Minutes of the Faculty Senate regular meeting on Tuesday 14 March 2017.

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 14 March 2017 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

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

2. **The 14 February 2017 minutes (pdf) were approved as posted.**

3. **Announcements and Information.**

   None

4. **Reports**

**Speaker Todd McNerney**

Speaker McNerney thanked the members of Ad hoc Committee of Grievance Process.

The Speaker announced that Faculty Senate Budget Committee will be having an open meeting with the division heads of Academic Affairs, on April 10, 2-4:30, Location TBD (William Veal is Chair).

The Speaker shared the results of inquiries he made concerning faculty leadership at other institutions and if they are involved with about evaluations of the Provost and President. Ten schools were contacted and include other state institutions and our CAA conference affiliated schools. Of these ten schools, five of the schools have input into evaluation of the President. Eight out of the ten have input in the evaluation of the Provost. In the case of the schools that did not respond, Speaker McNerney researched their websites. In most instances, the system used was survey. The Speaker spoke of the course evaluations familiar to CofC faculty as being similar, in that we see the results, our immediate supervisor sees the results, and when we come up for Tenure or Promotion, a wider group of people sees the results. The results are not shared universally.

The same type of system is in place at Francis Marion. The results of the surveys are not seen by the faculty; they are taken into account by those charged with evaluating the President or Provost. Some universities share the results in report fashion with faculty leadership (their equivalent of the Senate).

Towson is part of the University system of Maryland. Their survey is similar to Francis Marion, but the speaker expressed that the questions are similar to ones we might like to adopt.

The Speaker expressed that he will share his report with the Board of Trustees, and he will make a formal request recommending the President and the Board adopt a process to collect faculty input in the evaluations of the President and Provost. Speaker McNerney advocated that the process be collaboratively determined.

The Speaker asked for questions.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked what is the timeline for sharing with the Board? Senator Krasnoff spoke in favor of a collaborative construction of the instrument, and if that does not happen, the Faculty can construct an instrument, collect data and give that to the Board of Trustees.

Speaker McNerney said he will ask for a formal response in advance of the April Board of Trustees meeting. Speaker McNerney said he perceives a willingness on the part of the Board to establish a working plan, either with current leadership, or with the next Faculty Speaker.

**Provost Brian McGee** declined to give a report (memo regarding the absence of a report), in consideration of the busy meeting agenda, but accepted and answered questions.

**Betsy Baker, Senator (English)** asked about the Bridge Program with Trident Technical College, and had questions about Trident Tech instructors teaching on the College of Charleston campus holding office hours outside of class.

Provost McGee said that as part of the Bridge program, there has been discussion about Trident developing and using a course that would be satisfactory to our English department as Trident's version of a four credit hour English 110 in addition to their two semester English sequence.

The Provost said that in conversation on the developing program, they have uncovered some cultural differences. Trident instructors do most of their interacting with students virtually and part of the ongoing discussion has included an emphasis on meeting student face to face in traditional office hours. In conversations with Trident, a leading source of transfer students to the College of Charleston, the Provost mentioned that we are learning more about their strengths as an institution.

Senator Baker followed up with asking if Trident instructors would be provided office space.

The Provost affirmed that they would.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked for a comment on Spring 2018 spring break, observing that spring break will be two weeks later we have seen previously.

Provost McGee said that as part of building the calendar, there is periodic review of the calendar. Questions were raised about if the model for the old calendar, about mid-point of the semester, was optimal or would other models work. Discussions with Academic Council, with Student Government Association (SGA), and with Graduate Student Association (GSA), revealed a range of opinions. The President opted for a later spring break consistent with the preference of
SGA. This model will be reviewed in ongoing fashion. In deciding on the later spring break, any academic disadvantage could not be identified.

Senator Krasnoff asked if this was an SGA initiative.

The Provost replied that the review stemmed from Academic Affairs, in conversation with the President, then to Academic Council. The question came up separately from SGA and GSA, so was not initiated by SGA.

