Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting 11 and 18 April 2017

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 11 April 2017 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115). The meeting continued on Tuesday 18 April 2017 at 5:00 PM, same location.

Agenda

1. Call to Order 5:07 PM.
2. The minutes of the March 2017 regular meeting were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and Information: None
4. Reports
   a. Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney

The Speaker gave a brief report in order to complete the full agenda.

He thanked the Ad Hoc Committee on Hearing Procedures for their work, including Chair Roger Daniels, and committee members Claire Curtis, Susan Farrell, John Huddlestun, Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Conrad Festa, Carl Wise, and Angela Mulholland.

The Speaker said he would be leaving at 6:40 PM for a production of Rent which he was directing and would yield the floor to the Speaker Pro Tempore Larry Krasnoff.

The Speaker yielded the floor to President McConnell.

b. President Glenn McConnell

President McConnell delivered prepared remarks, a transcript of which, as delivered, is presented below.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon to all of you. It is a pleasure to be here with you.

I want to start out by thanking you for all you do for the College, for the students here. The time and energy you devote to our institution is helping us become a better and stronger university. So thank you for your passion, investment, talent, and commitment to the College of Charleston.

With that, today, I want to provide you with some updates on accreditation, potential state appropriations, and our vision for the College as we head toward our 250th anniversary in 2020.

As you all are well aware, the College has been involved in a 3-step process to have our accreditation reaffirmed by our accrediting agency SACSCOC.
The first step was to compose and provide a detailed narrative with evidential exhibits that explained we were in compliance with SACSCOC core and comprehensive requirements as well as a set of federal requirements.

All of you who worked on that, thank you so much for your efforts in trying to get that massive document and exhibits to SACSCOC.

The second step of the process took place at the end of March, which was an on-campus visit by members of the SACSCOC team. As I announced in my email to campus two weeks ago, the on-site visit went well, and we were told during the departure interview that the team had no recommendations to make to us. As such, their report to the SACSCOC Executive Committee will state that we are in compliance and our 10-year accreditation should be approved.

Therefore, we expect at the SACSCOC December meeting to have our accreditation voted on or reaffirmed. The December vote will be step 3 of the process. This significant accomplishment could not have been possible without the hard work across this campus. I know that there are people in this room that have been pressed and pushed along the way for everything that had to be done, but it looks like that it paid off real well. To get a report and not have a recommendation is really an accomplishment for the College of Charleston.

The College continues to plan and implement its QEP, “Sustainability Literacy as a Bridge to Addressing 21st-Century Problems.” Through our work, inside and outside the classroom, we will equip our students with the skills and knowledge to handle the problems related to sustainability that they will face in their lifetimes, such as rising sea levels, economic inequality, social injustice, air and water quality, and more.

We will be infusing sustainability literacy into our curriculum and also into our decision making at the College. From ensuring any renovations or new buildings we construct are environmentally friendly to looking at the types of products we are buying to our financials, the College is committing to being a more sustainable university. We will talk the talk and we will walk the walk.

Now, let me talk budgets – everyone’s favorite topic. South Carolina’s General Assembly is currently working through its budgetary process in Columbia.

The College as well as all the public universities in the state submitted budget requests to the General Assembly earlier this year. In February and March, I traveled to Columbia to present in front of the House and Senate budget committees our proposals and requests.

Depending on which side of the General Assembly you look at, the tea leaves read a little differently. For example, as it now stands, it appears that no higher education institution will be receiving additional monies to their operational budgets in the House of Representatives version of the bill. On the Senate side, each College would get a percentage increase in their operational line, which is about $500,000 for the College.
It is likely the House and Senate will pass a 2 percent mandated increase in the employer contribution to employees’ state retirement, but only fund about 50 percent of that for the states’ college and universities. That would result in unfunded costs to the College of Charleston to the tune of approximately $900,000. Incidentally, the Insurance Reserve Fund where we must buy our property insurance has announced they may go up 30 percent on rates, which would cost the College of Charleston about $200,000.

Taken together, the potential $500,000 increase in operating revenue we would receive from the Senate will be quickly consumed by the mandated increased costs that will total $1.1 million.

Unfortunately, most of the new money in the state budget is tied up for repairs to damage caused by Hurricane Matthew last fall. So depending on what appropriations bill is passed and is signed into law, the College’s budget will nevertheless be tight.

That being said, there is some good news out of Columbia. The state is looking to pass a higher education bond bill. I think this will be the first bond bill in about 15 years. This bond bill will help with the renovation and repairs of facilities around South Carolina.

The House version of the bond bill has allocated 12 million dollars to the College of Charleston. $1.5 million is for the renovations of 58 George Street, on the corner of St. Philip and George. It's a historic structure on campus that housed our Rivers Communications Museum, which we had to close due to structural issues.

$10.5 million will go toward the renovation of the Silcox Physical Education and Health Center – a WPA-era building in desperate need of repairs and upgrading to support our growing public health program.

The bond bill will go to the Senate after it passes the House. We are working to keep the money for the College in the House version of the bond bill as well as we hope to pick up additional dollars when the bill gets to the Senate.

If you look at available revenue, it looks like the House didn't spend it all and left for the Senate to put its mark on the bond bill.

There's a good chance we can pick up an additional $8 million for the renovation of the Stern Student Center when the Senate considers the bond bill.

The old swimming pool wing has 19,000 square feet of space, we can recover and repurpose for meeting and student space for students.

If the bill is passed and signed into law later this spring, we would hope to begin these facilities projects toward the end of 2017 or in early 2018.

However, we also have other projects which need to be done such as the Simmons Center overhaul, the Learning Technology Center, other small buildings, and finishing the Sottile Theatre. There are other projects we have that we want to get funding for.
Construction continues on the Rita Hollings Science Center. I had meetings last week about the building and the progress being made. Construction crews have over a hundred people on site daily in an effort to finish the building on time this summer. I am rather confident, based on assurance I got, that the building will be ready for academic use this fall semester with us beginning to move in starting June 23, 2017.

Now, I would like to talk a few moments about the direction in which the College is heading.

I must admit up front that this is not just “my” vision for the College over the next four years per se, but a shared vision – one that represents the input and thoughts of campus administration and academic leaders.

In talking about this shared vision, I guess it’s only right to start at the very beginning and that means answering this question: What’s the need for a vision? Well, without vision, there is no direction, no charted areas for growth. Without vision, when the purse strings tighten and the purse bag lightens, there is no prioritization in allocating limited resources. Without vision, simply put, an institution floats rudderless.

Well, I can safely say we are not rudderless. In the College’s 2009 strategic plan, we outlined a destination for this institution: something we called greatness. I applaud all of the hard work that went into that plan – for it represents a lot of time, energy and thought.

We – everyone in this room, everyone on campus, every one of our graduates – we all want the College to be great – to maximize its power of place, to achieve academic excellence, to connect with the many assets of the Lowcountry.

This institution already has so many pockets of greatness. But we need to spread it across campus – to spark greatness in each and every discipline and program we teach.

I realized in talking with people that first, we really needed to agree on how we define this institution. There are as many different definitions of this place as there are people.

Hence, our somewhat collective identity crisis here on campus. And, to be perfectly honest, that is probably typical for an institution that covers so many different disciplines and caters to so wide an audience.

So who are we right now? Past administrations have tackled that question and articulated answers in different ways. And we stand here today, the benefactors of their hard work.

Now, we, as an institution, have taken an even greater sky view of the College, and we see our university as embodying all the concepts of the previous administrations, but also being something greater.

In fact, in my conversations with some academic leaders on campus, they pointed to us being “nationally ranked,” to the College being “grounded in the liberal arts” and they consistently
used the term “comprehensive.” For whatever reason, our institution has shied away from that last term – comprehensive.

It’s an academic term, I agree, but one that our campus must endorse because if you look at our offerings, look at our programs, look closely at what we do here – we are a comprehensive university – meaning we teach science, business, humanities and so much more. And that is a tremendous thing.

By being a comprehensive institution, we are not moving away from our liberal arts and sciences core, but it does mean that we are recognizing the importance of our professional programs, especially as it relates to student demand and local and regional employer needs – which speaks to our mission as a public university to serve South Carolina and its people.

So, let me share with you our shared definition of who we are: The College of Charleston is a nationally preeminent, comprehensive, public university deeply rooted in the liberal arts and sciences tradition, offering leading-edge programs in business, technology, education and languages and dedicated to its public mission of advancing the region’s economy, culture and future. The College empowers students, both undergraduate and graduate, to be engaged, ethical citizens and leaders in a global society.

That was the definition I gave the Board of Trustees. With that definition, I felt that, as an institution, we can move forward to the next step: identifying our number-one priority.

