Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 1 November 2016.

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 1 November 2016 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order, 5:06

2. Approval of the 11 October Faculty Senate minutes. The minutes were approved with one change to clarify language of Senator Blake Stevens on page 12.

The Speaker asked for any other changes? There were none.

3. Announcements and information

Speaker McNerney explained that the November Senate meeting is moved to first Tuesday instead of being held on the traditional second Tuesday due to election day on November 8.

Please mark the roll at each door.

The Speaker asked for unanimous consent to removing one item from agenda. From New Business, the proposal for a new program (BPS Hospitality Operation Management) from the Faculty Curriculum Committee will be removed to allow the Faculty Budget Committee to examine it and should be back on the agenda in December.

Unanimous consent was granted by the Senate.

4. Reports

a. Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney

Speaker McNerney updated us on the Board of Trustees (BoT) meetings he attended in October. BoT elected new officers. David Hay was elected Chairman of the BoT, Frank Gadsden was elected Vice Chair, Renee Romberger was elected secretary.

The Speaker attended several committee meetings, including Athletics subcommittee, where upcoming changes in FLSA (Fair Labor Standards Act) were discussed.

Academic Affairs subcommittee discussed, among other things, the Motion passed in October by the Senate charging the Speaker with developing or identifying an instrument to gather faculty input in the evaluations of the President and the Provost. The Speaker will continue to move forward on this motion and to keep us updated.

The Budget and Finance meeting included updates on a number of capital projects. Senator Irina Gigova attended that meeting and reported back to the Faculty Budget Committee. The Budget and Finance committee presented for the full Board's approval a series of resolutions covering the refunding of two bonds issued in 2007. Refunding the two bonds will save the College
significant money. In 2007, they were 30 year bonds, after they move through the process including before CHE (Commission on Higher Education), they will become 20 year bonds.

A great deal of discussion involved the FLSA. For those employees who are paid a threshold salary of $47,600, if they are classified as a director, they may work longer than 40 hours a week. An example the Speaker gave was in the Athletics department, where trainers may work more than 40 hours a week traveling with teams. In these cases, the College has tried to compensate with compensatory time. The mandate from the federal government could have budgetary effects.

The Speaker reported on attending the Governmental Affairs and External Relations committee meeting. An action presented to the Board from that committee was the restoration of the College Seal.

At the Alumni Relations committee meeting, the Speaker learned that at the Alumni weekend, November 17-20, there will be a number of Alumni receiving awards. Their support positively affects College business. One initiative Alumni Relations is working on is to create more opportunities in the Career Center for our alumni. They are also exploring creating a database of alumni businesses that students could search for job prospects and internships.

There is an active shared governance listserv. An email from the Speaker is forthcoming about signing up for the listserv.

The Speaker reminded us about the two ad hoc committees; one on Grievance, and one on Hearing. Any thoughts you have about these committees or matters of Grievance or Hearings may be shared with the Chairs, Roger Daniels (Hearings) and Amy Rogers (Grievance).

A task force has been created to look at the creation of a General Studies online degree. There are three senators on that task force, and many of our faculty colleagues.

No Questions.

b. Provost Brian McGee

The College of Charleston has hired a new Athletics director who will start in January 2017. Mike Roberts, currently at Southern Methodist University, is dedicated to student athlete academic success.

The Provost reported on attending the Academic Affairs committee of the Board of Trustees. He reported on many Dean-driven items of business, including an enrollment report, usually posted on http://irp.cofc.edu/.

The report includes 5-year trend data, the current student profile, and new student profile. We have 2349 new students. The report also includes the retention rate (near 80%), which is very stable, and the graduation rate at the four-year mark (over 60%).
The College Reads event was well-attended, and a splendid experience. The Provost congratulated the College Reads committee, and noted the speakers were excellent.

The Provost encouraged faculty and staff to go to their Chairs or Deans to discuss any concerns about the challenges of FLSA (Fair Labor Standards Act).

By the time the Senate meets in December, the Provost said we expect to have feedback about the narrative from SACSCOC. He thanked everyone for contributing to the completion of the compliance narratives.

The QEP deadline for course proposals is extended due to Hurricane Matthew.

The Provost spoke about strategic goals and key indicators for success. In trying to bring focus and direction to the plan, a smaller list of key metrics are being developed. Some examples may be: serving undergraduate transfer students, the growth and development of graduate programs, the timely graduation of students, the retention of students. The President is currently talking with multiple constituencies to discuss how best to set goals, measure them and achieve them. We will hear more in the near future.

The Provost will meet with the Academic Planning Committee on November 4, and that is one of several topics they will discuss.