There were no more questions.

**Divya Bhati, Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning** reminded the Senate of the SACSCOC onsite visit and thanked everyone for their time and support.

There were no questions.

Speaker McNerney introduced the next report and informed the Senate that some of the recommendations will go to the Bylaws Committee if there are suggestions for changes to Bylaws or the FAM, and suggestions will go to Academic Affairs if there are changes recommended for the administrative side of the FAM.

**Simon Lewis spoke on behalf of the Ad hoc Committee on Grievance Process** (doc). He praised Amy Rogers for chairing the Committee. Lewis said that the committee looked at a number of peer institutions for best practices.

Lewis stated that some recommendations are not significantly different from what is already being done, but there are at least two suggestions that have not be done before.

The first recommendation is the creation of a Faculty Assistance Pool, which would consist of people who had experience on Faculty Grievance or Faculty Hearing, offering a point of contact for people outside of the formal Grievance and Hearing process. Lewis stated that the Faculty Assistance Pool would have a limited role, more helpful for procedural questions than advisory.

Lewis stated that if the grievance was between faculty and staff, then the course of action is still advised: to go to the Ombudsman office or contact Human Resources.

The question of combining faculty Grievance and faculty hearing committees was raised. Lewis said that although combining committees would require less bodies to fill positions, it was still thought that keeping the committees separate was best. Lewis reminded the Senate that the Faculty Hearing Committee also has an ad hoc committee assigned to it, so that committee may have different results.

Lewis stated that a new recommendation is that all members of Faculty Hearing and Faculty Grievance and all alternates should receive mediation training. Receiving this kind of training will allow members of the committees to give better advice within the committee. The best time for providing training was offered as the beginning of the academic year.
Lewis demonstrated an outline of the flow of grievance process, available in the linked document.

Lewis restated that the two suggestions that are new are:

- the creation of a Faculty Assistance Pool;
- the suggestion that committee members and alternates receive mediation training.

The Speaker asked if there were questions.

**Jacob Steere-Williams, Senator (History)** asked if there was thought given to the numbers of members of the committees?

Lewis stated the numbers would remain as they are now.

**Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large, HSS)** offered the observation that the Hearing Committee's function was to deal with adversarial disputes between administration and someone who is facing being fired. Their function is to provide recommendations to the President who then takes action or not. Nunan offered that there is little mediation taking place on the Hearing Committee, while Grievance is all about mediation. Nunan did think that some sort of legal training would be useful, especially since the College's legal counsel is often involved.

Lewis said the ad hoc committee on Grievance would probably take Nunan's suggestions to provide appropriate training as a friendly amendment.

Senator Nunan asked about the people who will serve in the Faculty Assistance pool. He pointed out that there may be people interested in the Hearing process who have not served on the Hearing and Grievance Committees. Restricting membership to those who have experience on those committees might restrict the pool too much.

Lewis pointed out that the rationale behind the composition of the Faculty Assistance pool hinged on the fact that they will have received the suggested training.

Nunan mentioned that if a commitment would be made for training, then should faculty be asked to commit to serving for at least a couple of years?

Lewis said he would be in favor of requiring this.

**Kevin Keenan, Senator (Political Science)** asked about the about the clause that stated people could go directly to the grievance committee if they were not comfortable approaching their Dean or Chair.

Lewis affirmed that is part of the existing structure of the Grievance Committee.

The Speaker said that is part of the current Bylaws.
Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) asked what happened if the Faculty Grievance Committee decided not to hear a grievance?

Lewis said you would be able to take that out of the Committee structure.

Nunan replied that language from the FAM on page 25 indicates that "grievances unresolved by the grievance committee will be referred by the Committee chair to the appropriate authority."

Irina Gigova, Senator (at large, HSS) asked a question on behalf of a constituent. How many representatives will serve on the proposed Faculty Assistance pool? And is the pool to be a faculty standing committee or a more informal pool?

