Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 13 February 2018

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 13 February 2018 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. **Call to Order**, 5:05 PM.

2. **The minutes from** 16 January 2018 were approved as written.

3. There were no **Announcements and information**.

4. **Reports**
   
a. **Speaker of the Faculty Elizabeth Jurisich** announced that the 2018-2019 Senate meeting schedule is posted on the Senate website ([http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/about-faculty-senate/meeting-schedule.php](http://facultysenate.cofc.edu/about-faculty-senate/meeting-schedule.php)). Speaker Jurisich explained that the Faculty/Administration Manual (FAM) specifies that Faculty Senate meets on the first Tuesday of every month, which is sometimes not possible, and results in shifting the meeting to the second Tuesday. Please let her know if you see any conflicts in the schedule.

   Speaker Jurisich thanked all who participated in recent elections important for shared faculty governance. Results are in MyCharleston, under the Faculty tab. She is especially grateful to Scott Peeples, who will serve as 2018-19 Faculty Secretary. Please look for the call for faculty committee service from the Committee on Nominations and Elections.

   Jurisich attended the January Board of Trustees meeting and reported on Senate business. The Board approved two new programs approved by Faculty Senate, the Masters in Data Science and the Bachelors in General Studies. She also gave summaries of the reports given in Senate meetings.

   Jurisich addressed the impending search for the next College of Charleston president. President McConnell's retirement will be sometime in the summer, 2018. The Board has appointed Steve Osborne to serve as interim president, starting in July 2018.

   Speaker Jurisich, Dean of Professional Studies and Associate Professor of Economics Godfrey Gibbison, and six Board of Trustees members will serve on the presidential search committee. The chair of the search committee is Trustee **Renee Romberger**.

   There will be several listening sessions designed to solicit input from four groups of stakeholders; faculty, staff, students, and alumni. The listening sessions provide opportunity for stakeholders to share what qualifications, characteristics and attributes are deemed required in the college president.

   Views will be gathered from the listening sessions and shared with the search firm hired to assist in the national search. An email will be forthcoming announcing the schedule.
An online comment form will be available for those not able to physically attend a listening session. Tim Johnson will serve as the leader of the faculty stakeholder group. Co-leaders are Hollis France, Devon Hanahan, and Denis Keyes.

Speaker Jurisich accepted questions.

**Larry Krasnoff, Senator** (Philosophy) said that many faculty members are concerned with the structure of the search committee. Krasnoff said that there should be more than one faculty member, representing the different disciplines. He said the search committee is incredibly unrepresentative of the stakeholders across campus. He described the search committee as essentially a Board of Trustees sub-committee with a couple of advisors. Krasnoff described a typical search committee as containing multiple faculty members, representatives from offices such as student affairs and athletics, student representatives, representatives from the alumni association, and the Foundation Board. Krasnoff said the search committee only advises the Board of Trustees, so incorporating more stakeholders in the search committee is not usurping the Board's power. Krasnoff offered suggestions for actions the Faculty Senate could take, including:

- issuing a statement from stakeholders supporting including more stakeholders;
- holding a "shadow search committee," which could include holding separate listening sessions and writing a separate advertisement including a description of desired characteristics for the next president;
- issuing reports when candidates visit campus.

Krasnoff said that all of these actions could be posted publicly.

**Speaker Jurisich** commented that the Board of Trustees is aware that the search committee does not resemble previous committees. She said they were determined that the committee remain a small committee. The Chair of the Search Committee, Renee Romberger, has assured the Speaker that the search committee will take the information from the listening sessions very seriously.

**Tom Kunkle, Senator** (at-large, SSM) asked what the Board's response was when Speaker Jurisich proposed more faculty representation on the search committee?

Speaker Jurisich said that the search committee of eight members includes two faculty members and six Trustees and the Board felt that this was adequate faculty representation.

**Julia Eichelberger, Senator** (at-large, HSS) thanked the Speaker for trying to express the faculty's desire to have a greater role in the search committee process. Eichelberger said the listening sessions do provide a chance for faculty to voice their concerns, but there is a strong possibility that those concerns will be disregarded.
Eichelberger said that the people who will decide on the next president are unlikely to be at the listening sessions. She suggested that Speaker Jurisich could request that the listening sessions be recorded and made public.