And in moving forward, one thing became obvious to me in my conversations about the College. Everyone agreed that this institution is at its best when we put our students’ needs at the forefront.

When we consider the student first, everything becomes clear. That applies to our academic offerings, to our extracurricular activities, and to our business decisions. How does this impact the student – is the one question we always come back to.

So, naturally, this shared vision is one that prioritizes the enrichment of our student experience. We, the faculty and staff, all know that our student experience is what makes the College truly distinctive.

And to take our student experience to even greater heights, we will take an approach that focuses our efforts on three overarching themes – the mind, body, and the spirit.

The life of the mind is the centerpiece of our student experience. The College’s faculty understand that knowledge is the best export of any society, and, together, they work to inspire and educate some of the country’s best and brightest students – with direct benefits to the city, the region and far beyond.

Over the next four years, we’ll focus on enhancing the life of the mind by investing in more innovative academic programming and coursework, incorporating the tenets of sustainability literacy with a special focus on digital and technology literacy across all of our disciplines and
committing even more support to the academic part of the College’s budget so that faculty have the resources they need to be exceptional teacher-scholars, mentors and partners in learning.

When referring to our second theme, the body, I mean the student body – its composition – as well as the physical campus.

Through the realization of our shared vision, the College will focus on improving quality and inclusion through these key areas: increasing enrollment of our graduate and undergraduate populations, expanding the School of Professional Studies to attract more adult learners, raising the SAT/ACT scores of our traditional freshman class, increasing the percentage and number of under-represented student populations (with special emphasis on African American and international students), improving retention rates, boosting four-year graduation rates, and prioritizing facilities projects that impact the student experience.

In regards to our last theme, spirit, I believe spirit is the X-factor for any university, a defining characteristic of its culture. It shows what values permeate the campus community, what kind of graduates a university produces. As such, spirit is more than just enthusiasm for the school.

At the College, spirit will speak to character and maturity. If cultivated properly, graduates are then ready for anything – ready for career, ready for further academic study, ready for a life of learning.

The College will foster this type of spirit by emphasizing the institution’s core values as well as focusing on these key areas: pushing for all students to participate in internships and/or professional experiences before they graduate, growing the number of students participating in a study-away experience, and increasing the number and appeal of activities on campus that reinforce our culture of intellectual inquiry and well-being.

Taken together, mind, body, and spirit will significantly elevate the student experience we provide to our students.

In turn, this will grow our national reputation as well as enable us to produce more world-class graduates who will become society’s next great CEO, public servant, artist, educator, scientist, social justice warrior, or change agent in a field that has yet to be created.

I have great confidence in what our future alumni can go on to achieve because I wholeheartedly believe in our exceptional faculty and all the members of our campus community who contribute to the personal and professional development of our students. As you heard a thousand times, it takes a village, and I think we – at the College – all do a remarkable job and play an important role in getting our students from the Cistern on the day of Convocation to crossing the Cistern on the day of Commencement.

I’ll close my remarks by saying this: For those of you in the room who are history buffs, you’ll appreciate the concept that the golden age was never the present age – that, in essence, we don’t recognize greatness while it’s in existence, only when looking backward through time with a sense of nostalgia.
Well, I disagree with that, because I feel that the College is well-positioned for a golden age right here and right now: Now is the time when we can provide world-class instruction in a world-class setting producing world-class minds.

By addressing the mind, body and spirit of this campus, we can and we will achieve something really special for our students and our greater College family. These three overarching themes – of mind, body and spirit – will be the markers of our greatness as we approach our 250th anniversary in 2020.

I hope you share my enthusiasm for the direction in which we are headed. The students are at the heart of everything we do. And with that, I’ll stop right here because if you’re like me, you believe that well done is better than well said.

Thank you for your time in allowing me to address you. I've tried to give these remarks and the Board has consistently asked me, where are we going over the next 5 years, what are the benchmarks, how do we measure it, how do we look at it? We've been looking at this for some time in the light of our strategic plan to make sure we have that roadway clear for them.

I'll be happy, Mr. Speaker, to take any questions.

---

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the 900 thousand dollar increase that the institution will have to cover for the retirement shortfall that the legislature is trying to sort out. He said that in his understanding from reading newspapers, that figure is just for next year and will continue to increase in future years. For employees, there will be ceiling, but for state agencies, like the College, this burden will continue. Nunan asked isn’t this just another unfunded mandate? And in that case, was there a contingency plan to deal with this ongoing additional financial burden on the College?

President McConnell replied that there is no basket of cash to pay for it. He said the shortfall will probably continue to occur for the next 4-5 years. He invited Paul Patrick to comment

**Paul Patrick**, Vice President for Administration and Planning, replied that the legislation that will likely get passed requires annual increases, not for the employee, but for the employer. Those increases are "a percent a year for five years." He explained if the system meets its assumed rate of return of seven and a quarter percent from investment earnings then the need for the additional contribution increase of the employer is diminished. Patrick said the likelihood of the system returning that assumed rate of return based on recent history is not guaranteed. Patrick offered that over the next five years there might be an increase on behalf of the employer's share to get us to 18 and a half percent. He said he thinks over the next few years, there will be a pension increase on the employer, not on the employee. The employee will max out after this round of increases.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked if there is a chance that the bond bill which is to be used for higher education will be used for roads instead?
President McConnell replied that as he understands it, there is an effort underway in the state Senate to move a new highway bill through. President McConnell offered some observations on the Department of Transportation and the highway system. He offered that it was a bad practice to take money from the general fund and use it to pay bonds for the road system. He said that is why there is a separate highway fund. He said that sales tax and corporate taxes were put into place for general core functions, not for roads and bridges. The President expressed that many people in the business community think we should have a bond bill and an infrastructure bill. He said the higher education bond bill would not raise the debt service in the annual appropriations bill. McConnell expressed that if an attempt is made to bail out the road system with the general fund, we have robbed the future of the state and particularly for education.

McConnell hoped the Senate will pass the revenue bill already passed by the House. McConnell used the expression, "burp in a whirlwind," to describe using the bond bill to fix the roads.

Gigova commented on hearing the vision for the College and expressed that it would be easier to be enthusiastic if there were some occasional pay raises. She mentioned performing additional duties for no increase in pay and the cost of living in the expensive Charleston area. She expressed the wish that the issue be part of McConnell's discussion with the Board of Trustees.

President McConnell said he shares that frustration and said after the budget reset and paying bills, we will have make smart decisions to create good opportunities. McConnell said he felt they made a good case for a million dollar increase in the operational budget. He plans on talking with the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee this week.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked if there were any consequences for people in optional retirement plans for the new unfunded mandate from the state on pension plans?

McConnell did not know of any consequences.

Kelly asked about the vision for the next four years and how that translates into decisions about where the College will spend money in a time of diminishing amounts of money available.

McConnell replied that monies would be used to take care of the academy. "where your money is is where your heart is." He stated we are here for the students, and for five years, a greater proportion of our budget will be migrated to the academy. He stated he is trying to keep administrative expenses down going forward. He said he recognized that adjunct pay needs to be increased.

Another area to invest in is attracting students to the College.

McConnell stated that resetting the budget last year, there was a disproportionate cut made to the President's office.

Betsy Baker, Senator (English) asked about plans to increase undergraduate student enrollment in light of the cap of 10,000 students.
McConnell said the cap is left from the College's historical footprint, but it is now expanded to Harborwalk and North Charleston. McConnell said the College needs to grow responsibly, while being able to still pay its bills.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked about McConnell's statement, “The College of Charleston is a national, pre-eminent, comprehensive public university deeply rooted in the liberal arts and sciences tradition offering leading edge programs in business, technology, education, and languages and dedicated to its public mission of advancing the region’s economy, culture, and future.”

Krasnoff wondered why those four areas were emphasized and if the statement was factual or aspirational?

McConnell stated that the areas represent the roots of the liberal arts and sciences tradition and the College is more than that now.

**Simon Lewis**, Guest, thanked President McConnell for the clear statement of the vision and for the acknowledgement that all is rooted in the liberal arts. Lewis pointed out that the statement given was very different from the one used by the College in the last ten years. Lewis pointed out a shift from a nationally pre-eminent liberal arts university to a nationally pre-eminent comprehensive university, rooted in the liberal arts. Lewis stated this is a significant difference and sounds like an afterthought. Lewis stated the primacy of the liberal arts tradition allows for clearer message when recruiting faculty and in convocation with Freshman students.

McConnell stated that when they started looking at the College from an aerial overview, taking into account Carnegie classification and the Masters programs, we are a comprehensive university, founded in the liberal arts and sciences. He used the example of the real estate major as a business course, but informed by liberal arts and sciences.

