Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 11 October 2016

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, 11 October 2016 at 5 PM in the Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. **Call to Order**, 5:04 PM
2. **13 September, 2016 minutes** were approved as posted.
3. **Announcements and information**

Speaker McNerney reminded members to sign the roll, near the doors. He hoped Hurricane Matthew effects were minimal for all of us. He thanked everyone for being here, despite trying times.

**4. Reports**

   a. **Speaker of the Faculty Todd McNerney**

Speaker McNerney explained the decision behind continuing the scheduled Senate meeting despite Hurricane Matthew as due in part to the October Board of Trustees meeting. There was a carryover from September of old business, which was important to discuss before the Board meeting.

Speaker McNerney reminded everyone that effects of Hurricane Matthew continue. Colleagues and students may have conflicts.

Speaker McNerney gave an update on the unfilled Faculty Secretariat position. The position description will be posted soon.

On behalf of the committee on Nominations and Elections, an extension to October 14 was announced, of the election of replacement of At-Large Senators for HSS and SSM. Faculty were asked to encourage their faculty within these schools to vote.

Two ad hoc committees have been convened: one reviewing practices of the Faculty Hearing Committee and its charge, and the other reviewing the Faculty Grievance Committee and its charge. Chairs elected are Roger Daniels, Amy Rogers. To share any thoughts on these committees, please contact the chairs.

The Faculty shadowing program started by Lynn Cherry is ongoing. To date, 44 faculty colleagues have been shadowed by 19 Trustees. You can learn more about the program here: [http://trustees.cofc.edu/increasing-board-engagement/index.php](http://trustees.cofc.edu/increasing-board-engagement/index.php)

Speaker McNerney reminded us of the upcoming Board of Trustees meetings. The schedule and a sample meeting schedule is located here: [http://trustees.cofc.edu/schedule/index.php](http://trustees.cofc.edu/schedule/index.php) or you can contact Speaker McNerney for details. He welcomes faculty members attending.
An adjustment to the posted agenda: Divya Bhati will not be giving a report.

b. Provost Brian McGee

Provost McGee wished those who observe Yom Kippur an easy fast.

He offered a thank you for attending the Senate meeting, despite many demands on your time.

Provost McGee offered a verbal report on damage from Hurricane Matthew: light property damage, power outages.

Provost McGee thanked Public Safety and Physical Plant staff for quickly bringing the campus back to normal.

Some offices experienced water damaged. Both old and new buildings were affected. Please keep the Provost informed about any challenges. Academic Leadership, Academic Affairs joined Physical Plant on Monday to find problems and file work orders.

He has been asked many times about water in the basement of Robert Scott Small building. RSS has recovered quickly due to improvements made after flooding last year.

The Provost reminded everyone to please file a work order or let your department chair know of any problems in classrooms. Please don't assume a problem has already been addressed.

In terms of priority repairs, the order has been student housing, then classrooms, with offices and administrative spaces third.

Concerning revisions to the Academic calendar, Provost McGee thanked Lynne Ford and Mary Bergstrom, along with consultations with Deans, program directors, and student leadership. Attempted to create the best possible schedule. The Provost reminded us that a Federal policy mandates classroom hours. Used two weekend days and two makeup days. Opted not to use Fall break.

Using a Saturday and a Sunday is more balanced in regards to religious observances.

Creating the final exam schedule was a challenge, compressed balancing early morning and evening hours. Posted on the registrar's site you will find the most current schedule.

Provost McGee asked for questions specific to Hurricane Matthew?

Betsy Baker, Senator (English) asked if the last physical day of classes is still December 9?

Provost McGee affirmed that the last day of classes is December 9, and the first day of finals will be Saturday, December 10.
Iana Anguelova, Senator (Mathematics) opined that the schedule is tough for faculty teaching on Monday, Wednesday, Friday schedules. That means they will meet four days in a row.

Provost McGee stated that yes, this is a miserable schedule, and pointed out that in theory, faculty and students could teach or take classes from Monday, November 28 through Friday, December 9, and roll immediately into Final Exams on December 10. It will not be easy for faculty or students.