Speaker Jurisich said that Romberger had assured her that the faculty co-leader and potentially a search committee member would be at each session.

Eichelberger said some remember that the search committee for the previous president made recommendations, but the Board of Trustees took its own vote, which is its right to do.

Speaker Jurisich acknowledged that this past experience causes people to feel their time is wasted, but said that there is a new Chair of the Board of Trustees.

Eichelberger expressed concern that the Board may not be conversant with faculty perspective and with the hopes faculty have for the college, as their perspective is very different. She said that difference is natural, but is so dramatic a difference, it may not be healthy. It would be good to encourage more public access to the listening sessions so that more than one or two search committee members can listen to stakeholder concerns.

Speaker Jurisich said there will be summaries, and some technology available so people can make comments anonymously through a website.

**Brian Lanahan, Senator** (at-large, EHHP) said we owe a more transparent search to our next president. He said the credibility of our institution would improve with public transparency and give the next president the vote of confidence that will allow them to move into the role and to be successful.

**Richard Nunan, Senator** (at-large, HSS) observed that Senator Krasnoff's proposals would send a negative message to candidates for president, but those presidential candidates are probably already aware of the controversy surrounding the presidential search of four years ago.

Nunan appreciated the Speaker's positive spin on the search committee, but asserted that the search committee is "just a disaster," since it contains six members of the body that will ultimately make the decision on who to hire, and virtually no one else. Nunan said that as far as he understands, Dean Gibbison is an administrator with a faculty appointment. Nunan quoted from the *Presidential Search Committee Guidelines*, written by Muriel Poston and posted on the AAUP (American Association of University Professors) website. Poston states, "The involvement of administrators on the search committee is problematic and should be discouraged since they may represent the perspective of the outgoing administration" ([https://www.aaup.org/issues/governance-colleges-universities/presidential-search](https://www.aaup.org/issues/governance-colleges-universities/presidential-search)).

Nunan said the search committee is six Board of Trustees members, one administrator associated with the outgoing administration, and the Speaker of the Faculty. Nunan said it
might be the case that the Board of Trustees does not agree with AAUP views on the presidential search, however, presidential candidates are probably conversant with those views and they wonder why AAUP guidelines are not being followed.

Nunan encouraged the Board of Trustees to reconsider the composition of the search committee and said the AAUP offers two guidelines to assist with reorganizing the search committee:


Nunan said the basic message in both documents is that faculty are an equal voice in the selection of a president for an institution of higher education.

Nunan said if a Board of Trustees ignores AAUP guidelines, the candidates they select is a set of candidates that mirror its own parochial concerns. What they will not get is a candidate who has a deep understanding of academic culture, including what is important and significant about the culture and how to run an institution steeped in that culture.

Nunan said it might be the case that by some miracle, we will get a good president from this process, but that would be a miracle and he wishes the Board would reconsider.

**Patricia Williams Lessane, Senator** (Library) asked if anything prohibited the Faculty Senate from taking a vote of no confidence in the Board of Trustees in the event they do not listen to faculty concerns?

Speaker Jurisich said there is no policy prohibiting that action.

Williams Lessane said that since there will be a race for governor of South Carolina soon, the atmosphere is ripe for radical action if the Board does not take into account faculty concerns.

**Richard Nunan, Senator** (at-large, HSS) added that the AAUP advises that faculty select their own representatives for the search committee, instead of faculty appointees made by the Board.

**Larry Krasnoff, Senator** (Philosophy) said that listening sessions are not a substitute for broadening the search committee. A broad search committee would commission listening sessions anyway, but they are not a substitute for a representative search committee.

There were no more comments.
b. Provost Brian McGee

*The Provost's report is reflected in his PowerPoint [Appendix A].*

**Provost McGee** acknowledged President McConnell’s service and expressed appreciation.

The Provost reminded faculty of the upcoming Sestercentennial celebrating the College of Charleston's 250th anniversary in 2020 and invited faculty to think of proposals. There will be a budget for academically focused disciplinary and interdisciplinary proposals that offer opportunities to explore the College's history, including strengths and weaknesses.