Lewis said the definition de-emphasizing liberal arts and sciences tradition was less inspiring for faculty.

McConnell said it is not the intent to back away from the liberal arts and sciences tradition, but to define who we are. He said one of the great things about the College is a business student can also manage a stage production at the School of the Arts. The melding of disciplines is a great strength of the institution.

**Divya Bhati**, Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, wished to add to President McConnell's thanks and extended her heartfelt gratitude and thanks to all the faculty and staff who contributed to the reaffirmation effort for SACSCOC. She extended special thanks to the Deans for completion of compliance reports, and to administrators, staff, and to Provost McGee for spending countless hours editing, reviewing, and drafting. Special thanks to President McConnell for his leadership through the whole process, who also spent countless hours reading drafts, and making notes.
Bhati expressed the hope that this work will be ongoing, producing quality work we can all be proud of.

There was a hearty round of applause given.

There were no additional questions.

c. **Provost Brian McGee (pdf)**

Provost McGee recognized Speaker Todd McNerney for three years of service as Speaker of the Faculty and expressed his deep appreciation for his work. The Speaker enjoyed well-earned applause.

The Provost reflected on several items of good news: the wonderful work of the students, and spoke of the multiple awards, ceremonies, and receptions.

The Provost recognized the wonderful work of faculty and staff, and said he recently signed off on the certificates going to faculty award winners and is impressed by the amazing career work reflected by those colleagues.

He expressed the pleasure of reading through tenure and promotion packets, third year review, and other retention files and seeing the impressive work amassed over the years. The Provost said we are a wonderful institution not because our buildings are unusually pretty or we are dangerously close to the ocean, but because of the impressive work of the people.

He gave a report on tenure and promotion and recognized the rigor and work that go into these career milestones. He thanked all the colleagues who worked on departmental evaluation panel letters, the Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review, Deans who provide good and careful review of their faculty colleagues, and are a crucial part of the process of providing four independent recommendations to the President.

The Provost also recognized the good work of the Post Tenure Review Committee.

Provost McGee noted that getting a report back from SACSCOC with no recommendations is the best report in last 30 years. He said we are one of the longer accredited institutions in the southern region, and should be proud of that.

The Provost mentioned that some SACSCOC reports will mention some features of our governance structure and of our curriculum work that has been in place for years and we are proud of that as well.

The Provost said that the College has to be accredited to exist in the modern regulatory environment, but the most important thing from faculty perspective is do wonderful work in teaching, learning, service, and research, and our accreditation should be a good indication of our continued commitment to everything that makes that possible.
On policy development and implementation, the Provost spoke of the Trump presidency plans to deregulate federal government, the private sector, and presumably state government. In higher education, the federal government has been the driver of how we are regulated. It is too early to tell if there will be changes in the regulatory apparatus. The Provost spoke of the challenges to keep administrative costs down while producing information needed by regulatory bodies.

The Provost spoke over the coming months, work will be done on developing new 2 + 2 programs to help Trident Tech student matriculate at the College of Charleston.

He mentioned that the College will be working to clarify the Charleston Bridge Program.

The Provost said that work will be done creating a new comprehensive agreement on joint graduate programs with The Citadel.

The Provost mentioned on-going work on revising cross-registration agreements with other local public and private institutions.

The Provost said the work of maintaining policies and keeping compliant with state and federal regulations and giving clear information to all will continue.

The Provost shared that there will soon be a draft report produced by the Ad Hoc Committee on the graduate school’s organization and thanked the members and Chair of the committee Dean Fran Welch for their work. The Provost said he looks forward to reviewing the report with the Committee chair and discussing the report with the President as we look to the next phase of the development of the Graduate School. The Committee has made some interesting recommendations on the tighter integration of the research and Graduate Commissions.

The Provost said it is customary to work over the summer on revisions produced by Bylaws and FAM Committee. Some of those items are still under discussion and will be incorporated to probably appear in the 2019/2020 FAM.

The Provost commented on the agenda item concerning the report on the GenEd and Catalog Year Policy. The Provost thanked Joe Kelly, Julia Eichelberger, and Lynne Ford for work done on the question, in order to create clarity on how the catalog year works for General Education.

The Provost mentioned many other reports that will probably be heard in the Fall.

The Provost said that the Deans and other academic leaders have been in discussion with the Faculty Budget Committee about the development of next year's budget and thanked all the members for good work done there.

The Provost accepted questions.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large HSS) asked for an update on student enrollment.
The Provost said that application numbers are strong, and they have had a series of "yield" events, which are held in hopes of convincing accepted students to attend.

The Provost stated it's too early to determine what retention numbers will be from this year for our continuing students. He said for newly enrolled students, which can be broken into multiple student populations, we are ahead of expectations for the Charleston Bridge program, the iCharleston International bridge program is where they expected it to be at this time, the Honors College and regular admission student numbers are slightly behind where they had hoped. When asked, peer institutions report they are seeing the same trend of students waiting later to make final decisions.

The Provost said that the College is adapting to changing behavior of prospective students.

There were no further questions.

d. **Lynn Cherry, Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources (PPT).**

Dr. Cherry introduced Curriculog, the new electronic curriculum process. Curriculog will be implemented in Fall 2017.

The benefits of using Curriculog are many, including no more paper forms. The electronic forms will be easier to track and see where a proposal is in the approval or signing stages. It is a more transparent system. All can see where the curriculum proposals are in the approval process.

The format of the forms will be the same, and the approval process will follow the same path as the current paper system.

Since Curriculog will be accessed through MyCharleston, anyone involved with a proposal can log on and see it, including the people responsible for signing.

Cherry said that the system is accessible from off-campus, as well.

Acculog, the current catalog system, and Curriculog are from the same parent company and work together seamlessly, allowing you to get information from the draft catalog of programs and courses newly approved.

Cherry said that Curriculog will not autofill form boxes; that people still need to do the work of filling out all the correct information.

Training sessions will be offered in Spring 2017. Cherry has already offered overview sessions for Faculty Curriculum Committee, and the Graduate, Continuing Education, and Special Education Committee.

This summer, training sessions will be offered for Chairs and Program Directors.
Cherry said beginning in August 2017, they will begin offering training sessions for faculty.

Throughout the Fall 2017 semester, there will be several workshops offered where you can work with your actual proposal.

Cherry mentioned Megan Gould is the administrator of the system. There will also be some tutorials available.

Cherry thanked those who started the process of adopting Curriculog, including Conseula Francis (former Associate Provost) and Mary Bergstrom (Registrar). Mary Bergstrom, Franklin Czwazka, and Jerry Mackeldon continued to shepherd the implementation after Conseula's untimely death.

Any questions about Curriculog may be directed to Lynn Cherry or Megan Gould.

There were no questions.


Professor Fragile gave a Committee report on recommended changes to the FAM concerning the PTR process. Fragile said the recommendations arose from areas the Committee questioned and did not find clarified in the FAM. Those questions are:

1. When can a candidate seek a Superior rating? Must they wait 6 years after their previous review? For example, if a candidate received a Satisfactory rating one year, must they wait 6 years to pursue a Superior rating?

2. What is the purpose of a deferral? Is it to avoid getting an Unsatisfactory rating? Is it to preserve eligibility to seek a Superior rating? If a candidate doesn't have to wait 6 years to seek a Superior after a Satisfactory, then is there any reason to grant them a deferral?

3. What time period should be considered for a Superior rating? The time since the last PTR? Always 6 years? The cumulative time since the last Superior?

As described by Fragile, although asked to approve the requests, the Committee felt they didn't understand the purpose of the request to defer.

The committee found that as a result of changes made a few years ago to the Post Tenure Review process, the faculty member can get a satisfactory review as default.

No packet is submitted, and most work is completed by the Chair.

The Committee felt the faculty member may choose to defer the satisfactory rating for two reasons: to avoid an unsatisfactory rating, and if it was necessary to preserve eligibility to go up for a superior rating.
Fragile said the Committee then questioned when a faculty member can request a superior rating?

He expressed areas that the committee felt needed clarification are in the area of faculty requesting deferrals and when is a faculty member eligible for a superior rating?

The recommendation from the committee is that faculty can go for superior rating at their convenience, within existing time frames. They also recommended that it be stated in the FAM very clearly that faculty have some sort of review every six years.

There were several questions.

**Jon Hakkila**, Guest, asked if this means that a superior rating resets the clock?

Fragile affirmed.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator (at-large, SSM) pointed out that if the recommendation is adopted, it eliminates the positive reason for deferral (to preserve eligibility to go up for a superior rating) and asked if the committee recommends eliminating deferral?