Lewis stated that their committee views it as an informal pool. He and the committee thought that at least three members so that there would be a range of experience.

Gigova next asked about current language in the FAM which talks about limits of time. Will the current timeline applied to hearing complaints stay in place?

Lewis said although his committee did not address the issue of the timeline, he thought current processes would stay the same.

Brian McGee, Provost, said that the processes vary depending on the nature of the grievance involved. The Provost gave some examples of grievances. Grievances other than those that are outside of more complex employment law, for example, involve an attempt at resolution using the chain of command with Chairs and Deans. In the cases where there is dissatisfaction between the faculty colleagues and their supervisors, the Grievance Committee would provide an attempt to resolve the grievance that is consistent with the existing FAM. If that process doesn't lead to a satisfactory result, the faculty colleague may make use of the ombudsman office. Once internal processes are exhausted, the colleague may choose to look outside the institution for resolution.

Lisa Covert, Senator (at-large HSS), brought a suggestion from a constituent to spell out what exactly is meant by mediation training, including how long the training will take. The training should be clearly defined so there is some uniformity of experience.

Lewis said at this stage, they are looking for agreement on the suggestions, and that those details may be worked out later.

The Speaker said the recommendations will be moved to the Committee on Bylaws and the FAM.

5. Old Business

Jason Vance, Chair of the Committee on Bylaws and the FAM introduced two motions:
· Motion to Split the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs into Two Committees: The Committee on Graduate Education and the Committee on Continuing Education (doc)

Vance presented a brief background provided by Committee on Graduate Education chair Christine Finnan, and offered as explanation the workload has grown past the composition of the current single committee.

Vance read a description of the duties of each of the committees and the composition of each committee.

The Speaker reminded the Senate that a motion coming from committee did not need a second, and asked for questions.

Jon Hakkila, Guest, pointed out that Continuing Education may refer to undergraduate not graduate education.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said that she is not sure there is a distinction between undergraduate and graduate levels in non credit courses. Non-credit is sufficient.

Hakkila agreed.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) commented on the composition of the committees. Although both have five members, the Graduate Committee will still probably have a heavier workload than Continuing ed.

Christine Finnan (Chair, Committee on Graduate Education) said she thought that five members was still enough to get the work done for Graduate Education.

The Speaker called for a vote and the Motion carried.

· Motion to Form a New Standing Senate Committee: Adjunct Oversight Committee (doc)

Vance gave a brief history of the Motion brought in Spring 2016 by Julia Eichelberger and Betsy Baker (English). Vance said the Committee will be a new standing committee called the Adjunct Oversight Committee. Currently, there is no committee dedicated to recommended practices and policies concerning adjuncts at the College. Given the importance at adjuncts, it is necessary for their concerns to be part of the shared governance structure. Vance described the composition of the committee and the duties.

Both motions were thoroughly discussed and after each discussion, a vote was called. Both motions passed with majority vote and will be posted for ratification by all faculty.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) said it was interesting to pull the committee membership from the other standing committees and said he could see that benefit when the
members could report back to their standing committees issues with adjuncts. He expressed worry that faculty from those committees are taking on additional burden.

Vance said there was discussion on possible overlap between the Adjunct Oversight Committee and the Advisory Committee to the President both composed of members of the standing committees, but felt the communication between the relevant committees was worth it. Vance offered that centralizing the reports function of the Adjunct Oversight committee may lessen the burden on existing committees.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked if the flow of membership go the other way: each member of the Adjunct Advisory Committee could be ad hoc members of the standing committees.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) noticed that some standing committees had adjunct representation. In the example of the Faculty Welfare Committee, would that adjunct also serve on the Adjunct Oversight Committee?

Speaker McNerney said the intent would be that no, the adjunct representative on the Adjunct Oversight Committee would be an additionally elected adjunct representative. It does bring one more adjunct voice into the shared governance system.