The Provost next addressed student access in technical colleges. We have an international bridge program called iCharleston. The bridge program brings students to us in the Spring instead of the Fall. Other bridge programs in past years have had mixed success, especially as compared to USC and Clemson bridge programs. The Provost spoke of reviewing bridge programs focusing on Trident Tech and South Carolina students. It's part of our public mission to study carefully and intentionally how to transfer students from technical colleges, including local technical colleges, as well as thinking about trying a residential bridge program. The Provost will be discussing this with Academic Planning.

The Provost noted several ad hoc committees working with College committees or institutional committees. He thanked Speaker McNerney and the members of those committees for that service and for making progress. That work is good for shared governance process and institutional success. One ad hoc committee being formed this semester will work on reviewing the Graduate School structure. That committee is forming and Dean Fran Welch will serve as co-chair.

The Provost offered comments on several agenda items, including the move of the Professional Studies Hospitality Operation Management program to December's agenda so all the Faculty Committees involved have plenty of time to look at the proposal. The Provost spoke of "knotty issues" being looked at by Academic Standards and thanked the members of that committee for taking on the challenge. The proposal for Pass/Fail rates will improve the catalog if it passes, but might not solve the problem with the Biology proposal that initiated it.
The Provost expressed gratitude to the multiple committees that have looked at the issue of the major GPA calculation. We have some of the strongest work yet on this coming from multiple committees, in particular Academic Standards. He has discussed with the Registrar's office some practical issues of workability.

The Provost asked if there were any questions.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) asked about student growth. Is it out of state students or in state?

Provost McGee responded that the number of nonresident students is about the same as last year. The growth is from resident students.

c. Divya Bhati, Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning

Dr. Bhati brought the compliance binder, without attachments. With attachments, it would have been about 6,000 pages. The binder was thick as a brick.

Dr. Bhati thanked the 16 working groups and extended her deepest gratitude to all who contributed, especially her staff and the Provost, who worked many long hours.

She thanked all those who took on additional roles and responsibilities. She thanked Lynne Ford for her deep commitment to the College's reaffirmation process in taking over Conseula Francis’s group 5 and helped with Graduate School standards, too. Dr. Bhati claimed that Mary Bergstrom was on her speed dial, and the tremendous amount of work done by Deanna Caveny-Noecker and her team. She thanked the over 150 faculty, staff, administrators, students, and Board of Trustee members who were narrative reviewers.

Dr. Bhati reminded us that this is the completion of the first step. She shared the timeline of where we are currently.

Dr. Bhati shared that when we receive feedback sometime in November, we will have to write focus reports to answer any questions.

We will submit the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) report by the end of January.

The onsite visit is in March, and response reports will have to be written to answer any questions asked at that time. In December 2017, the SACSCOC Board of Trustees reviews the report. Finally, the College of Charleston will receive the official letter in January 2018.

Dr. Bhati asked for support and cooperation to complete the list of work needed for the QEP. Currently, there is a call for sustainability focused course proposals for Fall 2017. The QEP will be run by the Sustainability Literacy Institute, which is proposed as part of the QEP.

The SACSCOC reviewers will be on campus March 27-30. Save these dates on your calendars. They may want to speak with you!
There were no questions

5. **Old Business**

None.

6. **New Business**

a. Christine Finnan, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs introduced the following proposals.

   i. New course, BIOL 612 (pdf)

   ii. Course deletion, BIOL 618 (pdf)

The two Biology courses were discussed together. The new course (BIOL 612) is an update to the curriculum and broaden the focus. Seth Pritchard, faculty member from Biology, was able to offer the information that the update will make the course more applicable to Marine Biology and MES (Master, Environmental Studies) students.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) asked about the new course title deleting the word Marine. Why does it still count toward marine biology?

Seth Pritchard replied that they did not want to exclude terrestrial biology examples from the class. The course will still contain plenty of marine content.

The Senate voted on and passed the Biology course proposals.

   iii. Course change, ENGL 700 (pdf)

Christine Finnan explained that the English program wanted to make ENGL 700, a repeatable seminar series. Each seminar series differs in content.

Speaker McNerney asked for clarification on how many seminar classes can be taken. Students are capped at taking three of the seminar courses.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) had a procedural question. How many times can you take the same course for credit?

Dr. Finnan clarified that the seminar course being discussed had the same course number, but the content is different and can be taken three times.

Betsy Baker, Senator (English) added that the director of the English Graduate program tracks each student individually, so there would not be a case where the student takes the same course.

The Senate voted on and passed the English course proposal.
iv. Program change, MATH

Christine Finnan asked Bob Mignone (Mathematics) to speak on the Math program change.