Fragile said that the case of a faculty member approaching retirement, it might be efficient to defer that person, but other than this there is no reason for deferrals and that should be clarified in the FAM.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large, HSS) pointed out a small detail that needed correcting. Fragile amended the report [amended pdf linked above].

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) asked for clarification on when faculty go up for superior rating, is there base salary adjustment?

Fragile said yes. DeLaurell next asked if faculty get a satisfactory rating, is there any salary adjustment. Fragile said no.

Fragile said that going up for some kind of rating every six years is in the FAM, but the Committee would like that clarified.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker**, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, added that the intention of the post tenure review changes made three or four years ago were to clarify that faculty could go up for superior without waiting six years from their last superior rating, but it was buried in an appeals section of the FAM, resulting in ambiguity. The PTR Committee appropriately identified the areas needed clarification.

DeLaurell asked if it’s possible to get a satisfactory rating, then it's possible to get an unsatisfactory rating and what are the consequences of an unsatisfactory rating?
Fragile said that is spelled out in the FAM, basically that the faculty member and the Chair design a remediation plan, approved by higher levels and committee, which then triggers follow up.

DeLaurell asked how that affected review every six years? Could you be in remediation for two years?

Caveny-Noecker answered that the remediation is put into place, and the next year, a review takes place, and the PTR Committee determines if the faculty member has met the objectives of the remediation plan. If the faculty member has not, it triggers more serious intervention.

Fragile asked when would that person be eligible for superior rating?

Caveny-Noecker said the person would have to meet the remediation plan, or would not be eligible to remain at the College of Charleston. If after a year, the faculty member did not meet the objectives, that would trigger proceedings that would lead to termination. Caveny-Noecker said she presumes if a faculty member meets the terms of the remediation plan, then the six year cycle of review would continue.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) clarified that according to Fragile's slide, faculty at the rank of professor should be eligible to seek superior rating starting six years after their promotion and not more frequently than once every six years. He asked if that meant faculty may not achieve promotion more than once every six years?

Fragile clarified that the meaning should be faculty can't be awarded a promotion more than once every six years.

There were no more questions.

f. Roger Daniels, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Hearing Procedures, suggested changes to the FAM (pdf).

Professor Daniels offered a summary of the committee’s recommendations.

- Propose language to address conflicts of interest of participants in the hearing process. Motions containing suggested language is in the linked pdf.
- Authorize the Hearing Committee to determine if there is a conflict of interest.
- Prescribe for three year terms to serve on the Hearing Committee.
- Introduce language to expand the number of committee members to eleven. This will help if there is more than one hearing.
- Tighten up the timeframe, so that faculty would not have unresolved hearings over the summer. The Committee added language reducing the number of days for filing a hearing grievance from 20 to 15.
- Introduce proposed language to change from 5 days to 10 days where the committee must meet to discuss whether a hearing will be conducted. The committee will then have 15 working days for which to schedule a hearing.
• There was reintroduction of language that was inadvertently omitted from the FAM on post-hearing procedures.
• New language will require the committee report to the President a grievant within 15 working days.
• Recognize the central authority of the President who will give due consideration to the Committee's recommendation. The recommendation of the Faculty Hearing Committee is just a recommendation. It provides information for the President to make a decision.
• The President will state the reasons for a contrary decision regarding the Committee's recommendation. The Ad Hoc Committee would like to see open dialog if there is a decision contrary to the recommendations of the Hearing Committee, recognizing there will be limitations to what the President can say.

The ad hoc committee’s recommendations will go to the Committee on Bylaws and the FAM.

Daniels offered that this will begin a good conversation between administration and faculty on the Hearing Process.

There was discussion.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) gave comments regarding the overlapping of the faculty and administrative parts of the FAM.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker**, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs asked if Krasnoff's question concerned portions of the hearing procedures are contained in Faculty Bylaws, and portions are in the Administrative sections of the FAM?

Krasnoff noted that the report overlaps both sections.

Caveny-Noecker said that the constitution of the committee, the terms of the committee, are in Bylaws, and the process including the timeline and happens to the recommendation of the committee is in the Administrative portion of the FAM. Caveny-Noecker said that the part that is overlapping is in the definition of the committee and the role of the committee.

**Speaker McNerney** said recent practices call for any changes to the FAM, including the administrative part, to be brought before the Senate by the Committee on Bylaws and the FAM as notices of intent.

Krasnoff asked about the language concerning the Hearing Committee's determination of conflict of interest. Could the determination of conflict of interest be appealed to the Hearing Committee by the grievant or the President?

Krasnoff pointed out that the appeal is being made to the committee that is making the decision of conflict of interest. Is it a matter of asking for a re-hearing? Krasnoff said the appeal is not made to a second body.
Daniels said that once the Committee has determined that there is a conflict of interest, that information may be of use to the President as they consider if that testimony is valuable. The President may have a different view of conflict of the interest than the faculty member.

Daniels said the conflict of interest motion was the most controversial to the Ad Hoc Committee and legal issues were brought up on which he did not elaborate. He said the committee could address a potential conflict of interest somewhat informally.

Krasnoff agreed with the idea and said the Hearing Committee should be able to run a hearing according to their rules and said he wanted to make sure he understood. He said the appeal is asking for a re-airing of the issues before the committee and stated that usually an appeal [of conflict of interest] is made to a different body. He said he was not criticizing, but seeking clarification that the Hearing Committee makes a decision, then other parties (the President) can say, I want you to talk about it again.

Daniels said the thinking of the Ad Hoc Committee was that the President might not agree there is a conflict of interest, and could make that determination. The Hearing Committee may make recommendations about the merits of the case.

Krasnoff asked about the recommendation that faculty serve on the Hearing Committee for three consecutive years in light of this year's change to the Bylaws allowing faculty to serve up to five years on a committee. He asked if the Ad Hoc Committee would allow five years, or mandate for three?

Daniels said that their intent was to assure continuity and consistently, and can't imagine that anyone would want to serve on Hearing for five years.

Speaker McNerney had to leave at this point to direct a CofC theatre production of Rent and remanded the floor to Speaker Pro Tempore Larry Krasnoff.

**Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff** asked for other questions or concerns.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) expressed that including timeframes was commendable. She mentioned that the language in Motion 1 bars any attorneys, and that some faculty are attorneys.

Daniels expressed that he would need to defer to College of Charleston legal counsel on the question, but he would assume a faculty member would not give up their rights; a grievant would represent themselves not as an attorney, but as a faculty member persuading their colleagues that they have been wronged. The motion is designed to prevent people from "lawyering up."

DeLaurell suggested modifying the language to exempt current roster faculty.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker** contributed that the language specifies only that the College's representative is not an attorney.
De Laurell asked if the College's representative is the Provost, what happens if the Provost is also an attorney?

Caveny-Noecker said the language is open for conversation.

De Laurell suggested that the language may need to be adjusted.

Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff reminded the Senators that this is a report, and there is a process whereby the suggestions may be introduced as motions and amended.

Daniels suggested that Bylaws may want to adjust the language based on suggestions.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) seconded Caveny-Noecker's points about the legal representation language, and said it was to protect the grievant from someone who possessed legal training gaining an advantage. Someone who is an attorney cannot serve as the College's representative. Nunan pointed out that attorney Andy Abrams served as Provost in past years, and designated the Dean from the School of the grievant as his substitute. Nunan said since the condition applies only to the College's representative, he is not sure there is a problem, but he is serving on the Bylaws Committee in 2017-18 and will welcome questions.

Nunan questioned Daniels on the conflict of interest. He said Motion 1 specified the person should not have conflict of interest in the proceeding and Motion 2 gave authority to the Hearing Committee to determine whether there are conflicts of interest among participants. Nunan said he is not sure what the Hearing Committee does with Motion 2, as witnesses would possibly have a conflict of interest.

Nunan pointed out the overlap in the two motions. He said the Hearing Committee could rule in Motion 2 that the Provost, for example, has a conflict of interest to serve as College representative because the Provost was involved in the decision-making that led to the hearing in the first place. So the Provost, in that example, would have a conflict of interest because the outcome of the hearing would affirm their decision. The conflict of interest would apply to the Dean in the relevant school, the department chair or panel members that sat in judgement of the grievant, if this was a T & P case. Nunan offered the opinion that the language should probably state that none of those people should serve as College representative ever. He said if we stop short of that, can the Hearing Committee simply decree that the Provost, Dean, Department Chair or others involved should not serve?

Daniels said that the language in the motions is designed to apply to any of those conditions described. He said the intent of this is to keep the outcome from being contaminated by those who may have a conflict of interest.

Nunan asked if the Ad Hoc Committee is advising future Hearing Committee chairs to routinely exclude the Provost and the Department Chair?