**Lisa Covert**, Senator (at-large HSS) asked about the composition of the committees and whose decision would it be to designate the members of the Adjunct Oversight Committee.

Vance said each committee would designate their representatives for Adjunct Oversight and the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Guest, said that committee members coming from the standing committees would be able to understand what the committees could do to address adjunct issues they see, whether it be a budget issue, welfare issue, or compensations issue. She said one of the major functions of the Adjunct Oversight Committee would be to act as clearinghouse for data concerning adjunct faculty, providing a single consistent source for information collecting and sharing.

Eichelberger said that what Krasnoff suggested would not be counter to the intent of the committee, but would it would be more practical for existing members of each standing committee assign members to Adjunct Oversight.

**Provost McGee** called attention to overlap of committees. For issues concerning the employment and working conditions of faculty, the Office of the Provost would feel compelled to share information specific to adjunct colleagues simultaneously to both committees: Faculty Welfare and Adjunct Oversight. The Provost said the overlap would have to be managed based on the intention of the Faculty.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) wondered at the practicality of getting people motivated to serve double duty. He mentioned more logistical concerns, including when in the Fall
semesters new committees first meet, and who is responsible for reminding committees they need to assign representatives to Adjunct Oversight.

**Speaker McNerney** said he assumes that future Speakers with the Faculty Secretariat would have the responsibility of determining who the members of the committees are.

Krasnoff said it does represent another burden for the Secretariat and the Speaker to make sure the committee is staffed and chaired, so that when the Fall starts, it is a committee.

Eichelberger said she does not see that the committee would be prevented from still doing important work and collecting information for reports even if it was convened in October.

**Irina Gigova, Senator** (at large, HSS) suggested that the duties of the standing committees include the new duty of assigning representatives to the Adjunct Oversight Committee.

**Bill Manaris, Senator** (Computer Science) suggested that it could happen the other way, that members are elected, but they sit on the standing committees.

Speaker McNerney said it could only be an option if someone makes an amendment to change the motion.

Vance and Speaker McNerney said that suggestion is in line with the one made by Senator Krasnoff.

**Tom Kunkle, Senator** (at-large, SSM) pointed out that the committee might be more invested in adjunct welfare if they self-selected onto the committee, instead of being appointed from standing committees.

**Alex Kasman, Senator** (at-large, SSM) pointed out that requiring members of the Adjunct Oversight Committee to attend all the meetings of the standing committees would be a waste of their time.

Kunkle said that sometimes it would be better to reduce the load on faculty already serving on standing committees by requiring four new members of the Adjunct Oversight Committee. He was not sure which method would be easier to fill.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest** (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) gave her perspective as someone who sits with Faculty Compensation, has been called to have conversations with Faculty Welfare Committee, and has worked with people on adjunct matters. Caveny-Noecker said that Faculty Welfare, Faculty Compensation, and Budget are complex committees, requiring that members learn a lot in order to be effective in a shared governance system. She said she appreciates and values the learning curves of serving on those committees and appreciates the reinforcement of members returning to those committees to serve more than a single year. Caveny-Noecker offered the belief that there is value in those members serving on the Adjunct Oversight Committee and offered that shared governance works well when there are
connections between committees that have overlapping responsibilities and likes the structure of having those relationships be within the composition of those committees.

**Emily Skinner, Senator** (Teacher Education) spoke from her perspective of serving on Faculty Welfare, and said much of their committee business did involve adjuncts. She said adopting this motion would formalize the process for connecting people who are working on similar issues. She offered the observation that the standing committees often had various subcommittees and someone invested in adjunct issues would volunteer to be the representative on the Adjunct Oversight Committee. She spoke in favor of a formal cross-committee structure.

The Speaker called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed.

The Speaker said both motions will be posted soon for ratification by all faculty.

**Senator Meg Cormack** (Religious Studies) made a Motion to Amend the Standing Rules ([doc](#)), requiring Faculty Senate to end at 7:00 PM. The Speaker explained as a standing rule change, the motion would not have to go to the Bylaws and FAM Committee.