Back and forth discussion ensued about options. Provost McGee reminded us that this is schedule is kept in summer school all the time, but acknowledged it will be a "tough slog" and a challenge.

Provost McGee thanked faculty for their patience with the schedule revisions.


Along with the two ad hoc committees mentioned by the Speaker, there have been two more formed: on to focus on grading systems and one on a possible general studies major, 4 in all—working hard. The storm has affected the onset of the Graduate School Study Committee, but that will shortly be constituted.

The Provost offered comments on an "astonishing coarsening of our public discourse and direct challenges to civility in our public sphere" over the last several days [as we witness debates and discourse in an election year].

Some faculty will have an opportunity to make use of public events in the classroom and will do so much more civilly. Our students will benefit from professors who are able to demonstrate what our public dialog and discourse should be.

The Provost stated that on the agenda, we will hear from the Academic Standards Committee Statements on hearing about how we calculate a major GPA. This speaks to our obligations to have clear policies, transparency and fair play in our dealings with students. The Provost thanked Bob Mignone and multiple faculty committees for spending the last two years on this important issue.

Questions?

There were none.

c. Interim Associate Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer (Rénard Harris)

Dr. Harris wanted to introduce himself. He is an associate professor of Teacher Education in the School of Education, Health and Human Performance. For Fall 2016 and Spring 2017, he is an Interim Associate Vice President.
Dr. Harris spoke of his intent to foster an action-oriented office. Currently, there is a lot of data to work with. Dr. Harris named the four people working in the office.

Attempting to shift from big program approaches, to more grassroots efforts. Important to respect how we all self-identify — differences of all types are embraced. Dr. Harris and his team will try to create a swirl about what diversity is. The office is open door to everyone.

Students will contribute to images for the wall depicting "claiming your difference."

Dr. Harris spoke of the need to do a better job of retaining underrepresented students. Need to not continue marginalizing and isolating. His office is working with groups to create experiences that students can retain.

Dr. Harris spoke of creating experiences for our students that go past their performance in the classroom. One example of an area that could include more students is homecoming. Underrepresented students should feel welcome in homecoming by participating. Dr. Harris intends to bring different groups together. Then approach a common cause.

Peer to peer workshops will take place intent on sharing what diversity, civility, and sensitivity from your own lens looks like.

Dr. Harris emphasizes creating a "swirl" among students in terms of action, not thinking. Will also create an FYE course, while recognizing that there are many FYE courses already addressing diversity.

Questions?

There were none.

d. Faculty and Staff Giving Committee (Seaton Brown)

Mr. Brown welcomed everyone back from "hurri-evacu-cation."

Mr. Brown was a CofC student, and after graduation, continued to work in admissions. Total population of faculty and staff give about 14%-16% of total population on campus. Their committee has been charged with increasing this number to 20%. Philanthropy never ends. It's the commitment of many groups: Faculty, staff, Alumni, athletics, parents, Friends of the College to give back to the College and support our students in different ways.

Mr. Brown spoke of looking for more involvement from faculty and staff. The goal of the Faculty and Staff Giving Committee is to increase participation. Mr. Brown spoke of how giving is reflected in ratings in U.S. News and World Report and other organizations which do rankings. High ranking, influenced by faculty and staff giving, helps in Mr. Brown's recruiting efforts.

Mr. Brown urged us to please consider automatic withdrawal and thanked those who have been giving for the past 5 years.
Mr. Brown urged us to think of a favorite student—did that student have a scholarship? You have the opportunity to grant that scholarship. He described many different funds you can support.

Mr. Brown introduced Lauren Whiteside, Assistant Director for Alumni and Campus Engagement. Please contact her to set your auto withdrawal or to check how much you have already given.

Mr. Brown shared the names of the Committee faculty members: Bob Perkins, George Dickinson, Cass Runyon and Amy Kolack, Carrie Blair Messal, Laura Turner. Official faculty and staff campaign runs through November.

Mr. Brown mentioned Malcolm Gladwell's podcasts on revisionist history. Three episodes talk about education. One of the podcasts talks about impact of giving and philanthropy. That podcast can be accessed here: http://revisionisthistory.com/episodes/06-my-little-hundred-million

Questions?