Daniels said no, the Ad Hoc Committee was not advising that.
Nunan said they all have a conflict of interest, and used the analogy that we don't put policemen in charge of making decisions about the people they have arrested, for a reason.

Daniels said he understood, but asked if that meant the case would be farmed out to someone outside the institution?

Nunan replied that no, the hearing "would be farmed out to someone who was not in that chain of decision-making." He provided an example: Provost McGee could appoint Deanna Caveny-Noecker to represent him on behalf of the College at the Hearing. Caveny-Noecker would not be in the line of decision-making that led to that grievance in the first place.

Daniels said that it's possible she could have conflict of interest through transitivity, to which Nunan replied that life is not perfect.

Nunan said direct conflicts of interest, at least, should be avoided.

Daniels reminded Senators that the process is not jurisprudence, but is a forum for hearing a grievance from a colleague. He asked how you avoid a conflict of interest from a Provost.

Nunan replied, "By not having the Provost serve in that capacity" [as College representative].

Nunan brought up the point for clarity.

Daniels said the conversation has been moved further along towards recognizing possible conflicts of interest which contaminate the outcome.

Nunan asked if the intent of the Ad Hoc Committee was not to assign a Hearing Committee Chair the authority to say, the Provost cannot serve because the Provost was involved in the decision-making and that's reason enough to exclude the Provost. Nunan elaborated that he was asking for clarification as to whether assigning that general authority was not [emphasis added] the intent of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Daniels agreed that was not the Ad Hoc Committee's intent.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker was asked to contribute as another member of the ad hoc committee. She agreed that it was not the committee's intent to suggest that the Provost by virtue of making a decision always has a conflict of interest in a hearing and can never be the College's representative. The intent discussed a lot in the Ad Hoc Committee was to reflect and acknowledge the possibility that the person representing the College could have a conflict of interest. Caveny-Noecker expressed the committee's sentiment, as she understood it, to present motion 1 and motion 2 separately because there was agreement that there was a need to acknowledge that someone serving as the College's representative could have a conflict of interest.

Caveny-Noecker explained that there was not consensus in the committee about the appropriate ways of addressing a possible conflict.
Jason Vance, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked for an example where the College's representative did have a conflict of interest. Would this be a case where that representative is also serving as a witness?

Daniels replied that the committee very deliberately did not consider past grievances. Daniels mentioned that, for example, a Provost could be married to a grievant, in which case they would need to exclude themselves from the process.

Provost McGee said that would be a good example.

Daniels said that if a grievant had a formerly settled grievance against a member of the Hearing Committee, that could be a conflict of interest.

Vance said if, for example, a grievant has named the College representative as the source of the grievance.

Daniels said that would be something that the Hearing Committee would have to consider, and the facts and circumstances of each case would be unique. Daniels said the Committee members would have to have some dialogue.

Vance replied he was asking for clarification, following a point made by Nunan. He asked what types of scale did the Ad Hoc Committee identify or were the possible conflicts of interest ambiguous?

Daniels replied the discussions were not ambiguous and did not wish to discuss conversations the committee had, since he viewed that as a breach of trust.

Simon Lewis, Guest, was curious about the process in setting up two ad hoc committees to look into Grievance and Hearing Committees, which worked in parallel fashion and submitted reports and potentially motions for the Bylaws Committee. He wondered if there is any way the Senate can mesh those two responses. As an example, Lewis stated that the Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance came up with a suggestion for two years of service on that committee and that the Ad Hoc Committee on Hearing suggested three years of service.

Daniels stated that he thinks there were compelling reasons why Grievance and Hearing are separate, and said that Hearing Committee deals more with academic freedom issues and denial of tenure and promotion, and those things are different than what Grievance does, which is a little more undefined.

Daniels said there could be discussion in the future about combining the committees, but the Ad Hoc Committee on Hearing Processes, which he chaired, did not look at that issue.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked about the reports, and suggested that since there will be no adjustment to the FAM until the 2018-2019 edition (affirmed by Provost McGee) and since Bylaws will bring the issues to a new Senate in Fall 2017, that debate be taken up at that time.
Kelly thanked the ad hoc committees for their hard work, and suggested that there was not much more business to be done by this Senate body.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker** said in the interest of shared governance, if there is substantive feedback that people wish to make, give it to the chair of the Bylaws Committee for 2017-18, or to Roger Daniels, or herself, so that feedback on the ad hoc committee's report is not lost.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) expressed that this is a useful occasion to have the conversation and begin the discussion, as it becomes recorded in the minutes. People who look at the minutes might have suggestions that emerge as a result of reading the conversation. The Bylaws Committee of next year may be guessing about what Faculty Senate may think about a lot if these issues, so he thought it was worth spending time on.

Daniels said he is happy to continue answering questions, and he thinks this is important.

Nunan asked about the 15 working days versus 20 for a grievant to file a complaint. He wanted to know the thinking behind the suggestion to change, in light of the hardship a grievant faced when realizing they would no longer have a job, in the case of a tenure decision. In light of all that has to be done at the end of the semester, it seems shortening the days they can file a grievance represents hardship.

Daniels replied that the committee thought that by shortening the time frame, cases could be resolved before the summer, when committee members, witnesses, and grievants are no longer under contract. He offered the opinion that five extra days would not help the grievant, but prolong the agony.

Nunan said that erring on the side of the grievant is preferable to erring on the side of the convenience of the institution or committee, and people who are willing to serve on the Hearing Committee should be willing to work into the summer.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) said that the 15 days does not operate for the convenience of the committee and expressed the opinion that what the grievant wants is a resolution, and the more you allow resolution to not take place, the more difficult it will be for the grievant. She noted keeping a schedule that will get a decision out quickly will allow the grievant to progress to the next legal step.

Nunan commented that the Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance made a report [in March] which included the suggestion that members of that committee receive mediation training. Although, as Nunan remarked, the Hearing Committee is very different, in that they deal in adversarial, legal matters, he thinks that those committee members need some form of legal training as well. He asked if the Ad Hoc Committee on Hearing discussed that?

Daniels said the committee discussed it and thought it was a good idea. He offered the opinion that everything committee members needed to know was included in the FAM.

Nunan dissented.
Daniels said the consensus of the committee was supportive for some sort of training.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker** said that the Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance suggested mediation training for both committees: Grievance and Hearing. She said that the Hearing Committee, based on its charge, does not have the authority to mediate.

Caveny-Noecker said that the Ad Hoc Committee discussed the need for training and that is one of the reasons the Committee pool was expanded to 11 committee members (to be able to hold two hearings in a year), and that is why the committee suggested Hearing Committee members serve three years (for continuity of experience). The Ad Hoc Committee discussed training through mentoring by former committee members, but did not formalize those recommendations.

Nunan summed up that the Ad Hoc Committee then was not opposed to training?

Daniels said they were not opposed, just unclear about what kind of training and who would conduct the training (legal training provided by the College of Charleston counsel would be a conflict of interest, for example).

**Roxane DeLaurell** said that overtraining committee members may lead to less fact-finding, and fact-finding is really their charge. She said listening and using basic sense are essential to the faculty members on the Hearing Committee, and that might be compromised by legal training.

Nunan wished to make a point on the grievant's ability to make a request for a public hearing. He asked if the current weak language in the FAM was addressed in any way by the Ad Hoc Committee?

Daniels said the Ad Hoc Committee did not address that language and thought the language in the FAM, giving the grievant the right to request a public hearing was clear.

**Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff** asked a question of Parliamentarian George Pothering on procedure. He wondered if reports could actually contain motions. Wouldn't motions be more appropriate as new business?

**George Pothering**, Parliamentarian, said that motions could be made with reports.

**Quinn Burke, Chair, Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid Committee** (FCAS).

**Professor Burke** presented the Grade Redemption policy in March 2017 to the Senate. He incorporated feedback from the Senate and is waiting on the input of many campus groups (Athletics, Financial Aid, Scholarships) that need to study the proposal more carefully. In order to give groups enough time to study, he wanted to guarantee that the new committee members of FCAS would make it a priority to present the Grade Redemption policy to the Senate in September 2017. Burke also believed a charge from the Senate would ensure timely feedback from the different groups.
Burke presented the Motion: The Faculty Senate charges the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions & Financial Aid (FCAS) to present a final Grade Redemption Policy for the Senate’s consideration and vote at the September 2017 Faculty Senate meeting. (doc)

There was discussion on the motion.

Susan Kattwinkel, Senator (Theatre) had a question on timing since the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid (FCAS) would not meet over the summer and wondered if the committee would have enough time to work on the wording for September.

Burke said FCAS would convene over the summer and they would be able to get the wording together.

Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff asked for the vote.