The Speaker asked for discussion.

**Jason Vance, Senator** (at-large, SSM) mentioned changing the order of Senate business.

Speaker McNerney said that the order of business is part of the Bylaws, so a change would have to go through the Bylaws and FAM committee, if voted on by the Senate.

**Kevin Keenan, Senator** (Political Science) asked about calling for a quorum at 7:00.

The Speaker said that sometimes the Senate still has a quorum after 7:00, and at any point a Senator can call for a quorum, and at any point, a Senator can make a motion to adjourn.

**Betsy Baker, Senator** (English) pointed out that even if a motion is made to adjourn, sometimes the Senate votes for continuing business. Senator Baker said since mechanisms are in place to either adjourn or call for a quorum, then she is in favor of not changing the Standing Rules.

**Meg Cormack, Senator** (Religious Studies) averred that tired people do not make the best decisions, so having important business at the end of Senate meetings is not a good idea. Senator Cormack pointed out that tasks expand to fill available time, and used the example of the retooling of the Gen Ed curriculum several years ago, in which major business was done by 7:00 each meeting, because Senate members knew the 7:00 end of meeting would be honored.

Senator Keenan asked if it would be possible to automatically call for a quorum at 7:00?

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) advocated against forcing an automatic stop in favor of getting business done if it is the will of the Senate.
Christine Finnan, Guest, said flipping new business to the front of the agenda would make sense, because you don't need a quorum to listen to reports and make comments, but you need a quorum to conduct business.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) said at one time in the Senate's history, there have been those who call for adjourning at 7:00, and that any Senator has that option.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting/Legal Studies) liked the suggestion to flip new business to the beginning of the agenda, with reports appearing toward the end.

The Speaker called for a vote on the motion to amend the standing rules. The Motion did not pass.

Bill Manaris, Senator (Computer Science) made a comment on the wording of the motion.

A Motion from the floor was made by Senator Roxane DeLaurell for the Committee on Bylaws and the FAM to recommend amending the Bylaws to change the order of Faculty Senate Business, putting Business ahead of Reports. That Motion was seconded.

Jim Young, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if it was ever the case that a report introduced a piece of new business.

The Speaker said that was possible.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) said that there will be a chance to debate the issue when the motion is presented from the Bylaws Committee and called the question.

Calling the question was seconded, and passed.

The Motion to recommend amending the Bylaws to change the order of Faculty Senate Business, putting Business ahead of Reports was sent to Bylaws and the FAM Committee.

The Speaker called for a vote and the Motion passed.

The Speaker introduced the next piece of old business.

Quinn Burke, Chair of Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid Committee introduced the Proposal for Academic Forgiveness Policy, Student Government Association (original doc from February agenda)[Updated by FCAS, Grade Redemption Policy (pdf)].

Quinn Burke gave a brief history of working with SGA on the policy for over a year. Burke explained the Proposal was first designed as academic forgiveness by way of exclusion, and gave the example of a student getting a D in a course, then taking that course over and getting a C. The student would be able to strike the D off the record.
After much discussion in Committee and with different groups, the Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid Committee designed a policy of redemption.

Burke revealed the current policy and reminded the Senate that the policy is presented for information, not for a vote. The proposed Policy will be introduced for vote in April.

Burke said that the majority of our peer institutions have a forgiveness policy and the majority of those policies are ones of redemption (sometimes referred to as replacement or substitution).

Burke asked for feedback from the Senate which he will take to committee

Godfrey Gibbison, Guest (Dean of Professional Studies) asked if there was a maximum number of times a student could use the policy.

Burke gave an example of one attempt allowed to better a course grade, in order to prevent "grade shopping."

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked what was the logic of having a small limit on the number of credits. Basically two classes seemed like a small number.

Burke said it began with the exclusion policy but was continued in the redemption policy.