The Provost discussed the Sabbatical calendar and said approximately 34 letters awarding sabbatical proposals are being sent out. Some are contingent on successful tenure and promotion.

Provost McGee gave a brief report on the student complaint system. Over the last twelve months, seventeen complaints have been lodged. The majority of complaints were non-academic and concerned campus dining. The seven academic complaints were spread almost evenly among the Schools.

Eleven student complaints were resolved to the students' satisfaction; three complaints were unresolved because the students did not respond to the proposed resolution. Another three complaints were received recently, and the process has not been completed.

Provost McGee commented on the study on the direct instructional cost. It was first completed in the 2011 academic year using 2009-2010 data. Dr. Bev Diamond has replicated the study completed in 2011 using data from the 2016-2017 academic year. The costs are seen in Appendix A. The Provost said there are various ways to present the data, including a comparison of the revenue received for every dollar in direct instructional costs in FY2010 and FY2017. The Provost pointed out that based on the data, the College is managing its costs responsibly. The Provost said all the schools are producing more revenue than they cost.

The Provost gave a summary of the 2017-2018 Program Cost Study as finding good stability in program costs relative to revenues and as procuring a series of program reports on expenses for both graduate and undergraduate.

The Provost invited Program Directors, Deans, and Chairs to study the data and look for opportunities to create greater efficiencies. He repeated that costs are being managed well, despite having more roster faculty, more senior faculty, and smaller course sections than seven years ago.
Provost McGee said that a study of overhead costs would be valuable, and has expressed that to the Board of Trustees, who have assured him that the College should be doing that.

Provost McGee addressed the College identity conversations, describing them as helpful and wide-reaching, addressing changes at the College and at the national level in areas of resources, faculty lines, student major patterns, student programming, educational preparation of students, and enrollments.

Provost McGee commented on the tenure and promotion packets, and said they reveal inspiring work, amazing research, transformational work done in classroom, interventions and service in the community, and the tremendous work we do for students. He said it serves as a reminder of the excellent and important work of the University, which transforms Charleston, the state, and the nation for the better.

The Provost said at a time when we spend a lot of effort talking about our future and how we work with other stakeholders including the Board, we should not forget the tremendous work we do as an institution and the transformational experiences we give students and the benefits we provide to the community. These things give him full confidence in the future.

There were no questions.

c. Committee on Graduate Education, Chair Christine Finnan, gave a report on the Graduate Program Admissions Process [Appendix B].

Finnan said after the change last year separating the Graduate Education Committee from Continuing Education and Special Programs, the Graduate Committee had a chance to revisit their charge in relation to graduate education. One policy area they looked at was streamlining admissions policy for graduate programs. The Committee sought to ensure transparency in admissions decisions and adherence to Graduate School policies.

There were no questions.

5. There was no Old Business.

6. New Business

a. Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (Quinn Burke, Chair). Concentrations and Minors Proposal [Appendix C].

Burke said the proposal clarifies the role of the minor as related to the major.

There were no questions.
The vote was called and the proposal passed.

b. **General Education Committee (Lisa Covert, Chair)** introduced the following curriculum changes:

   i. ECON 101 *(pdf)* *note: pre-dates Curriculog*
   
   ii. PHIL 115 *(pdf)*

The proposals were viewed and discussed separately. The items were approved unanimously.

Covert asked for departments to consider submitting proposals for math/logic alternatives. PHIL 115 is currently the only one.

c. **Committee on Graduate Education (Christine Finnan, Chair)** brought the following proposals:

   i. **English, MA** - remove foreign language requirement *(pdf)*

There was no discussion. The proposal passed.

   ii. **Public Administration, MPA - 4+1 program with Urban Studies, Planning and Administration Concentration** *(pdf)*

Although a vote was not needed for Public Administration, Provost McGee felt that a vote was appropriate.

**Discussion.**

Finnan said the Public Administration proposal allows for strong student to begin their graduate work while still undergraduates.