The motion carried.

h. Jason Vance, Chair, Committee on Bylaws and the FAM brought a report (doc) and a motion (doc) on a Proposed Motion to Change the Order of Senate Business.

Vance gave a brief history of the motion, stemming from the March meeting where Senator Meg Cormack proposed endorsing the Senate meeting end time of 7:00 PM.

Discussion at that meeting, as reported by Vance, reflected the need to keep the option open to extend business past 7:00, and proposed changing the Bylaws to flip the order of business in the agenda, in order to move reports to later in the agenda and curriculum first.

Vance reported that he met with Parliamentarian George Pothering and the Bylaws and FAM Committee on the issues. Vance confirmed that there are already provisions in the Bylaws that allow the Speaker of the Faculty to modify the order of the agenda, and any Senator can call for a change in agenda order, if there is a concern that important business, such as curriculum proposals, be addressed in the first part of the Senate meeting.

Vance also confirmed that reports may contain motions, according to the Parliamentarian and Robert's Rules. He suggested that a Curriculum Committee report could contain a motion to change the order of business in that meeting’s agenda, in order to address curriculum matters.

Vance reported that discussion in the Bylaws and FAM Committee meeting reflected that the reports contain valuable information that needs to be disseminated in our departments. Shared governance might suffer if reports are moved to the end of the meeting, where Senators are tired, and a quorum may not be maintained.

Vance shared an interesting graphic in his report (doc) on Faculty Senate attendance, and calls for a quorum. While business being stopped for a lack of quorum occurs rarely, people may
perceive that meetings are emptying early due to fewer Senators in attendance at Senate meetings later in the year, and guests leaving early after their reports are given or their courses are proposed.

Vance suggested that changing the order of business will not address apathy.

Vance said the Bylaws and FAM Committee recognized the need to address Senate business in a timely manner, but found that the proposed motion to change the order of business would not address the root of the problem, and may have a negative impact on transmitting information from reports to our colleagues. Since there are already mechanisms to change the order of business, the Committee could not endorse the motion.

Vance on behalf of the Committee suggested that the Speaker of the Faculty, at the start of Senate meetings, could ask if there are any objections to the agenda as presented. This could be offered as a reminder that Senators have the privilege to make a motion to change the agenda.

Vance then presented the motion (doc).

The Speaker Pro Tempore called for discussion on the motion.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) gave Jason Vance an A for his excellent report. DeLaurell brought up the possibility that moving agenda items around on the day of the meeting could be discourteous to the Guests present to make their reports. DeLaurell disagreed that voting for the motion would be abdicating faculty governance, but on the contrary would move faculty governance to the forefront, as is proper for the importance curriculum has. DeLaurell maintained that a vote for curricular matters at the end of a long Senate meeting when people are anxious to get home means that too little attention and discussion is paid to curriculum. DeLaurell said that changing the order of business could be more respectful to those giving reports, as they would know when to show up and would not have to experience the possibility that their information is not presented.

Vance said that the Bylaws and FAM Committee discussed this, and gave another possibility--since we know when curriculum will be heavy at Senate meetings (February and October), Senators may use a majority vote to change the agenda order on those meetings.

Gayle Goudy, Guest (Chair of Curriculum Committee) suggested the Senate could designate three meetings a years to feature Curriculum Committee items.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) spoke in favor of defeating the motion.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) offered the observation that changing the Bylaws to amend the order of business would not solve the problem, as going later than 7:00 PM is a new problem. Kelly suggested that the Senate of 2017-18 look at how it deals with Curriculum. He suggested that the Faculty Senate does not need to look at new courses or changes to courses, but should be dealing with new programs, significant changes to programs, and larger issues. He urged Senators to vote against the motion.
Jon Hakkila, Guest, spoke of his experience several years ago as Chair of the Graduate Curriculum Committee. He said that Committee introduced a "consensus proposal," suggesting that both the Graduate Curriculum and Curriculum Committees present curricular changes that were not programmatic changes as consensus items, to be voted on in bulk unless someone had an issue with a particular item. Hakkila suggested that the Chairs of the Committees reconsider that "block" approach.

Vance said he thought that was a great idea and made the point that as Robert's Rules defines it, committee reports can introduce motions and recommendations which may be presented for a vote.

Vance reminded the Senate that the Faculty Curriculum Committee could bring a recommendation of courses to approve, with the understanding that the Committee had vetted the courses thoroughly. He spoke of the concern others may have with voting on the whole battery of courses, without chance of discussing them individually.

Hakkila said there is an assumption that Faculty Senators are able to see a copy of the proposal, are able to review it in advance, and can make a note of any questions in advance of a Senate meeting.

Robert Westerfelhaus, Senator (at-large, HSS) said that regardless of the scheme used to look at committee reports, "we are not resolving the problem before us now, which is to have deliberation in a deliberative body that hasn't deliberated much this evening although we've already met for almost three hours." He said regardless of which of the described schemes for addressing curriculum we might adopt, it wouldn't matter in terms of shortening meetings or enabling us to expeditiously deal with business, as we haven't even begun to discuss curriculum yet.

Blake Stevens, Senator (at-large, School of the Arts) was curious about agenda item # 7 [Constituent's General Concerns]. Stevens said if Vance is sensitive to the critique that the Senate body is reactive, then always putting agenda item 7 at the end is confirming that, since it is a catch-all. Stevens stated that the meetings where he has been able to stay until 7:45 or 8:00, he finds the open-ended moment is often very productive and yet, it is still deferred to the end. Why is this?

Vance said the Bylaws and FAM committee focused on business and reports. He said that Stevens brings up a great point. Vance said sometimes constituent concerns often roll into things that are brought up at subsequent meetings.

Stevens suggested offered that if Senators are to think of their activities as being more proactive, we should consider moving agenda item #7. With fewer people at the end of the meeting, the opportunity for hearing constituent concerns is lost.

George Pothering, Parliamentarian, commented that constituent concerns is at the end because you don't know what's going to come up. He said at the end, if issues are raised, they can be
Brian McGee, Provost, said that this is a good discussion about how we do business together, and offered a motion to call the question.

The motion to call the question was seconded. The Speaker Pro Tempore asked for a vote and the motion carried.

The Speaker Pro Tempore called for a vote on the Proposed Motion to Change the Order of Senate Business. The motion was defeated.

Provost McGee moved that the Senate recess the April 11 meeting and convene again on Tuesday April 18 at 5:00.

The motion was not seconded.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) spoke in favor of the final report, which is relevant for advisors of current Study Abroad students, and will necessitate changes in Degree Works, and her team needs all the time they can get to rebuild those changes.

Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff asked Lynne Ford is this a report, and not a motion?

Lynne Ford affirmed that her report is a clarification for which she would like the Senate's endorsement.

Ford clarified that the report was necessitated by two prior actions taken by the Senate on how we will clarify General Education within the catalog year policy moving forward.

i. Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, Gen Ed and Catalog Year Policy clarification (doc).

Ford reminded Senators that in the November 2016 Faculty Senate meeting, Senators declined to pass a motion to adopt a new three year cycle of a fixed GenEd curriculum (called a "Freeze"). As a result, additions and deletions and requirement changes to the GenEd curriculum can be adopted by the Senate. Curriculum for General Education is based on catalog year and is addressed by the Catalog Year Policy adopted in 2012.

Ford read the Catalog Year Policy, “students must fulfill the general education and degree requirements, and must abide by the academic regulations in effect at the time of their matriculation at the College. Matriculation is defined as the first term of degree seeking enrollment or the first term of readmission at the College. This catalog year remains fixed during the time a student is continuously enrolled.”

Ford mentioned that a strict interpretation of this policy means that the 97 courses added to and the 3 deleted from GenEd at the March 2017 Senate meeting would only apply to the students
admitted to the College in 2017-18. Ford said many faculty want these courses to apply to all students.

Ford offered the clarifying proposal, three types of changes may be made to the GenEd curriculum: courses may be added, deleted and requirements may be changed.

She gave the examples of increasing or decreasing the number of hours in a distribution category (example of a requirement change, Natural Sciences might say instead of 8 hours in a single science, they can be in two separate sciences).

Ford said the 2015 catalog to 2017 is the foundational block. That is the curriculum that was frozen; that is the curriculum that was determined by the faculty using the approval criteria of student learning outcomes, assessment plans, the review and recertification of all the courses.

Moving forward, Ford asked Faculty Senate to consider the following summary of how the changes affect the catalog years.

- Any courses approved for addition to the list of approved GE courses will apply to CY 2015 and all subsequent catalog years.
- Any courses approved for deletion to the list of approved GE courses will apply to the next catalog year (e.g. 2017-18) and all subsequent catalog years, but not retroactively to previous CY years.
- Any change to a GE requirement will apply to the next catalog year (e.g. 2017-18) and all subsequent catalog years, but not retroactively to previous CY years.