Kasman mentioned that there was paperwork involved in the redemption policy whereas the default policy does not have paperwork. If there was no limit mentioned, a student could take any course more than once, and count the second one.

Burke said he will have more conversation with the Registrar.

Mary Bergstrom, Guest (Registrar) stated that the repeat policy remains the same. Both redemption policy and repeat policies have paperwork associated.

Jacob Steere-Williams, Senator (History) asked about a sentence in which the option will not be allowed when a student is assigned a grade as a result of an honor code violation.

Burke said any student found in honor code violation should be not allowed.

Jon Hakkila, Guest, asked if this type of policy improved retention? He mentioned that every institution he has worked at had some sort of similar policy.

Beatriz Maldonado, Senator (at-large, LCWA) asked if a student could apply the policy to any grade? A through F? Have other institutions stipulated the grade? Burke said some other schools specify the grade would be D or below. Burke said that they felt the language should be clear that the student needed to me satisfied with the second grade earned.
Maldonado asked if this policy applied to the major GPA or will we see the averaging of the two classes in the overall GPA?

Mary Bergstrom, Guest (Registrar) said it would affect cumulative GPA, and therefore, would also affect the major GPA.

Speaker McNerney clarified that it is not an averaging of grades. The lower grade is completely erased. The grade would not appear, but the course would still be listed on the transcript as having been taken.

Mary Bergstrom, Guest (Registrar) said that the transcript key will need to change and the look of the transcript will change.

Bill Manaris, Senator (Computer Science) asked [unintelligible].

Godfrey Gibbison (Guest, Dean of Professional Studies) said that one of his last acts as a Senator while working at Georgia Southern was to get rid of a policy like this. He said he was comfortable allowing a limited number of repeats, but going beyond that is asking for trouble.

Burke said since an advisor will have to sign off on the requests each time, then that can act as a cap.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if the course repetition policy would still be in place.

Bergstrom said yes.

Jason Vance, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked about courses that are always filled being repeated and the burden this would place on teaching classes which are already in demand.

Burke mentioned the redemption issue is different for students who need to take a particular course. The exclusion issue was a problem for people on the committee.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) mentioned that Senators have given the committee a lot to think about, and we will have opportunity to debate the issue in April.

6. New Business

Gayle Goudy, Chair, Faculty Curriculum Committee introduced the following curriculum changes. All curriculum proposals were introduced for discussion separately, voted on, and approved by the Senate.

i. Business Administration (Mack): add six more elective hours to the major, in the form of upper-level courses. [BADM]
ii. Bachelor of Professional Studies (Gibbison): add PSYC 333 and PSYC 334 as BPS electives [BPS]

iii. Computer Science (van Delden): add new course (CSCI 381) [CSCI]

iv. Environmental and Sustainability Studies (Welch): Add existing courses (BIOL 211, MGMT 350, SCIM 371, URST 313, URST 361) to various requirements of the Environmental and Sustainability Studies minor [ENSS].

v. Geology (Callahan): terminate the Environmental Geology (EGEO) from the Geology BA degree and the Environmental Geosciences (EGEO) concentration from the Geology BS degree [GEOL]

vi. International Studies (Friedman): add the newly created MUSC 233 to its "Culture and Literature" options, and add MUSC 234 to the INLA electives [INTL]

vii. Marketing (Pitts): create a new course (MKTG 355 Marketing and Society) and add it to major and minor [MKTG 355]; create three new courses (INTB 309, MKTG 309, MKTG 315) [MKTG-INTL 309]; change the title and prerequisites on MKTG 425, make corresponding changes to the MKTG major and minor, and also make some other small changes in the major [MKTG major]

viii. Religious Studies (Siegler): create a new course (RELS 276), and add it as an elective in their BA and minor [RELS 276]

ix. Southern Studies Program (Eichelberger): add ENGL 361 to their electives [SOST]

x. Spanish (Del Mastro): change major by adding two new courses (SPAN 449 and SPAN 450); change minor by eliminating 6 credit hours from the fixed set of 300-level courses, add SPAN 381 as a required course, allow 3 credit hours to be satisfied with any SPAN 300 or 400-level elective, and add SPAN 449 and 450 to electives [SPAN]

Christine Finnan, Chair of Committee on Graduate Education introduced the following curriculum proposals. All Graduate Education curriculum proposals were discussed separately, voted on, and approved by the Senate.