Bob Mignone, Guest (Mathematics) explained that last year the Mathematics Masters degree program was redesigned into two tracks; Mathematics and Statistics. They realized they inadvertently left out a sequence choice in the Operations Research sequence.

The Senate voted on and passed the Math program change.

b. Gayle Goudy, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, introduced the following:

- 21 Proposals in French: Batch 1 (pdf); Batch 2 (pdf)

Shawn Morrison (French) was invited by Dr. Goudy to speak of changes to the French curriculum. Dr. Morrison expressed that the changes were to update curriculum.

The Senate voted on and passed the French course proposals.

- Next, some concentration changes were proposed for International Studies. (pdf)
- Minor changes, INTL (INST minor) (pdf)

Beatriz Maldonado offered that they were adding some courses to both the concentration and the minor.

The Senate voted on and passed the changes in International Studies.

- Finally, a new concentration was introduced in Political Science (pdf).

Claire Curtis (Political Science) spoke of the changes as melding public policy analysis with a career focus.

The Senate voted on and passed the changes in Political Science.

c. Shawn Morrison, Chair of the General Education Committee (doc), offered a motion with two parts.

i. Gen Ed Cycle of Freezing

ii. Course additions during the Freeze

She shared a PowerPoint of GenEd cycle of changes in a timeline (PPT).

Dr. Morrison reminded the Senate of the reasons for the freeze:
• helps with transparency;
• helps transfer students understand what courses can be used to satisfy the GenEd requirements;
• allows faculty to advise students according to their catalog year;
• allows for gathering of assessment data over a four-year period in order to improve the General Education program.

Dr. Morrison showed samples of the two sets of General Education catalog requirements based on the student's “catalog year.”

Dr. Morrison included examples in her PowerPoint of what happens if there is no freeze. Included are also examples of the OAKS course that Chairs have access to.

Speaker McNerney invited questions.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator (at-large, HSS) asked for clarification about the cycle of reviewing course proposals. Are they approved in one batch, or over time? When do the courses go into effect?

Dr. Morrison explained that Senators will approve course as they are presented, from the departments. The courses, then wait "in line" until the next cycle.

**Susan Kattwinkel**, Senator (Theatre and Dance) wondered how rigid the cycle of waiting is. If a course falls off the list somehow, will it be another four years before that course can be offered?

Dr. Morrison explained that Senate has the final approval for courses.

**Gioconda Quesada**, Guest (Faculty Coordinator for General Education) explained that in the OAKS page, all faculty members can see what courses have been submitted in the previous years [in OAKS, make sure you choose semester 0000 On-going, Non-credit Sections, then look for the course titled GenEd Assessment].

In the OAKS Content area, faculty may see the courses the GenEd Committee are considering, and those that the Faculty Senate has approved.

**Gayle Goudy**, Guest, Chair of the Faculty Curriculum Committee, asked if “curriculog” would solve the concern that courses could be lost by assigning an active date?

**Mary Bergstrom** (Registrar) answered that she was not sure if curriculog would do that, but as a member of the General Education committee, as course are approved, she makes sure and places the date on courses to become active in DegreeWorks in the future.

Dr. Quesada reiterated that the GeEd Committee has adjusted the workflow process several times, and they go over the list of courses several times before the catalog is published.
**Joe Kelly**, Senator (at-large, HSS) urged Senate to vote against the proposal. He offered the opinion that instead of achieving clarity and less confusion, we are instead substituting new confusion for the old confusion.

Senator Kelly states that we are losing flexibility within the curriculum. Courses that logically should be humanities credit courses cannot be counted as humanities credit until the next year. Courses that come before the Senate that satisfy the Humanities/GenEd criteria and are approved should be put into the curriculum. Courses that are deleted from the curriculum that are in GenEd should leave the GenEd curriculum. It seems to add more confusion if they are left in GenEd for transfer credit.

Senator Kelly offered the opinion that the freeze is hurting students more than helping them and said it seems that the freeze is driven by assessment. Senator Kelly said that it seems assessment is doing what we are told that assessment doesn't do. Assessment is supposed to enhance the curriculum and improve what we are doing, and it seems that we are damaging the GenEd curriculum through this need for assessment.

Senator Kelly hoped that we could figure out how to do assessment without freezing the curriculum for four years.

**Divya Bhati**, Guest (Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning) clarified that the College was monitored twice for GenEd and agreed that assessment should be meaningful.

Speaker McNerney reminded everyone that the Speaker should yield the floor to anyone wishing to speak before they speak.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if a student can change their catalog year anytime during their college career?

**Shawn Morrison** stated that a student can change catalog year for their major and their minor, but not for GenEd.

**Mary Bergstrom**, Guest (Registrar) stated that a student's General Education catalog year is based on their year of admission or readmission to the College. She affirmed that Dr. Morrison is correct for major or minor, a student may "up it to current catalog year."