Mr. Brown thanked all for the College's influence in experiences that make the university unique. He uses his liberal arts and sciences degree every day no matter if he works in his major field or not. He uses his experiences in his work as a recruiter for the College.

If you donate $50 you get a cup that allows free coffee at several locations.

e. Academic Standards Committee

i. Major GPA Policy (Quinn Burke, Bob Mignone)

Bob Mignone (member, Academic Standards Committee) gave the background of his involvement in this issue. A parent was quite upset and confronted him about the difference in how the catalog stated the major GPA was calculated versus how it was actually calculated.

What is in the catalog is often different from what departments use.

Provost McGee charged the Academic Standards Committee with coming up with a policy the College can adopt across departments in order to be consistent and uniform. Academic Standards has worked with the Curriculum Committee and Academic Planning Committee for the last two years to come up with a plan.

Quinn Burke (Chair, Academic Standards Committee) stated that the College has a major GPA policy that we are not implementing.

Dr. Burke reminded the Senate that we are not voting, just discussing two potential options that he invites input on, then will go back to the Committee with the following goals:
• consistency for students;
• consistency across programs;
• maximum transparency.

We were urged not to think just about our own departments, but about the entire institution.

Dr. Burke noted that the major GPA does not appear in the official student transcript of graduates of the College of Charleston.

He stated the goal is to make changes by Fall 2017 and have a policy that is actually enacted.

There are two options, but that doesn't preclude another option or more being developed.

(The text for both Options listed below are taken from the PowerPoint provided by Quinn Burke)

Option #1
All Applicable Coursework & All Electives

“The method used for calculating the semester and cumulative GPA is used to calculate the Major GPA by applying the method to the subset of graded courses taken for the student’s major, including any chosen concentration, track or cognate, if applicable.

The Major GPA is based on all coursework applicable to the major (regardless of course prefix). Including all graded courses taken from among applicable elective course options, even those electives beyond the required number. Excludes prerequisite courses unless otherwise applicable to the major.

A minimum major grade point average (Major GPA) of 2.000 is required. Please see specific major requirements in the ‘Schools’ section of the catalog - anomalies exist."

Option # 2
Eliminate a College-wide Major GPA Policy

“The College of Charleston does not calculate major or minor grade point average.

The College recommends using the grading system found in the Undergraduate Catalog. It is customary to include all courses taken in the program of your major/minor, whether they are part of the major/minor core or not.”

The Academic Standards Committee meets October 12. Bob Mignone and Quinn Burke will report Senate's comments and question to the committee. Will review, and bring a motion to the November meeting for a vote.

Dr. Burke then opened the GPA Options to discussion.
Alex Kasman, Senator (at large SSM) offered a couple of comments, stating that Option 1 sounds like it might be complicated. It might be difficult for Registrar to implement.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) answered that the office does its best to incorporate policies into the software the College uses. The Registrar has contributed a prioritized list of options to Committee to take into consideration.

Iana Anguelova, Senator (Mathematics) asked if the Registrar prefers Option 1 or Option 2?

Mary Bergstrom says the Office of the Registrar prefers Option 2, to eliminate the major GPA. This would bring the College in line with other universities, such as UNC. Their second choice would be Option 1, the Applicable option.

Dr. Burke and Bob Mignone gave some discussion. Bob pointed out that if Option 2 was chosen, a student may be able to graduate with a major despite having a very low GPA in that major.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator (Philosophy) pointed out some wordsmithing needs on Option 1, then asked if we have data on how many students have a lower GPA in their major than their general GPA? Is it very many students?

Dr. Burke states we do not have data on that. Pointed out that students are confused, in one example, Bob Mignone gave, students who are taking the actuarial track in Mathematics, students take finance, accounting and economic courses, but those courses are not calculated in their major GPA under the current policy.

Iana Anguelova, Senator (Mathematics) asked if we remove the requirement, would we have more students who will not be able to reach the minimum GPA? She asked a second question about why the Registrar's office cannot use the GPA calculator to calculate the student's GPA? Is this a problem for the software?