Provost McGee asked about the CSIS courses and asked if the Citadel would simultaneously pursue certificate status for the same constellation of courses?

McGee asked if the courses described would be offered solely on College of Charleston campus, or would the courses rely on some Citadel faculty?
**Bill Manaris**, Senator (Computer Science) said the certificate was a stepping stone toward completing the Master degree.

Provost McGee asked if there had been any discussion about course management or seat allocation that might be affected by the addition of the certificate programs?

Manaris said the issue was raised and that they have available seats.

Finnan said she will contact Computer Science for answers to these questions.

Speaker McNerney asked if the courses needed to be pulled and sent back to committee.

Provost McGee said the questions need to be answered before the courses go before the Board of Trustees, but if it's the will of the Faculty Senate, the courses could proceed.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) asked how many hours is normal for a certificate.

Provost McGee replied that the most recent update done in 2008 specifies 12 hours is standard for a graduate certificate.

i. CSIS-new certificate Information Systems

ii. CSIS-new certificate Software Engineering

iii. EDGT course changes

iv. MAT-EDEL

v. MAT-EDSP.

vi. MBIO-Core Reqs

**Shawn Morrison, Chair of the Committee on General Education** requested approval of the following courses in the following categories for the General Education program, beginning Fall 2017.

Speaker McNerney suggested discussing each proposal as a block.

**Susan Kattwinkel, Senator** (Theatre) expressed her concern with "humanities creep." She described the purpose of GenEd as teaching the skills associated with the areas, but also to get students from a wide variety of disciplines. She expressed introducing topics like Geography courses as humanities risked students being able to complete all their requirements without ever leaving their department. Kattwinkel expressed if everything becomes a humanities, then what are the humanities?
Kevin Keenan, Senator (Political Science) asked to see the syllabus for the Geography course and said that there are some courses that sit more in the Humanities than in Social Sciences. For example, he said, the History of Geography is considered writing about the Earth.

Kattwinkel said she did not see a connection between the Humanities learning outcomes and the assignments in the Geography classes.

Keenan gave examples of Humanities type of questions that a course of this type would offer.

Shawn Morrison offered that questions she had about the relevance of a course as humanities were answered by another committee member.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) said that the soft definition of Social Science at the College allows for a broad inclusion of courses in the Humanities.

Provost McGee offered a comment on the three Humanities packets. If passed, he said there will be an astonishing expansion of Humanities courses that will count for General Education.

The Provost said an addition of 96 courses to the Humanities list yields an increase of 38 percent increase of courses qualifying for Humanities credit. 58 percent of catalog courses in English would count as Gen Ed. 68 percent of History courses would count as Gen Ed.

The Provost said that although the courses are fine, and meet the signature assignment requirements, he wanted reflected in the minutes that next year's catalog Humanities requirement will be remade.

The Provost said that although this change will not result in any additional hours taken by students, it will result in a different advising scheme to manage, a different approach to making sure we assess the courses, and it will add additional complexity and will create new challenges. The Gen Ed curriculum for next year will be meaningfully different from this last year's. It will be very difficult to model the implications for enrollment management that come from these changes.

The Provost noted the stresses on Deans, Chairs and Program Directors as they try to manage seat counts, and emphasized that these kind of changes do have profound consequences.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at large, HSS) said that in the case of History, for example, they will not offer all the courses all the time, as all courses listed are not offered every semester. She said in actual enrollments and advising, she thinks the effect won't be as significant. She agrees that the catalog will look larger.

