mignone (Guest) spoke of the decline in math skills, failure to place in college Algebra, and the need for math preparedness in all the STEM classes.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) affirmed the point of the proposal is a good one. Does it do what you want it to do? He expressed that there needs to be some way to allow the well-prepared math student into the courses.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) said that in conversations with ECON Chair Calvin Blackwell, they agreed that any math that transferred in as a math, the student would not be precluded from taking the course.

DeLaurell said this is an attempt to get everyone up to an adequate math level. She also wished to go on the record as stating that we need to examine the salaries we pay our admins. They are our first responders, invaluable to departments, and we need to reward them with raises.

Jason Vance, Senator (at-large, SSM) clarified that it is the timing of taking the math that this changes. They would still have to take a math as part of GenEd requirements.
Jason Howell, Senator (at-large Science and Mathematics) asked if the prerequisite change would allow a student who had AP Calculus to take the course.

Maldonado said any math that shows up in their transcript is accepted.

Some more discussion occurred.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

2. Prerequisite changes to 300- and 400 level ECON courses

Maldonado said if the student meets the prerequisites then you should not have to wait to take the courses.

Bob Frash, Senator (Hospitality and Tourism Management) said that it seems that a 300 level should imply junior level.

The Speaker and the Provost said that the course numbering policy does not state class standing. He stated there is a lack of consistency in labeling 100 and 200 level courses.

There followed some discussion about defining course numbers, and inconsistency across departments. Changes in course numbering would require significant curricular reform to achieve.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) called the question. The motion was seconded. The motion to call the question passed.

The Speaker called for a vote on the course changes.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

iv. Mathematics: Add MATH 455 to the Actuarial Studies track (pdf)

Bob Mignone (Chair, Mathematics) said that it was an oversight to leave this off the list.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

v. Communication: Add new course to the COMM degree requirements (pdf)

Ryan Milner, Senator (COMM) explained that they are adding a 200 level foundation course.

Susan Kattwinkel, Senator (Theatre and Dance) asked a question of the Provost. Are all departments required to have a 36-hour major?

Provost McGee stated that the requirement was removed by the Senate several years ago.
The Provost asked Milner if still possible for student to finish in 4 years with 39 hour major?

Milner said the department is examining some options, including moving the major back to 36 hours.

The Senate voted on and passed the proposal.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) brought up that one of our students was cited and ticketed for having a protest after the Presidential election. Senator Krasnoff said at some point, the student protest attracted more than 50 people, and there is a city ordinance that says you must have a permit for more than 50 people.

Krasnoff could not find how long it took to get a permit on the city's website. He is concerned because since students do organize rallies and protests, he would like legal clarification on the rules in order to support students.

The Speaker and the Provost will ask Legal Counsel for legal clarification.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) asked about the news story which suggested that the Secessionist party provoked the citation.

Another student reported to Senator Nunan that in organizing about ten protests, he applied for a permit only once. and the rest of the time the city left them alone.

Nunan asked if students being targeted? Nunan stated that as an institution of higher education concerned with free speech, we should be thinking about ways to support our students in these kinds of situations.

**Jason Vance**, Senator (at-large, SSM), reported that there is still misunderstanding of protection of minor’s policy and science outreach to schools. Currently the language is fairly restrictive, even beyond what CCSD requires, and faculty wonder how the rule applies, how much vetting they will have to do with the volunteers from the schools that participate in this outreach, including parents.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) clarified that students’ official transcript does not contain major GPA. It is not displayed anywhere.

8. Adjournment, 7:42.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jannette Finch, Faculty Secretary