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) responded that they do calculate major GPA and their office does it differently for over a dozen departments on campus. Ms. Bergstrom provided examples from concentrations, interdisciplinary programs such as Urban Studies, Biology. There is no consistency. It also changes over time depending on the leadership, as departments change on what is counted and what is not. Students have a hard time understanding what counts and how it is calculated. There is no consistent method applied.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) expressed the concern about college wide triggers putting students in academic probation?

Lynne Ford (Associate Vice President, Academic Experience) clarified that the college-wide trigger is based on overall GPA and is calculated cumulatively. That overall GPA calculation would remain in place.

Mary Bergstrom (Registrar) emphasized that we are discussing an additional degree requirement, one of several, to clear for graduation. The cumulative 2.0 stays in place.
Bill Manaris, Senator (Computer Science) offered his opinion that option 1 is best.

Susan Kattwinkel, Senator (Theatre and Dance) pointed out that both options would restrict what a department can do. While looking at Option 1, Senator Kattwinkel surmised that a department could make the major GPA higher than 2.0. Senator Kattwinkel pointed out that inspiring students to try something out of their concentration, but resulting in a lower GPA could discourage experimentation by students.

Quinn Burke and Bob Mignone sought to explain that courses taken out of individual interest or as electives outside of the major are not applicable to the major GPA. Will clarify this with an example and attempt better wordsmithing.

Iana Anguelova, Senator (Mathematics) finds option good.

Bob Mignone discussed word choices. He had used the term "required electives," but the word "applicable" was suggested. An example could clarify.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) gave the opinion that Option 1 will require a lot of work beyond wordsmithing and an example to clarify. Need to make it airtight, otherwise why do it? Senator Kelly asked if one of the options is more suited to the ethos of liberal arts and sciences? Is there a trend in liberal arts and sciences education to move away from major GPA?

Dr. Burke said in looking at other schools, it gets more complicated with interdisciplinary courses.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at large SSM) asked if there is a reason we cannot say all courses which count toward satisfying the major requirements?

Dr. Burke shared that feedback from a person who spoke with him about it cautioned against the possibility of grade inflation, when students are able to take 4 electives, but count the three with the best grades. In this person's opinion, all four of those electives should count, not just the top three.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) spoke as a person not familiar with curricular affairs, but familiar with this GPA question for one of the standards for SACSCOC. From a computer science and logic perspective, it gets too hard to program, because you have to consider all the different cases for each student. It's not easily solved by just looking at the prefixes, and listed examples from interdisciplinary programs, the sciences, many of the mathematics majors, all the business majors, require multiple prefixes. The word applicable explains what CAN count for the major the student took. Once you think of it this way, it can be a fairly simplistic calculation, it just needs to be articulated more clearly so that everyone can understand it.
**Bob Frash**, Senator (Hospitality and Tourism Management) offered that Option 2 would not be the direction his Dean would want to take. Do we have a sense of what the Deans’ opinions are of the policy and do we have a sense of what accrediting bodies require?

Dr. Burke spoke from the perspective of TEDU, whose accrediting body requires a 2.5 GPA, there would be exceptions based on accrediting bodies. The Committee has not brought the options before Deans.

**Alan Shao** (Guest, Dean of Business) stated that this would not be an accreditation problem for AACSB [unintelligible].

**Pam Riggs-Gelasco**, Senator (Chemistry and Biochemistry) had two questions. For Option 1, using the Biology example, if Biology currently requires Organic Chemistry and it doesn't count for the GPA, can they embed that requirement in a prerequisite [unintelligible]. Her other question concerned Option 2 and maintaining the rigor of the major. You could require key courses to have a specific GPA.

**Mary Bergstrom** (Registrar) stated that yes, you can do this—there is some rigor you can build into core courses.

**Lynne Ford** (Associate Vice President, Academic Experience) That would have to be managed by hand at the departmental level for all of the majors.

There was further discussion and examples offered by Bob Mignone.

**Simon Lewis** (Guest) expressed confusion because the purpose is to get consistency, but all options are inconsistent. Maybe Option 3 could state that one has to complete all the requirement for at least one major [that major will calculated according to various GPA systems. Check with your department chair].