Gia Quesada, Guest and Faculty Coordinator for General Education said that this model is going back to the less structured Gen Ed model that existed three years ago. Quesada reminded the Senate that for advising purposes, the Gen Ed courses listed here will be available only for students entering in Fall 2017.
Quesada asked to help spread the word that these changes will affect only Freshmen entering in Fall 2017.

**Jason Vance**, Senator (at-large, SSM) observed that English is offering practically their entire upper division range of courses, and he presumes that includes any prerequisites.

Larry Krasnoff pointed out that we have left the discussion of Humanities Packet and suggested we continue with the order.

**Beatriz Maldonado**, Senator (at-large, LCWA) returned the conversation to the Geography class and spoke of having to make the decision for courses that were borderline Humanities and Social Sciences as one or the other.

The Speaker invited more discussion on Packet 1.

**Jolanda van Arnhem**, Senator (at-large, Library) was curious about the Provost's comment about changing the flow of students and where they will wind up. Is the change so major that it will result in loss of enrollments?

Provost McGee said every time you add more possibilities, you may have more students taking class because if fulfills GenEd. Upper division courses will be less likely than lower division courses to be taken for that reason. Modeling at this level of complexity and at this kind of seat count is extremely difficult to do. Provost McGee said it is an experiment and we won't know the severity until we've done it.

**Robert Westerfelhaus**, Senator (at-large, HSS) called for a quorum.

A quorum was established by count.

The Speaker called for continued discussion of Packet 1.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) said that we are not really going back to the old system. He said that we do have a broad distribution system. Programs can add new courses and reconsider old courses. Krasnoff said if courses meet the criteria, then they are in.

Packet 1 was added.

The Speaker called for discussion on Packet 2.

Scott Peeples, Guest (English) addressed a question on prerequisites for English courses. The prerequisites are the same as those for the 200 level courses that are currently part of GenEd. He said that the courses were once part of GenEd, with non-majors taking them. He resisted the suggestion that there was a raw number of GenEd courses that a single department should have.

He asserted that the courses met the requirements for GenEd courses as much as the 200 level courses do, and would like them counted.
Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large HSS) added a comment about the rationale for adding the large number of courses into GenEd. He said a number of courses were dropped during the push a couple of years ago to streamline GenEd courses, and that there were unintended consequences to doing so. He added that one consequence was severe difficulty with any Study Abroad courses. In order for students to sign up for Study Abroad, students look for courses that will count for Humanities credit. This has affected recruiting for Study Abroad programs.

Jason Vance, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if students could take a menu of courses that satisfy GenEd and not really experience diversity?

Betsy Baker, Senator (English) added that there are some prerequisites for English majors, but not for [unintelligible].

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) pointed out that diversity is important—there is still a standing rule in place that you can't take more than two Humanities in any field.

The Speaker called for a vote. Packet 2 passed.

The Speaker called for discussion on the third Humanities Packet.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) wanted to follow up on a point brought by Jason Vance on prerequisites in History.

Lisa Covert, Senator (at-large, HSS) said either two History courses or permission of the instructor are the prerequisites.

Packet 3 passed.

The Speaker called for discussion of the Natural Science packet.

There were no questions. Natural Science packet was passed.

The Speaker called for discussion on the Social Sciences packet. There was no discussion. The packet passed.

There was no discussion of the removal of the two courses. The removal passed.
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7. **Constituent Concerns**, Senator Alex Kasman voiced concern about the limited availability of the free Health Screening opportunities offered as a perk. Senator Jolanda van Arnhem pointed out that the screening is still available through vouchers for screenings at multiple Doctor’s Care facilities, so it is still available. Contact Ed Pope or Sandy Butler in Human Resources or search on Yammer for more information. You can download a screening voucher here: https://statesc.southcarolinablues.com/web/nonsecure/statesc/Member+Home/Health+and+Wellness/Preventive+Screening/

8. Adjournment, 7:34 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jannette Finch
Faculty Secretary