Ford said these changes allow the curriculum to grow, but holds students harmless. She said the General Education Committee plans to bring a process to 2017-18 Senate suggesting ways to better manage the growing size of the GenEd curriculum without a freeze and with a cycle of regular review.

Meanwhile, Ford said the points listed above offer an interpretation of catalog year and our understanding of General Education within the catalog year will serve as a compromise. She said students will be allowed to make the best use of courses faculty have determined are appropriate for GenEd, but at the same time, ensuring that courses do not disappear from a student's program of study if a department decides to remove them from General Education.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) said he remembered this being part of discussion, and faculty members pointing out that adding courses retroactively was not harmful, but he did not remember if that was part of what the Senate voted on.

Ford said it is important for all to be clear, with a record of the minutes, so we can revisit the issues when it comes up in future years.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked for a point of clarification. He asked if a student came in prior to catalog year 2015, are they not affected by any of this?
Ford said yes, if a student came in prior to 2015, and they have had continuous enrollment, the old GenEd, which was nearly every course in the curriculum, is available to them.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) asked if students could elect to choose different catalogs.

Ford said not for General Education. When a student declares a major, they get a catalog year, and can move up, not back, but they can't move their GenEd catalog.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) thanked Lynne Ford for pulling together the clarification. He said the clarification makes GenEd consistent with what we already practice with majors, where if a department adds a course to a requirement in a major, any student can take that course to satisfy the requirement.

Kelly made a motion that the Senate resolve to approve the clarification.

Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff asked for unanimous consent to suspend the rules to allow Kelly to make the motion. The Senate gave unanimous consent.

The motion was made to endorse the clarification on Gen Ed and Catalog Year Policy. That motion was seconded.

Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff asked for discussion.

Brian McGee (Provost) commended Lynne Ford, Joe Kelly, and Julia Eichelberger for their work on the clarification. Provost McGee cautioned the faculty and the Senate on the complexity of the catalog scheme created by College of Charleston. He noted that the complex nature presents an ongoing training issue with the management of undergraduate and graduate curriculum.

Provost McGee summed up the scheme as we have a catalog year for General Education, potentially a different catalog year for the major, potentially another catalog year for a minor. He said with the adoption of this interpretation, we have an asymmetrical approach to the addition and deletion of General Education curricula on a student by student basis depending upon their entry into the institution on what is the default catalog year for GenEd plus modifications in some ways but not others.

Provost McGee said it is manageable, but it means that there is an ongoing challenge for training and we will have to remind colleagues who advise students part-time of the complex scheme we have adopted.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) added that Degree Works should become your advising source. Multiple catalogs might be useful to search for courses, but Degree Works will have the list based on catalog year.
Provost McGee said the average advisor of an undergraduate cannot advise if they are unable to stare at Degree Works at the same time as the student does.

Ford said this was primarily a situation in the Humanities as that is the greatest source of growth.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) said that this will deal with an absurd situation, and gave the example of two students in the same class; one gets Humanities credit and one does not get Humanities credit and both students want Humanities credit. He said difficulties in advising are far outweighed by solving this problem.

Ford said, in response to Mary Bergstrom's point, that the advisor has to go to Degree Works and perform an individual audit for the individual student to make certain that student knows what courses are available.

Roxane DeLaurell asked for clarification on why the Senate is asked to vote endorsing something that already exists.

Ford explained that when the GenEd curriculum was adjusted in 2015, the freeze was part of that. The freeze got lost in the business of adjusting GenEd. Ford wanted to be absolutely clear that the three part decision rule [reflected in the bullets above] is endorsed so next semester, when the GenEd committee brings proposals, the Senate can apply one of the three conditions to scribe the change into Degree Works and to apply to a student based on their catalog year.

Ford explained that the Senate's other option, with a negative vote, is to apply strict interpretation of the catalog year rules.

Speaker Pro Tempore Krasnoff clarified that the Senate is voting on expressing support for the clarification of the policy, as presented by Ford.

There was no further discussion.

Speaker Pro Tempore Larry Krasnoff asked for unanimous consent to endorse the clarification. That motion passed.

There was a motion to move unfinished business to April 18 at 5:00. That motion passed.

The April 11, 2017 Senate meeting adjourned at 7:58 PM.

--------------------------------------------------

Items Discussed and Actions Taken on 18 April 2017

Speaker McNerney called to order the continued Senate meeting at 5:05 PM.

McNerney gave a brief report and reminded Senators of the Board of Trustees meeting Thursday, and stated he will share the report he gave at the March Senate meeting on faculty
participation on evaluations and the President and Provost with the Board and will make a formal request for the Board to work with faculty leadership to develop an evaluation process and instrument.

Speaker McNerney reminded everyone that Board of Trustee meetings are open to the public and he encouraged Senators and interested others to attend. He said he has learned a great deal by attending the meetings.

McNerney informed the Senators that a report traditionally given by the Faculty Compensation Committee at the final Faculty Senate meeting is not yet ready and when completed will be shared by Speaker McNerney via email and placed in Senate archives.

Speaker McNerney recognized Provost Brian McGee who asked for unanimous consent to amend the agenda to include a resolution to award degrees (pdf) during May 2017. The agenda was amended, the resolution was introduced, and seconded. A vote was taken. The resolution to award degrees passed.

5. Old Business

None

6. New Business

Speaker McNerney introduced the first item of new business and explained the process. The Committee on Nominations and Elections will present slates for three standing committees and call for nominations from the floor for any of the three.

a. Tom Kunkle, Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections introduced the Slates and Election for the 2017-2018 Standing Senate Committees (doc).

Professor Kunkle explained that a new committee, voted into creation at the March 2017 Senate meeting [Adjunct Oversight Committee], would have to be filled in August or September 2017.

He introduced the slates for the three standing committees: Budget, Bylaws and FAM, Academic Planning. He called for additional nominations.

Jacob Steere-Williams, Senator (History) nominated Christophe Boucher (History) to Academic Planning.

Paper ballots were distributed to Senators. All Senators vote on standing Senate Committees.

The slate for Academic Planning was elected; Christophe Boucher, as write-in, was not elected.
Speaker McNerney gave the names of the four candidates he has received thus far for the Committee on Nominations and Elections. The Speaker will make call to campus to fill the slate for Nomination and Elections.

Tom Kunkle made a nomination (as a faculty member) of Jared Seay (Library).

b. **Shawn Morrison, Chair of the Committee on General Education** introduced Mathematics/Logic Alternative Coursework for General Education ([doc](#)).

Professor Morrison explained the GenEd Committee has identified student learning outcomes (SLO) for the new Mathematics/Logic Alternative Coursework. Any programs and courses proposed for GenEd will need to meet the student learning outcomes, identify a signature assignment, and describe how the SLOs are assessed.

Speaker McNerney asked for questions or discussion.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked for clarification that the courses need to match one student learning outcome, not both of them? She asked if this would make counting more complicated for the Registrar or the GenEd Committee?

Morrison said the GeEd committee will utilize a list similar to the list they use for Foreign Language Alternative where there are categories and once the student has taken one course in each of the categories, the registrar will know that the SLOs have been completed.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked if there was controversy or discussion about theory or abstract principles that were vague?

Jason Howell, Senator (at-large, SSM) spoke as a former GenEd Committee member and a member of the Mathematics department. He said the proposal was created with the approval of the both Math and Philosophy departments. In terms of the abstraction, any course considered for SLO2 will have to write a proposal, which will be vetted by the departments of Math and Philosophy.

Krasnoff asked if that was part of the proposal?

Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, said that the proposal specifies that representatives from Mathematics and Philosophy will be asked to sit with the GenEd Committee during the certification process.

There were no additional questions.

The Speaker called for a vote and the Senate voted in favor.

c. **Speaker McNerney introduced items on behalf of the Faculty Curriculum Committee.**
Chair Gayle Goudy was absent due to a family matter. Two ex-officio members of the Faculty Curriculum Committee were present. Faculty representing their department's proposals were also present.

Each item was introduced, open for discussion, then voted on.

There was short discussion about the proposed Portuguese minor [item xviii].

Alex Kasman asked about the future of the minor dependent on two faculty members.

Mark Del Mastro (Chair, Hispanic Studies) had no qualms as department chair and addressed the concerns satisfactorily.