Dr. Burke suggested that then that becomes the department's responsibility.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator (at large, SSM) thought that the problem with that approach is that different rules may cause outsiders (employers) to think less of an institution's GPA. There needs to be a transparent way that outsiders can look at the GPA.

The Speaker reminded us that no action will be taken on this and asked if there were further comments.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator (Mathematics) opposes a minimum of C in required courses for the major, stating students could make a D in one course, but do well in another and still graduate with a C.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) pointed out that the arguments between option 1 and 2 are different kinds of arguments. An argument against Option 2 is that some departments might have to build in ad hoc schemes in order to protect the rigor of their majors. The argument for
Option 2 seems that it is too hard to come up with some consistency in Option 1. So rewriting Option 1 to achieve the clarity referred to by Senator Kelly is probably preferable.

Dr. Burke asked everyone to consider if this is a language issue or too difficult to do because of the differences across programs?

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) specified that the language would have to be clear enough so students could understand it and so that computers can understand it too.

**Pam Riggs-Gelasco**, Senator (Chemistry and Biochemistry) spoke about the Sciences being nervous about option 1 as student leave to take courses at Trident Tech. When the student transfers back, the grade does not transfer.

Provost McGee thanked all for the discussion which will help the Committee and shared that there is some correlation in how students do in Gen Ed and later, in their majors. This is not based on data, but observation. What we have now is not working.

Dr. Burke will take the discussion back to committee and return to Senate with their recommendation.

5. **Old Business**

a. **Larry Krasnoff**, Senator (Philosophy) introduced a Motion to Include Faculty in Routine Evaluation of President and Provost (pdf) (doc)

Invited Simon Lewis (Guest) to speak to the Motion. Senator Krasnoff stated this motion is about asking faculty to come up with a process to provide a template for all faculty to give opinions about the performance of the President and Provost.

Results would be aggregated into information that might be useful.

**Simon Lewis** spoke about the example of Francis Marion's simple survey sheet. That university scored very highly on the Great Places to Work, especially in the area of shared governance. It seemed sensible to use their model since they are another state college within South Carolina.

Their survey is routine, done yearly. How the data is used is up to them, and would be up to us. It seems it leads to better faculty-administration relationships.

Senator Krasnoff pointed out that a similar process has been done regarding Dean evaluations.

Motion presented (Senator Larry Krasnoff) and seconded (Senator Meg Cormack).

Speaker McNerney asked for discussion.
Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) pointed out that most of us are used to being evaluated consistently. She invited the Provost to comment on his willingness and perception of an effective evaluative process.

Provost McGee stated that he has been evaluated annually or in some fashion for his entire career. How the Provost will be evaluated is a question for the President and Board of Trustees.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at large, HSS) could not find anything in the FAM about how the Provost and the President are evaluated.

Senator Krasnoff stated that this is not a bylaws issue. He thinks of this as more a faculty-driven process. We are approving "in principle" the idea of an evaluation. If approved, this would trigger developing a process and instrument which would involve a wide variety of constituents.

Speaker McNerney added that this is not a Bylaws change, and is not under direct faculty jurisdiction. As he understands the Motion, we would be advocating something to the Board and the President for them to adopt.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) asked about the Dean surveys and asked for an update on that status.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker (Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs) has with her office aggregated three years of surveys for the Provost to use in evaluating Deans. Not every Dean for every year. The Provost is committed to using that sort of input as part of his evaluative process. Her office has a recent query from the Faculty Welfare Committee about Dean's evaluation by the Provost and Chair's evaluations by the Deans. She is compiling that information into a written report for Faculty Welfare.

Iana Anguelova, Senator (Mathematics) asked for clarification on to whom are we proposing this motion.

Speaker McNerney stated the President evaluates the Provost and the Board of Trustees evaluates the President.

Anguelova summarized that would be a survey from the faculty that the President can use, although they do not have to. This cannot be formally enforced, just suggested.

Alex Kasman, Senator (at large SSM) asked if we could we collect this information and present it to the Provost and the President?