**Jon Hakkila, Guest,** spoke in favor of the 4 + 1 programs as a great opportunity to combine undergraduate and graduate programs with the goal of retaining students. Most resources are in place, so no new resources are needed. Hakkila encouraged more departments to think of developing 4 + 1 programs. He also spoke as a parent of a student who is in a 4 + 1 program and can see the advantage for his child.

**Kevin Keenan, Guest and Director of the Urban Studies Program** spoke to the academic rationale for 4 + 1 programs as opening options for the undergraduate students to curriculum and training in Urban Planning that is not available at the undergraduate student. For students performing at the 3.5 and above level, this program creates a strong academic opportunity for them.

**Larry Krasnoff, Senator** (Philosophy) asked at what point do student apply?
Keenan said they have to have Junior status, defined as 60 credits completed, 3.5 GPA, a recommendation from the Director of Urban Studies and two additional faculty recommendations.

Keenan said the applications would be reviewed by Masters in Public Administration Admissions.

**Lynn Cherry (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources, Academic Affairs)** said that the undergraduates who participate in the 4 + 1 program are not admitted to the graduate program. They are only admitted to the graduate program after they have completed and earned the undergraduate degree.

Cherry said the opportunity to take graduate courses is available to the undergraduates, but they are not admitted to the graduate program at that time.

**Krasnoff** asked if there are benchmarks that the undergraduates have to meet? It seems like students would need assurances of what they receive if they perform well.

Keenan said the students have to maintain a B in graduate courses. If they fall below that in any of the graduate courses they are dropped from the program. This pathway is communicated with them.

Cherry made the point that any student receiving federal financial aid must remain an undergraduate students—they cannot receive federal financial aid if they are also graduate students.

A vote was taken and the proposal passed.

d. **Faculty Curriculum Committee (Chad Galuska Co-Chair)** introduced the following proposals:

i. Computer Science: Program changes to both the BS and the BA degrees (pdf)
   - [Computer Science, B.S. - BS-CSCI (pdf)]
   - [Computer Science, B.A. - BA-CSCI (pdf)]

ii. Computer Science/Information Systems: Program changes to INFS and a prerequisite change to CSCI 462
   - [Computer Information Systems, B.S. - BS-INFS (pdf)]
   - [CSCI 462 Course Change (pdf)]
iii. French, Francophone, and Italian Studies: Prerequisite changes to the following courses:

- FREN 435
- FREN 453
- FREN 454
- FREN 475
- FREN 476
- FREN 477
- FREN 481
- FREN 490
- FREN 491
- FREN 492
- FREN 496
- FREN 498
- FREN 499

iv. Geology: Create three new field courses and an associated program change.

- Geology, B.S. - BS-GEOL
- GEOL 364
- GEOL 365
- GEOL 366

v. International Studies: Change concentrations to reflect added/deactivated FREN courses.

- BA-INTL-INAF
- BA-INTL-INCL
- BA-INTL-INEU
- BA-INTL-INLA

vi. International Studies: Make INTL 350 a required course for the major and then delete it from individual concentrations:

- Required Courses - INTL
- BA-INTL-INAF
- BA-INTL-INAS
- BA-INTL-INEU
- BA-INTL-INCL
- BA-INTL-INLA
vii. Philosophy, Politics, Philosophy and Law Concentration: Add electives to the concentration for both the philosophy and political science majors. Change the way these major GPAs are calculated.

- PPLW Concentration (pdf)
- BA-PHIL-PPLW (pdf)
- BA-POLI-PPLW (pdf)

viii. Psychology: Changes to the following two courses:

- PSYC 397 Course Change (pdf)
- PSYC 497 Course Change (pdf)

ix. Studio Art: Course description change to ARTS 339 (pdf)

x. MATH: Decouple 400- and 500-level courses. **This did not require a vote from the undergraduate curriculum committee.**