Speaker McNerney added to this that once a student changes upward, they cannot retreat.

That was affirmed as correct.

**Heath Hoffman**, Senator (Sociology and Anthropology) commented that CofC was under monitoring for GenEd assessment because we were not doing any GenEd assessment. He also pointed out that the Learning Outcomes are general enough to apply to any course that is in "the pot" of GenEd.
Senator Hoffman shared that his department was concerned with the GenEd Freezing proposal, too, and asked what other institutions of higher education are doing?

**Lynne Ford**, Guest (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) answered that in general, other institutions have a small set of fixed courses in GenEd. Very few institutions change that curriculum every year. To be clear, Dr. Ford stated that every time a course is added or deleted, the corpus of the GenEd curriculum is changed. What seems like minor changes "around the edges" institute a new General Education curriculum.

Dr. Ford commented on Dr. Bhati's point that SACSCOC requires that every degree awarded by the College of Charleston at the undergraduate level include a General Education component. It is an identifiable GenEd component.

Dr. Ford and her team tried to make a rationale for the General Education curriculum, and included the review GenEd went through in 2012, to identify learning outcomes, and to identify approval criteria.

The process which has been articulated by the Faculty, and passed by the Senate, allows the General Education committee to review courses to be included in the [GenEd] component. That component is assumed to be fixed until it is changed by the Faculty.

Dr. Ford reaffirmed that the catalog year policy was passed by the Senate.

Senator Hoffman restated that other schools have a more stable “permanently frozen” GenEd.

**Bob Mignone**, Guest, used an example from Math/Logic to clarify the difference in courses for the major and GenEd. Dr. Mignone asked for clarification on when the Senate voted on the key component of the calendar year determining what courses students can take.

**Speaker McNerney** stated this is searchable.

**Lisa Covert**, Senator (at-large, HSS and a member of the General Education committee) addressed that assessment is a small component of the committee's discussions on the freeze. Both students and faculty are confused about changes in the GenEd curriculum, and students are getting bad information from faculty who aren't keeping up with changes in the catalogs. Senator Covert mentioned that flexibility is built into the system; one example given is a Special Topics course that could be tested out before it is included in the catalog for the next year.

**Gioconda Quesada**, Guest (Faculty Coordinator for General Education) reflected that formal discussion took place during the General Education committee meeting on adding courses continually to GenEd. The implications of this is to complicate what GenEd courses count when advising students.

Quesada suggested that flexibility desired by departments during the freeze can be addressed by bringing those problems to the GenEd committee.
Ann Gutshall, Senator (at-large, Education, Health, and Human Performance) asked a question on why is it a 4 year freeze instead of 10 or 6 or 2?

Gioconda Quesada responded that it started with assessment. They needed two years assessment data and time to analyze first two years. Originally, the freeze was meant to end in Fall 2016, but with SACSCOC accreditation, it was not a good idea to keep changing.

Pam Riggs-Gelasco, Senator (Chemistry) supported a vote against. From her perspective as Chair of her department, it is frustrating to be asked to assess, but not to be able to act on that assessment. The freeze ties hands for improvement.

Senator Riggs-Gelasco gave two examples of why the freeze might be detrimental. For educational grant funding that involves new programs and new classes, it is not practical to be frozen for four years. Another example given was for QEP, when the department would like to add a new GenEd sequence, multidisciplinary, based on sustainability, and they would not be able to do that. She wonders why would faculty vote to tie their own hands.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at-large, HSS) stated that this keeps coming back to assessment. He does not doubt that the freeze makes assessment easier to perform.

Senator Kelly read an email from a student who asked if a class (Intro to Irish and Irish American Studies) would count as a humanities credit. The class would not count as a humanities credit until next year. Senator Kelly pointed out that for a student with a tight schedule, they might be deciding against a minor and that decision is driven by the four-year freeze. He stated that decisions such as this are a bigger inconvenience to students than any benefit. Senator Kelly did not consider it confusing to look at a list of courses in order to tell students which ones count for Humanities, and which do not.

Lynne Ford, Guest (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) responded to Pam Riggs-Gelasco's concerns. She agreed that one type of flexibility is lost: the ability to add or delete courses. It does not remove the flexibility to change pedagogy or to change curriculum within an existing course.

Dr. Ford commented that none of us acts on an annual assessment cycle very effectively. It takes time to put a curriculum in place, to collect enough data that reflects several learning experiences over a period of time, to make sense of that information, then to talk with colleagues about how to make sense of that information: what might we change.

Dr. Ford said even at the program level or the departmental level, we assess on an annual basis, but we look at things over a period of time.