Speaker McNerny affirmed with, "Yes."

Senator Krasnoff said this motion could trigger a process, or it could take the form of a report. The Senator would like this to be faculty designed process, and would not be hard to do, looking at templates from other universities.
Susan Kattwinkel, Senator (Theatre and Dance) asked for clarification on the Provost evaluation.

Provost McGee clarified that what data points the President uses and how he uses them in the evaluation of the Provost is the decision of the President.

Senator Kattwinkel spoke of the parallel with faculty evaluation. Her colleagues’ opinions of her are not taken into account in yearly evaluations, just at tenure and promotion. Her students’ evaluations of her are taken into account. Senator Kattwinkel then wondered if the survey from Francis Marion is a good model. Do we know if in faculty evaluation at FMU, do colleague opinions show up in their faculty evaluations?

Simon Lewis (Guest) said the analogy was a good one, as students don’t know what is going on in our heads as we prepare our classes, we as faculty do not know what is going on behind the scenes in administration. The instrument should reveal information, even though the administrators are doing a different kind of job.

He expressed that all evaluations should be routinized. It should not be frightening. Chairs, Deans, Provost and Presidents should be evaluated, and it should be routine at all levels.

Lynn Cherry (Associate Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Resources) offered an observation from many years prior when she served as Chair of the Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness which had started the process of evaluating Deans. Doing some sort of meaningful evaluation may be fairly simple, but the instrument used for evaluation may have to be somewhat general, so that faculty can respond with a degree of confidence even if they are not sure what exactly the administrator does.

Irina Gigova, Senator (at-large, HSS) stated that she believes in giving feedback to superiors, but we need to figure out how to implement it. What mechanism is in place for faculty to register that this regular evaluation is not being conducted? Faculty Welfare?

Bill Manaris, Senator (Computer Science) observed that student evaluations are not mandatory, and he suspects that some faculty will do the same. He opined that this will help transparency.

Senator Krasnoff stated that the instrument should help clarify what the administrator does, using the example of Deans.

Blake Stevens, Senator (at-large, School of Arts) pointed out that the language of the motion was problematic in restricting evaluations to tenure track faculty, and perhaps should include adjuncts and all faculty.

A friendly amendment was offered to strike tenure-track and replace with all faculty.

Speaker McNerney asked if there was unanimous consent to friendly amendment? The Faculty Senate voted Yes.
The Speaker asked for further discussion.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator (at large, SSM) stated that this is a good idea, and the small details will be worked out in the process.

**Jason Vance**, Senator (at-large, SSM) echoed Lynn Cherry's observation that evaluations are often conducted by people who have no knowledge of the job. The review instrument should flesh out what the administrators are doing, instead of gathering grumbling.

**Bill Manaris**, Senator (Computer Science) [unintelligible]

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) stated that the survey should tease out what kind of interactions the faculty member has with the Provost (or Dean, or President). Senator DeLaurell suggested Jason Vance serve on the Committee that designs the instrument. The willingness of all of us to open ourselves up to peer evaluation is commendable and is part of being a scholar and an academic. We recognize that getting data is not a bad thing. What you should do with the evaluation is out of our control.

**Bob Frash**, Senator (Hospitality and Tourism Management) pointed out that in bottom-up management, in the service industries which dominate our economy, each level of management is evaluated. He thinks that Academic Affairs would applaud this kind of feedback and we should have a vehicle to address this.

**Joe Kelly**, Senator (at large, HSS) asked if there was a discussion of confidentiality? Will the results be treated the same way our evaluations are treated?

Is the intent for the results to be made public?

**Simon Lewis** (Guest) expressed that he sees the intent as being an additional piece of information, to be used by the people doing the evaluation. The Board of Trustees will get the information.

Senator Kelly suggested that the anonymity of evaluators and confidentiality of those evaluated be written into the motion.

**Susan Kattwinkel**, Senator (Theatre and Dance) asked who is responsible for designing and submitting the form for approval by the Senate, and then who will be responsible for this on a yearly basis?

Simon Lewis offered that this is one of the details of discussion.