- MATH 402: Advanced Linear Algebra MATH 502: Advanced Linear Algebra
- MATH 415: Complex Analysis MATH 515: Complex Analysis
- MATH 423: Partial Differential Equations MATH 523: Partial Differential Equations
- MATH 430: Mathematical Statistics I MATH 530: Mathematical Statistics I
- MATH 431: Mathematical Statistics II MATH 531: Mathematical Statistics II
- MATH 440: Statistical Learning I MATH 540: Statistical Learning I
- MATH 441: Statistical Learning II MATH 541: Statistical Learning II
- MATH 445: Numerical Analysis MATH 545: Numerical Analysis
- MATH 449: Linear Models MATH 550: Linear Models
- MATH 451: Linear Programming MATH 551: Linear Programming
- MATH 452: Operations Research MATH 552: Operations Research
- MATH 455: Bayesian Methods MATH 555: Bayesian Methods
- MATH 460: Stochastic Processes MATH 560: Stochastic Processes
- MATH 461: Time Series Analysis MATH 561: Time Series Analysis

Discussion was invited after each proposal. There was no discussion until the Math proposals.

**Provost McGee and Mary Bergstrom (Registrar)** wanted to make sure that the Math department understands that it will not be able to offer the courses listed above as cross-listed courses again in the future without going through curriculum approval and coming before the Senate.
Deanna Caveny-Noecker, (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) pointed out a typo, which was corrected.

All curriculum proposals passed.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked for unanimous consent to suspend the rules and add to the agenda a motion to call on the Board of Trustees to expand the Presidential Search Committee. The motion to suspend the rules was seconded. Majority vote suspended the rules.

The motion was introduced and seconded. The motion was discussed.

Some wordsmithing recommendations were offered by Senators Jim Young (at-large SSM) and Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS). The recommendations were accepted.

Olivia Thompson, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked what is the standard number of representatives on a search committee?

Lynne Ford (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) gave an example, and said her daughter attends William and Mary and their current presidential search committee contains twenty people, and includes students.

There was some discussion of how many members to suggest.

Iana Anguelova, Senator (at-large, SSM) spoke in favor of specifying a number or a proportion of the search committee consisting of faculty.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) spoke in favor of leaving off a specific number, since it is a resolution and it is up to the Board to interpret the resolution.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) spoke on the importance of adopting AAUP’s suggestions, including faculty selecting their own representatives, instead of faculty appointed by the Board.

Krasnoff agreed, and used the example of the Board going to the Athletic department to ask who that department suggested for the search committee.

Both Nunan and Krasnoff emphasized that the point is that each stakeholder group select their own representatives, instead of the Board “cherry-picking.”

Anguelova spoke in favor of including faculty representatives from each school, as different schools have different viewpoints.

An amendment was introduced to include specific language on faculty from each school. That amendment failed.
Julia Eichelberger, Senator (at-large, HSS) contributed another friendly amendment, which was accepted.

Jolanda van Arnhem, Senator (at-large, Library) looked up AAUP guidelines and verified that the guidelines suggest that there should be nine to twenty on a search committee, which would allow representatives from each school.

There was more discussion about the total number of faculty to include and whether that would encourage the Board to move expediently.

The Faculty Senate voted on the amended motion, which passed with a unanimous vote.

The amended motion is:

**A Resolution to the Board of Trustees from the Faculty Senate**

Whereas, the function of a presidential search committee is to advise the Board of Trustees on the selection of a president;

Whereas, the Board cannot be properly advised without the direct input of stakeholders throughout the institution;

Whereas, the presidential search committee now contains only two members who are not also Board members;

Whereas, a strong applicant pool and a successful presidential transition require a transparent and inclusive search process; therefore be it

Resolved that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston calls upon the Board of Trustees to add to its presidential search committee additional representatives of the faculty, and representatives of staff, student body, and alumni and Foundation boards.

The Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Faculty Senate returned to regular order.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) introduced concerns about requirements for independent studies and the individual enrollment form. He said in the past, he simply stated
how often the student and professor would meet and how the grade would be determined in a
general way, and that was captured on the individual enrollment form.

Nunan said the communication he received from the Registrar’s office indicated that the
independent study needed to include a course description, learning outcomes, and grading scale.

Nunan provided an example of the language used on the individual enrollment form, found in
Appendix D, below.

Nunan found it surprising that he needed to attach a detailed project description and/or syllabus,
and a grading rubric and a plan for assessing a student learning outcome.