Dr. Ford asserted that's what the freeze is about. We hold the curriculum as a constant over a period of time. There is nothing magical about 3 years or 4 years; that is up to you to decide. But there are some serious benefits derived from holding the curriculum constant.
She then spoke about the point that a course has to count. She stated that every undergraduate degree awarded by the College has three central components: General Education; the major; and electives.

A course doesn’t have to count for General Education to be a meaningful course, or to make a meaningful contribution to a student's degree from the College of Charleston.

**Heath Hoffman**, Senator (Sociology and Anthropology) appreciated the difficult decisions and conversations that went into the freeze plan. He continued with if we are required to have the General Education component, no two students have the same General Education experience because they can pick from a whole list of classes. He pointed out that since classes are added and subtracted to the list, we are not assessing the same thing. Senator Hoffman stated that there is so much confusion, he thinks some effort should be made in helping faculty learn how to advise better. He sees the motion presented by GenEd as a solution to a problem that doesn’t exist, but is creating more problems. He stated he does not think he can support the motion.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) stated that the way our system is set up now, with a General Education committee and a Curriculum Committee, we can propose courses to the Curriculum Committee, and if they are passed and approved, they will go in the catalog. Senator Nunan explained that what the GenEd committee is proposing, if you want a course to count for GenEd, there will be a "gatekeeping process where it can't happen for three years." He stated that there is a real cost to this, and affirmed what Senator Kelly stated earlier. Senator Nunan used the example that if you are in a program that lives by GenEd and not by majors, like Philosophy, it matters that a course counts for Humanities, and it is a serious detriment to the enrollment that it might not count for three years. It is less attractive to a student to take a course that is only going to count as an elective.

Senator Nunan professed to be mystified that adopting the GenEd proposal would be less confusing for students in terms of advising. Advising would be a problem with the freeze or without.

Senator Nunan proposed that unless it is against SACSCOC requirements, couldn't the cluster of GenEd courses stay the same and be evaluated again in four years. The cluster of courses would change every four years.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) agreed with others voicing concern against this. Senator Krasnoff was not sure how adding a course to the GenEd inventory confuses anyone. The only case where deleting a course could be a problem is if someone deletes a course already approved for GenEd in the middle of a year.

Senator **Krasnoff stated that** assessment changes every year, depending on what the departments offer that year. We don't have the stability of fixed courses for assessment. Senator Krasnoff stated that we must rely on the more general learning outcomes and see if students have met them.
Senator Krasnoff’s last point was that some would say that this is a problem with our distribution model which is antiquated because the courses are always changing.

He stated that Faculty has voted several times to keep this model.

Senator Krasnoff thanked administrators for working hard to come up with assessable models that work with our curriculum, but that assessment is being used to undermine the model faculty have adopted. He called for affirming the model we have, even though antiquated, and try to make it work.

**Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest** (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) pointed out that every General Education curriculum whether we have one every year or every four years has to be scribed and every student's degree requirements have to be matched against a particular General Education curriculum to see if they have met them. Dr. Caveny-Noecker stated that if curriculum changes every year, then when advising students, we would have to be attentive to asking what is the General Education catalog year, and what is the list of requirements and courses for that year.

Dr. Caveny-Noecker said that although the example used by Senator Kelly does sound more complicated for that student when a course has been approved but doesn't count for General Education, the fact is that what counts for that student is dependent on what General Education catalog that student is under.

**Lynne Ford, Guest** (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) spoke of the first GenEd review, that passed the Senate and was defeated by four votes as not really being an affirmation of the model we have. Dr. Ford stated that we have a distribution requirement and if the Senate is saying they want this model, then we should affirm the model, instead of getting it by default because two alternatives to the model failed.

Dr. Ford then addressed Senator Hoffman's comment that no two students have the same GenEd experience. She explained that part of the reason we went through the process of developing approval criteria and student learning outcomes for GenEd was that because we have a distribution requirement, with lots of courses, the only way we can say we have a General Education component is to find some commonality. So Dr. Ford said it's fine to have a list, and fine to have a list of Humanities courses that change over time, as long as we have an ongoing process to make sure that all the courses on that list continue to meet the approval criteria passed by the Senate, and continue to reflect the student learning outcomes that the Faculty approved. She stated that part of how we do that is through the assessment process.

Dr. Ford stated that if we decide to not fix [or freeze] the curriculum, then the General Education committee will probably offer a regular cycle of recertification for those courses.

Dr. Ford invited the Provost to speak to why the courses on the list are driven by enrollment. She stated we have a "curriculum by addition," and pointed out that that is generally not best practice for developing curriculum.
Dr. Ford stated that if the Senate votes against the freeze, then a regular cycle of recertification for all courses would be the only way to guarantee that the courses meet the will of the Faculty Senate as General Education courses.