Senator Larry Krasnoff stated that he is confident that we could come up with a process, similar to the process that we followed with Deans and Chairs.

The Speaker clarified that a committee could be formed by going to the Committee on Nominations and Elections.
The Speaker offered the Motion for a vote. The Senate voted on the motion, which was approved.

6. **New Business**

a. Quinn Burke (Chair, Academic Standards Committee) introduced a Motion to add One Earth Credentialing Agency to International Admissions (pdf) (doc). He gave an overview, stating that international students require evaluation of credentials, including transcripts, GPA calculations, and courses. International Admissions was working with four credentialing agencies to help with this evaluation. They lost one.

One Earth would become one of the four agencies which helps the department credential students. There is a list of top universities that use One Earth, and it has the support of the International Admissions department. Dr. Burke proposes that the Senate approves the addition of One Earth as a credentialing agency.

Questions?

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator (Accounting and Legal Studies) asked if this was a vendor? Who pays for it?

**Su Frost** (Office of Admissions) stated that the student is responsible for paying for their own evaluation.

Speaker McNerney stated that since this is a motion from Committee it does not require a second.

The Senate voted on the motion, which was approved.

b. **Jason Vance, Chair, Committee on Bylaws and the FAM,** presented a report (pdf) and a **Motion to Alter Composition of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President (pdf) (doc)**

Jason Vance explained the history of the motion.

In reviewing the motion, Senator Vance pointed out the merits: would strengthen relationships between committee chairs and the President and accountability. Concerns include difficulty to seat committee. This is solved by allowing committee chairs to designate a representation.

Dr. Vance introduced the revised motion.

Speaker McNerney asked for discussion.

**Alex Kasman**, Senator (at large, SSM) mentioned the purpose of committee: communication between faculty and the President.
Provost McGee asked for the use of full committee titles to avoid confusion about truncated names of committees.

Dr. Vance reported dissent from a colleague. By guaranteeing representation from the named committees, it excludes some faculty. Concerns may only be represented by the Chairs of the named committees.

Joe Kelly, Senator (at large, HSS) offered that the advisory committee should not be a suggestion box. He stated that we have so little power, let’s consolidate. He expressed support for this idea.

Meg Cormack, Senator (Religious Studies) expressed support and pointed out that the six additional faculty members allow greater representation.

Tom Kunkle, Senator (at large, SSM) expressed concern about listing adjuncts on the committee. He wants adjunct committee representation, but is concerned that are we running out of adjuncts who have the time available to serve on many extra committees. Is there a way to soften the language to suggest adjunct inclusion?

Jason Vance said the language of the committee already includes an adjunct committee member.

Speaker Mcnerney reminded us that for a motion to change or amend the bylaws, it must pass by a two thirds majority and be ratified by the full faculty.

The Senate voted on the motion, which was approved.

c. Christine Finnan, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education introduced two proposals left over from last spring.

   i. History Proposal (pdf)

A series of Special Topics courses are listed as non-repeatable, but each time they are offered, it is a different subject, so they want to change them from non-repeatable to repeatable.

Speaker Mcnerney reminded us that as a motion from Committee, it does not need a second, and invited discussion.

No discussion.

The Senate voted on the change, which was approved.

   ii. English Proposal (pdf)

The English department would like a change in description for English 512, Southern Literature, to better reflect current faculty.
No discussion.

The Senate voted on the change, which was approved.

d. Two proposals from the Faculty Curriculum Committee were introduced although the Chair was not able to be there.

i. New course CSCI 281 (pdf)

Provost McGee made a motion that that CSCI 281 be remanded back to committee. The motion was seconded, and remanded back to committee.

ii. Delete FREN 341 and change the French Program of Study to reflect this deletion (pdf)

Shawn Morrison (Guest, French) was able to explain the request to delete FREN 341.

No discussion.

The Senate voted on the change, which was approved.

7. Constituent’s general concerns

Speaker McNerney asked for constituent concerns. There were none.

Speaker McNerney thanked all for attending and accomplishing business despite the difficulties brought by Hurricane Matthew.

8. Adjournment, 7:24PM