Nunan was concerned about the language of assessment and "bureaucratic creep." He said an
independent study with a student is an uncompensated overload, and if requirements become too
onerous due to assessment requirements, he will no longer do them.

Nunan asked where the language originated from, who ratified the language, why are we doing
this, and asked for the appropriate faculty committees to study the language in the Individual
Enrollment form.

Lynne Ford (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) explained the history of
the language and the need for consistent criteria. Ford said when she was the Associate Provost
for Curriculum, she authored much of the language found in the Individual Enrollment form. She
said that Nunan in his independent studies probably set meticulously documented student
learning outcomes or objectives and planned meetings with students to assure that the student
had produced the work to demonstrate that they have met the student learning outcomes. Ford
said that faculty conducting independent studies before the language change in the Individual
Enrollment form varied widely in how they articulated student performance, from notes on
cocktail napkins to twenty-page syllabi. Changes in the language on the form were to design a
regular format for departments to use.

Provost McGee said that college policy 7.6.10, the Policy of Course Syllabi, requires that every
individual enrollment must have a syllabus (section 7.0). The policy was sent through all
pertinent committees and vetted extensively.

Nunan spoke about the difference between a grading rubric and detailed project description and
asked for the committees to again look at the language.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked about a couple of ambiguities in language
concerning grading rubric and grading scale. Krasnoff also asked about learning outcomes, and
received affirmation that they can be created specifically for Individual Enrollment, instead of set
at the departmental level.

Provost McGee said Academic Affairs will examine the Individual Enrollment forms to make
sure language is consistent and aligns with the policy that was approved in Spring 2016 and
revised in Fall 2016. The goal is for students to clearly understand how the grade will be assigned.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) and Chair, Committee on Nominations and Elections, called for service on college committees.

8. Adjournment 6:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch

Faculty Secretary

[Appendix A: Provost Brian McGee's PowerPoint]

[Appendix B: Report on the Graduate Program Admissions Process, from the Committee on Graduate Education]

[Appendix C: Concentrations and Minors Proposal from the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid]

[Appendix D: Individual Enrollment Registration Form Requirements]
Provost’s Report

Faculty Senate
February 13, 2018
Sabbatical Leaves for 2018-2019

- 25 Awarded
- 9 Awarded Contingent on Favorable Tenure Review
Electronic Submission of Student Complaints

- February 2018 Report Promised in February 2017
- 17 Complaints Filed Over 12 Months
  - 10 Non-Academic Complaints
  - 7 Academic Complaints (1 or 2 complaints per school)
- Complaint Resolution Status
  - 11 Complaints Resolved to Student Satisfaction
  - 3 Complaints Unresolved/No Student Response
  - 3 Complaints Unresolved/Still Under Review
### 2017-2018 Program Cost Study:
School Totals (UG and Graduate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>FY17 Cost/SCH</th>
<th>FY10 Cost/SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOTA</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>$231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHHP</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>$197</td>
<td>$153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCWA</td>
<td>$195</td>
<td>$143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>$254</td>
<td>$193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>$269</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$226</strong></td>
<td><strong>$176</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017-2018 Program Cost Study: Costs and Revenues

- In FY10, the College of Charleston received $2.18 in revenue for every $1 in direct instructional costs.
- In FY17, the College of Charleston received $2.16 in revenue for every $1 in direct instructional costs.
- In FY17, the College of Charleston generated $143,572,000 in tuition revenues (estimated), with $66,591,000 in total direct instructional costs.
## 2017-2018 Program Cost Study: Ratio of Revenues to Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>FY17 Ratio</th>
<th>FY10 Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOTA</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHHP</td>
<td>2.21*</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>2.47**</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCWA</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>1.91***</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This school generated $1.4m in external funding for FY17.