**Jason Howell**, Senator (at-large Science and Mathematics) asked if the freeze would apply to other things under the General Education purview, such as the foreign language alternative program and the Math/Logic alternative program?

Lynne Ford, Guest (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) responded that those two things would go into the catalog in 2017.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked why a freeze allows us to not re-certify every class?

There was back and forth discussion between Lynne Ford, Tom Kunkle, Alex Kasman, and Gioconda Quesada about how freezing can assure the courses don't change. Ultimately, the courses will have to continue to be reviewed anyway and there has to be a cycle of review.

**Provost McGee** stated that our GenEd is old, but that our assessment cycle is relatively young. The Provost said that the assessment cycle has not been tested by 5th year interim report of by reaffirmation of accreditation.

Provost McGee stated that faculty and students need to pay attention to advising materials.

Speaking as Chief Academic officer, Provost McGee stated that our process should meet the requirements of our regional accreditor and of the federal government for responsible, mature assessment where as we go, we learn and adjust.

Provost McGee expressed a wish to not abandon a relatively young assessment cycle, adapted to the needs of our complex GenEd, just as we are starting to get actionable results.

Provost McGee asked the Senate to vote in favor of the motion that was unanimously adopted by the GenEd committee.

Provost McGee called the question.

**Richard Nunan**, Senator (at-large HSS) asked if procedurally, can the Provost call the question? Speaker McNerney and Parliamentarian George Pothering affirmed.

There was a second on calling the question. The Senate voted no on calling the question.

The discussion continued.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator (Mathematics) asked about new proposals for QEP courses. If they are proposed in March, are they then frozen for four years?
Lynne Ford, Guest (Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience) stated that both Senator Anguelova and Senator Riggs-Gelasco raised an excellent point.

Richard Nunan, Senator (at-large HSS) wished to follow up something he said earlier. He pointed out to state that having a freeze will allow assessment to be done in an efficient way and that not having a freeze will not allow assessment to be done efficiently seemed like a false dichotomy. Senator Nunan stated, “Is it not the case that we could set a group of courses to be the ones used to do GenEd assessment for a four-year period without instituting a freeze on new GenEd courses?”

Lynne Ford replied that this would be an option to explore. She stated that the faculty created the framework in 2012, the GenEd committee certified existing courses, and accepted new courses in 2013. When that work was done, the Committee began assessing existing courses. For students, nothing changed until 2015.

Lisa Covert, Senator (at-large, HSS and a member of the General Education committee) explained that as a member of the GenEd committee, they did not like the term "freeze" and "thaw," but that it is a misrepresentation to continue to insist that you cannot make changes. Changes can be made easily by adding a special topics course. Senator Covert expressed that the terms are not perfect, but it might be more useful to think about practical ways of implementing flexibility that will provide some stability and allow for change.

Senator Covert also mentioned that the freeze allowed the GenEd committee to concentrate on other issues without evaluating a long list of courses.

George Pothering (Guest) asked if Degree Works can track all of this?

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) said that it can. But each student would have a different catalog year for GenEd. Incoming students and incoming transfer students would not know what that GenEd will be until the catalog is published.

Bergstrom suggested that advising sheets they use in a partnership with Trident Tech would be lost if a freeze cycle is not adopted.

Heath Hoffman, Senator (Sociology and Anthropology) suggested that the core of our GenEd stays largely the same, so we could advise to Trident which core courses are likely to remain the same. Hoffman states there is a long list of changes that have occurred because of assessment. He expressed concern that what is done in the name of assessment is much more than we have to do to be reaffirmed.

Senator Hoffman said that instead of assessing every GenEd class, every year, why not take a sample of GenEd?

Bob Mignone, Guest, spoke of serving on the GenEd Committee and said that there is a structure for General Education, the six or seven requirements, and there are the courses that fulfill those requirements. He said that the student learning outcomes are geared toward the
requirements. Mignone stated that he did not see how it mattered if the courses change, as long as structural changes are geared to catalog year. Assessing the program is done through requirements, not the courses.

He emphasized that changing courses is appropriate in response to assessment, and he did not see why the structure cannot be geared toward the catalog.

**Jon Hakkila** (Guest) provided the example of changes in courses as discipline change, not a structural change.

**Jennifer Barrett-Tatum**, Senator (at-large, Education, Health, and Human Performance) summed up the discussion so far, and asked if keeping the core courses frozen for a time, and measuring the major assessments within the core courses would be an option?