All courses listed below were passed unanimously.

i.    Asian Studies (Jin): create an independent study course in Hindi. (ASST)

ii.   Archaeology (Newhard): change one of the options for its capstone experience. (ARCH)

iii.  Biology (Byrum, Pritchard): BIOL 381 internship has revised SLOs and is now graded rather than P/F. They have submitted it to AA for reconsideration. (BIOL)

iv.   Classics (Newhard): create 5 new courses, deactivate CLAS 221 and 222, change the title and/or description of 7 courses, while also restructuring the major and minor. (CLAS)

v.    Communication (Kopfman): convert COMM 380 from a "Studies in" to a "Special Topics" course (COMM)

vi.   Computer Science (Mountrouidou): create two new courses in computer security. (CSCI)

vii.  Elementary Education (Perkins): Reactivate EDEE 374 to allow the Elementary Education department to teach out existing students who require that course (correct an oversight from last year). (EDEE 327)

viii. Middle Grades Education (Veal): Delete EDEE 327 from their Middle Grades Program major. (EDEE 374)

ix.   English (Seaman): convert ten "Studies In" courses to "Special Topics" courses: ENGL 350, ENGL 360-366, ENGL 370, and ENGL 390 (ENGL)

x.    Environmental and Sustainability Studies (Welch): add more electives to the program. (ENSS)

xi.   Film Studies (Bruns): add several recently created courses to the list of options in their minor. (FMST)
xii. Geography (Long): create two new courses (GEOG 206 cross-listed with POLI 206 and GEOG 290) and add them to the minor. (GEOG)

xiii. Historic Preservation and Community Planning (Stiefel): change HPCP 290 a variable credit course (HPCP 290)

xiv. Historic Preservation and Community Planning (Gilmore): change description and renumber HPCP 280 to HPCP 306, create two new courses (HPCP 285 and HPCP 350, both formerly Special Topics), add more capstone courses to major, and add ARTH electives to HPCP major and minor. (HPCP major)

xv. Irish and Irish American Studies (Kelly): remove a restriction that students can count only six hours of IIAS 304 toward the minor. (IIAS)

xvi. Latin American and Caribbean Studies (Colomina-Garrigós): add seven courses (FYSE 125, LING 260, MUSC 234, HONS 381, SPAN 400, SPAN 401, SPAN 491) to their major and minor. (LACS)

xvii. Political Science (Curtis): create three new courses (one cross-listed with GEOG), rename POLI 310, renumber POLI 368, make corresponding changes to their major, and lastly add one of the new courses to the newly approved PLCY concentration (POLI)

xviii. Hispanic Studies (Del Mastro, Moreira, Moreira): New Portuguese Minor with three new courses, one deactivation, catalog description changes on six courses, and prerequisites changes on six courses. (PORT)

xix. Public Health (Sundstrom): revisions to the ethics courses in B.A. program. (PBHL BA)

xx. Public Health (Balinsky): create a new course (HEAL 470) and add it to their B.S. (PBHL BS)

xxi. Philosophy (Grantham): PHIL wants to reword the catalog description of the BA. They also want to restructure the minor to emphasize depth rather than breadth. (PHIL)

xxii. Psychology (Galuska): create new course (PSYCH 198) to formalize volunteer lab work experiences, create a new course (PSYC 330) and add to the BA, BS, and minor, and deactivate PSYC 355. (PSYC)

xxiii. Sociology (Burkett): change the description of SOCY 260. They also want to restructure their minor: making the core smaller (a choice of one of three 200-level classes, instead of requiring two specific 200-level classes), and making the elective portion broader (adding a requirement that the courses come from two different areas within Sociology). (SOCY)

xxiv. Supply Chain and Information Management (Shockley): add INFM 390 to the electives in their major (SCIM)
Theater (Appler): create a new concentration within their major, focused on academic study of theater, rather than performance and design. They also propose a new course that will be required within the concentration. (THTR)

Urban Studies (Keenan): add a new category in their minor, for sustainable urbanism (URST)

Women and Gender Studies (TBD): change major and minor: add LACS 310 as elective, and add WGST 400 as an alternative to WGST 401. (WGST)

d. Christine Finnan, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education introduced the following course changes and proposals.

Each item was introduced, open for discussion, then voted on. All course matters passed.

i. MED Languages - remove EDFS 704 from ESOL emphasis

   · LALE - REMOVE COURSE

ii. MAT Performing Arts - remove 1 hour of 2 hours of MUSE 601 from degree requirements for Choral concentration

   · EDPA - CHANGE TO DEGREE REQS

iii. MS Marine Biology - remove requirement for organismal elective course

   · MBIO - REMOVE REQ IN ELECTIVES

iv. MFA Creative Writing - add ENGL courses to electives - this proposal has 3 bookmarked sections

   · MFA - ADD ELECTIVES

v. MPA - delete PUBA 614, 615; new course PUBA 514 - this proposal has 3 bookmarked sections

   · MPA - DELETE COURSES, NEW COURSE

vi. Urban and Regional Planning Certificate - changes to certificate organization; add EVSS 549 and EVSS 605/PUBA634 to certificate - this proposal has 2 bookmarked sections

   · URBP CERT - ORG CHANGE, ADD COURSES
vii. MS Environmental Studies - delete EVSS 646; new course EVSS 611; change program to add and delete - *this proposal has 3 bookmarked sections*

- EVSS - NEW COURSE, DELETE COURSE

viii. MPA and MS Environmental Studies - new course PUBA 651/EVSS 651; permission to cross-list; add PUBA 651 to MPA - *this proposal has 5 bookmarked sections*

- MPA&EVSS - NEW COURSE, CROSS-LIST, ADD COURSE

ix. MPA and MS Environmental Studies Concurrent Program - delete EVSS 646 from degree requirements; add EVSS 611 and PUBA 651/EVSS 651 to degree requirements

- CONCUR.EVSS-MPA - ADD & DELETE COURSES

x. MAT Elementary Education - remove co-req for EDEE 690 and 695; change course titles for EDEE 614, 665, 695; change course descriptions for EDEE 665 and 695 - *this proposal has 4 bookmarked sections*

- EDEL - TITLE, CO-REQ, DESCRIP. CHANGES

xi. Teacher Education - new course TEDU 536

- TEDU - NEW COURSE

xii. MAT programs and MED Languages - add TEDU 536 to technology course options for all MAT programs and MED Languages - *this proposal has 6 bookmarked sections*

- MAT&LALE - ADD COURSE TO TECH REQS

xiii. MED Teaching, Learning, and Advocacy - add EDFS 685 to all concentrations; add MTLA 706 to Curriculum & Instruction concentration; remove MTLA 711 as required course in Diverse Learners concentration; remove MTLA 605 and 678 as required courses for New Literacies concentration; remove registration restrictions on EDFS 730, 731, 740, 741, 750, 751; remove EDFS 762, 763, 764, and MTLA 667 from New Literacies concentration; add MTLA 671 and 672 to New Literacies concentration - *this proposal has 7 bookmarked sections*

- MTLA - CONCENTRATION CHANGES

7. Constituent’s general concerns

There were none expressed.
Speaker Todd McNerney gave concluding remarks, and encouraged everyone to attend the Faculty Appreciation celebration.

Speaker McNerney thanked everyone for giving him the opportunity for the last three years to serve as Speaker. He spoke of his years of service as teaching him a great deal about the College of Charleston. He said one of the things he has always enjoyed about being a member of the academy is how it allows him to continually learn. He expressed that he looks forward to helping the next Speaker, Liz Jurisich.

The Speaker shared some of what he has learned, and mentioned the faculty's commitment to shared governance remains strong. He said a great many across campus regularly engage in the messy and sometimes difficult work of shared governance. He acknowledged that shared governance is a fragile thing. The faculty voice in shared governance requires constant and diligent work, and if we don't put forth the effort to maintain it, like anything else, it will erode.

The Speaker said if we the faculty do not accept the challenge of serving on committees, approved by the faculty, or of serving as a Senator, or if we devalue these efforts in our Tenure and Promotion panels and discussions, we may expect senior administrators not to value these efforts either.

Speaker McNerney shared that when he was a junior faculty member, he was encouraged to get involved after his first year in shared governance, and he believed this advice has proved valuable.

His time as Speaker has allowed him to learn about many things being done on campus that can be a source of pride. Working to further those efforts is a valuable use of anyone's time.

The Speaker reflected that The College and all of higher education is going to face challenges in the near future, and said that in looking over the archives of Senate minutes, he noticed that similar challenges occurred 30 years ago. McNerney surmised that those challenges may have always existed.

Speaker McNerney thinks how we choose to address those challenges is the question.

The Speaker said the last three years has reinvigorated his commitment to the faculty's role in navigating, adjusting, and finally finding means and methods to capitalize on those challenges.

He thanked the body once again.

The Speaker enjoyed well-deserved applause.

8. The Senate meeting for April 18, 2017 was adjourned at 5:56 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Jannette Finch,
Faculty Secretary