**This school generated $0.7m in external funding for FY17.

***This school generated $5.7m in external funding for FY17.
Graduate Program Admission Process

The Committee on Graduate Education has approved a process for updating and modifying graduate program admissions requirements. This process is needed because each program sets its own admissions criteria (graduate students apply directly to specific programs whereas undergraduate students apply to the College of Charleston) and the Committee wants to ensure transparency in admissions decisions and adherence to Graduate School policies. In the proposed process, a graduate program will initiate admissions updates to be subsequently sent for approval to the line dean(s), the Graduate School dean or associate dean, the Provost, the Committee on Graduate Education, and the Graduate Council. The Committee on Graduate Education will prepare an annual report to the Senate each spring outlining program admissions changes.

The Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid supports the proposed process.
Concentrations and Minors

In addition to completing a major, a degree-seeking student may elect to pursue a program of study organized around a particular theme within the major discipline (a concentration) or outside the major discipline (a minor). These courses may be selected from a single department or from several, and interdisciplinary courses may be included. Either program must include a minimum of 18 credit hours selected from a formally designated group. Courses used to satisfy the requirements of a concentration or minor may not be applied toward another concentration or minor.

Earning a Minor

The College of Charleston does not require students to complete a minor. However, a minor allows you to take advantage of the extensive offerings across the College. There are a few rules to keep in mind when pursuing a minor.

- At least nine credit hours in the minor at the 200-level or above must be earned in residence at the College of Charleston. Residency is defined as instruction delivered by the College of Charleston, the degree granting institution.
• Unique courses, appropriate for the minor, but not otherwise offered at the College of Charleston, may be considered for approval as exceptions to the minor residency policy. Likewise, a set of courses completed elsewhere may be approved as exceptions to the minor residency policy if when considered in the whole they comprise a unique curricular experience not available at the College. Senior-Year Residency policies apply.
• Successful completion of a minor or concentration requires a grade point average of at least 2.000 in all courses taken which comprise it.
• Courses used to satisfy the requirements of a concentration or minor may not be applied toward another concentration or minor.
• Students must formally declare a concentration or minor online through the Program of Study Management (POSM) channel located on the Academic Services tab in MyCharleston in order to have the degree audit and transcript reflect credit for work done in that concentration or minor. A concentration or minor must be formally declared before the degree is posted.
• A student may earn a total of two minors from the College of Charleston.

Minors in Relation to Majors

• A student may not concurrently complete a major and a minor in the same subject.
• A student who earns a bachelor’s degree (AB, BA, BS, BPS) from the College of Charleston may return and complete the requirements for an additional major. In this case, credits from a previously earned minor may be used to complete requirements for a major in the same subject. All requirements for the additional major must be met. See applicable sections under Second Bachelor’s Degree or Pursuing an Additional Major After Earning a College of Charleston Degree in the undergraduate catalog for specific details.
• A student returning to complete an additional major may also earn a minor so long as it does not exceed a total of two from the College. At no time may a student earn a subsequent minor in the same subject as a completed major. See applicable sections under Second Bachelor’s Degree or Pursuing an Additional Major After Earning a College of Charleston Degree in the undergraduate catalog for specific details.
• Completion of a minor is designated on the official transcript, but a minor does not appear on the diploma.
What I was first told was missing by a Registrar’s Office staffer in an email response to individual enrollment submission:
We are unable to process the individual enrollment for ______________ — missing are the course description, learning outcomes, and grading scale.

Here’s the problematic language that appears on the individual enrollment form used now (dated 09/08/2016), and quoted to me in Registrar’s Office subsequent response (to my expression of mystification)...

From the checklist at the top of the form...
Attach a detailed project description and/or syllabus. Faculty supervisor must provide a grading rubric and a plan for assessing the student learning outcome.

From the list of requirements lower down on the form:
A detailed project description and/or syllabus must accompany all Application for Individual Enrollment forms. The means by which the faculty supervisor will grade the course must be included in the description or syllabus and a plan for assessing the student learning outcome.

New language is italicized.

Language used on the previous individual enrollment form:

From the checklist at the top of the form...
Attach a detailed project description and/or syllabus. The means by which the faculty supervisor will grade the course must be included in the description or syllabus.

From the list of requirements lower down on the form:
A detailed project description and/or syllabus must accompany all Application for Individual Enrollment forms. The means by which the faculty supervisor will grade the course must be included in the description or syllabus.