Lynne Ford stated that she didn't think so. Ford offered a correction to the question of sampling, stating that GenEd does sample. The act of asking for full faculty participation in the production of the artifacts for General Education was required to develop a culture of assessment. She stated that because everyone is aware of assessment and is practicing it affirms that we have developed a culture of assessment.

Ford did not think that designating a set of courses within the larger set of courses as the only thing we assess because that only represents a small fraction of students.

Jennifer Barrett-Tatum clarified that a pool of GenEd courses could be developed, and sample from that pool, then readjust the list of courses in that pool every three to four years.

Lynne Ford expressed that the construction of our General Education is based on distribution categories, the learning outcomes are attached to the category, then courses are approved using the approval criteria to fit within the category so that there is alignment. If it is indicated that we have approved a group of courses for GenEd, but that we only assess a smaller set of courses, and we expect to be judged on that smaller set, then why isn't the whole of GenEd contained in the subset of courses?

There was back and forth discussion between Barrett-Tatum and Ford on sampling and the fact that although courses are drawn from different batches, "every course has been approved using the approval criteria, and every course carries the student learning outcomes for that distribution, and every course contains a common signature assignment."

**Divya Bhati**, Guest (Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning) agreed that the model is archaic. She agreed that assessment should not drive curriculum. SACS does not mandate two year, three year, four year, or one year General Education [unintelligible] but they do mandate that there should be 30 credit hours that go toward GenEd for an undergraduate degree. There are specific areas that the GenEd courses are drawn from that must have a common thread. There should be cohesiveness in the bucket of courses. She reiterated that General Education is considered to be one program. Credit hours are drawn from Humanities/
Fine Arts, Social/Behavioral Sciences and Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and those credit hours must be 30 hours.

**Blake Stevens**, Senator (at-large, School of Arts) said he was not sure that the bucket analogy holds, because to pull from a bucket suggests randomness that doesn't match the way every new course has to go through various committees and then the Senate. The cohesiveness in a way is going to be guaranteed. The idea of cohesiveness doesn't contradict the idea of proposing new courses. He stated he is not sure that supports the idea of a freeze.

Senator Stevens revisited an earlier point, stating that the discussion started with complexity, then it seemed like complexity became less of an issue, then Degree Works was mentioned. He stated that in looking at the website, it seemed that you would only need two more links. So you would have Before 2015, After 2015, Before 2016, After 2016, After 2017, then as we keep adding links, the bottom ones fade away. Is it really that complex?

**Mary Bergstrom** (Registrar) shared that she gets many emails from students asking about courses that are no longer there. She emphasized that truly knowing what is in the GenEd bucket is essential for good advising. If a list was provided as Senator Stevens suggests, an advisor would still have to understand what the student's General Education catalog year is.

**Bob Frash**, Senator (Hospitality and Tourism Management) had a question on advising students. If the list of courses accepted for humanities comes up in Degree Works, then it is not complex for him.

There was some discussion of Degree Works from Mary Bergstrom.

Senator Frash continued that knowledge if fluid and dynamic and changing and adding courses on a regular basis, acknowledges that. He stated that slowing down and constraining that fluidity would not be consistent. Senator Frash offered that assessment is wagging the dog, and he would have to vote to defeat the motion.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at-large, SSM) sought to understand the assessment-driven need for the freeze.

Lynne Ford explained that the connection between holding the core of courses fixed and assessment is to create a longer cycle for the collection, analysis and interpretation of data, and the decision of what changes to make as a result of that.

If the Senate votes not to freeze the curriculum, then there are a number of ways to make adjustments. This was the process we came up with when we went from having very little assessment in GenEd to some assessment. A longer cycle makes the process of assessment more meaningful.

Senator Kunkle said that many of us are suspicious of assessment and asked how the data that is collected... how do you measure learning? The idea that the freeze makes us capable of more accurately measuring learning is hard to believe.
Ann Gutshall, Senator (at-large, Education, Health, and Human Performance) asked if it would work to have a freeze for deletes, but not for additions? That would allow fluidity and immediacy, but we could guarantee to partners like Trident that there were certain courses that would be frozen and not deleted.

Lynne Ford said that we as faculty don't delete very much. She stated that for the third of our student body who want to transfer to the College of Charleston, they can't use Degree Works. For current students, all they have to do is use Degree Works. For students who are looking at transferring into the College, they are on their own to figure out what is going to transfer and what is not going to transfer.

There was back and forth discussion between Jon Hakkila, Ann Gutshall, and Lynne Ford.

Lisa Covert, Senator (at-large, HSS) proposed to amend the motion to shorten the cycle to two years or to every other year.

Speaker McNerney and Shawn Morrison clarified that this would be two years frozen, then one year of implementation.

Kevin Keenan, Senator (Political Science) seconded the motion.

Speaker McNerney asked for discussion on the motion to change to two years.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at-large, SSM) pointed out that the same arguments apply and did not see how the motion changed anything.

Joey van Arnhem, Senator (at-large, Library) asked if we can make proxy or generic students so they can use Degree Works?

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) said that anyone can access the catalog. But the catalog is not published until June after Senate is completed and all the systems are updated.

Back and forth discussion.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Guest (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) said in regards to transfers, the issue is not whether they have the information, it is the issue of whether the General Education curriculum is changing underneath them while they are students at another institution planning on transferring to the College of Charleston.

Jason Howell, Senator (at-large, SSM) continued the discussion regarding the two versus the four-year cycle. He stated that we will still have this issue if it’s 4 year or every other year, unless we limit our program changes.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) asked to see the literal wording and assumed we are amending paragraph 1. He pointed out that the language in the motion distributed in the agenda was different from the language in the PowerPoint shown by Shawn Morrison.
The language of the motion that was distributed in the agenda was amended.

**Joey van Arnhem**, Senator (at-large, Library) asked if changing the time frame to two years actually helps the transfer students. She also did not know how assessment could be conducted and implemented within two years.

Lynne Ford affirmed that two years is certainly shorter.

**Pam Riggs-Gelasco**, Senator (Chemistry) asked if we can’t implement cycle of assessment instead of cycle of freezing curriculum? She used the example of this year, we could assess Math and Natural Science, then next year, we could assess Social Science. She asked is it was a SACS requirement that every GenEd class is assessed with an artifact every year?

Lynne Ford stated that she did not believe not this it is a SACS requirement, but that it is a requirement to assess our student learning that emanates from the General Education curriculum.

There was some back and forth between Lynne Ford and Pam Riggs-Gelasco.

The Speaker asked for further discussion of the amendment.

The Senate voted on and rejected the amendment.

Business returned back to the original motion.

**Provost McGee** called the question.

It was seconded.

The motion to call the question on the original motion was voted on and passed.

Speaker McNerney asked for a vote on the original motion presented by the General Education Committee.

The Senate voted on and rejected the motion.

d. **Quinn Burke, Chair of the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid** presented several proposals.

i. Proposal to modify the Academic Progress Standards for the Honors College to be inclusive of (a) no Class I or II Honor Code violations & (b) no conduct violation resulting in suspension or expulsion (doc)
Dr. Burke explained that the Honors College wanted to add language to clarify honor code restrictions.

Speaker McNerney asked for discussion?

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) clarified this does not exist at this time?

Dr. Burke and Senator Krasnoff discussed.

Dr. Burke made the assumption that students in violation of the honor code would be staying out of honors college.

Senator Krasnoff asked for an explanation of one of the bullet points and clarified that they were requirements for being in good standing.

Trisha Folds-Bennett (Dean of the Honors College) explains that any honor code violation removes the student from Honors College. If it is a GPA issue, or a matter of not taking a class on time, then that is negotiable.

Senator Krasnoff and Dr. Folds-Bennett discussed.

Joey van Arnhem, Senator (at-large, Library) pointed out the clause within the proposal stating the student's right to appeal.

Trisha Folds-Bennett (Dean of the Honors College) said that there was not any language specifying what honor code violations removes the student from Honors College.

Senator Krasnoff proposed a friendly amendment to the language for clarity.

There was no objection. The friendly amendment was accepted.

Provost McGee asked if there is a process of appeal for honor code violations?

Trisha Folds-Bennett said no.

Joey van Arnhem asked if there should be an appeal process? Senator van Arnhem asked what would suspend or expel a student?

Trisha Folds-Bennett stated it would be repeated violations?

There was back and forth discussion including the student's right to appeal with the honor board.

Speaker McNerney offered that it seems to be a matter of the degree of severity which defines suspension or expulsion.
Tom Kunkle, Senator (at-large, SSM) asked if a student could appeal to the College of Charleston for an honor code violation?

Lynn Cherry (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources) spoke about the appeal process that students have access to.

There was back and forth discussion.

The Senate voted on the friendly amendment adjustment. The motion carried.

Senator Riggs-Gelasco made a motion to adjourn.

Seconded by Senator Krasnoff.

The Senate voted no to adjournment.

Quinn Burke introduced the next proposal.

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

The test offers greater security; it is cheaper for students.

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

18 faculty remained.

There was no longer a quorum.

Larry Krasnoff pointed out that he appreciates proposals such as the test used for English Proficiency being brought to us, but we should not vote on it.

Speaker McNerney repeated that we do not have a quorum.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

8. Adjournment, 7:48 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jannette Finch
Faculty Secretary