

## Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 12 January 2016

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 12 January 2016 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

### Agenda

1. **Call to Order: 5:06 PM**
2. The minutes of the [8 December 2015 Regular Meeting](#) were approved as posted.
3. **Announcements and Information:** none.
4. **Reports**

#### A. **Speaker of the Faculty McNerney**

The Speaker explained that the date of the special meeting of the Senate focusing on budget matters, originally scheduled for January 19, has been shifted to January 26.

He thanked those who submitted responses to the related Google form survey and apologized for any difficulty some may have had in accessing the form. He said, reiterating information he sent out in a recent campus-wide email, that he has sent out an invitation to a number of individuals and offices around campus to respond to questions and come to the meeting to participate in conversation with faculty about the budget. All invitees have responded affirmatively, and the agenda for the meeting will be distributed by January 19, a week ahead of the meeting as dictated by our by-laws.

He reported that the College will proceed with a second round of budget cuts and said that Provost McGee will likely address this in his report to follow [below].

He thanked former Speakers of the Faculty Lynn Cherry, Bob Mignone, and Joe Kelly for taking some of their time to join him in a recent meeting with the Provost to discuss the budget cuts. He also thanked the Faculty Budget Committee for their long meeting on 11 January with the Provost to discuss budget cuts, at which both he and former Speaker Bob Mignone were also present.

The Speaker reported that he has been told that there will be an Academic Affairs (AA) budget process this year similar to last year's, which was marked by open meetings and transparency. He asked faculty to consider attending these meetings, and praised last year's process as initiating an important change in how we budget in AA.

He announced that on 28 & 29 January, the Board of Trustees (BOT) will be meeting. While all the committee meetings on Thursday (1/28) are open for faculty to attend, the Speaker recommended that faculty especially consider attending the Academic Affairs Committee meeting (10-11AM, Alumni Center, School of Education, Health, and Human Performance), followed in the same location by the Budget and Finance Committee (11:15-12:15). The Speaker will give a report to the BOT on the special meeting of the Senate.

Other campus events and meetings he called attention to and recommended attendance at:

- open forum on Information Technology (Thursday 1/14, 3-4 PM, Alumni Center), at which IT leadership and members of the IT Strategic Advisory Committee (ITSAC) will share information about their goal-setting for FY 2017 and '19 and ask for input from those attending.
- Martin Luther King, Jr. Program and Candle Light Vigil (Thursday 1/14, 6 PM, Sten Center Ballroom & Garden), featuring keynote speaker Senator Marlon Kimpson.
- Teaching, Learning, Technology (TLT) Conference (replacing the Faculty Technology Institute), for which registration is now open, and which will run during Spring Break (Tuesday, March 8 through Thursday, March 10).

On SACSCOC reaffirmation, the Speaker noted that reports at the present meeting will speak to our efforts along these lines, adding that while much has been done, much more remains to be done. He expressed confidence that we will be able to do what is needed for a successful visit next fall.

He closed by noting that there is on the agenda no business, per se, for the night's meeting, which, he hoped will allow more time for questions, discussion, and conversation and perhaps even spark future responses to the meeting's reports or items of business for future Senate meetings. In relation to calls he has heard for the Senate to be proactive and deliberative and not simply reactive, the Speaker suggested that the meeting's agenda seems well suited to that.

#### **B. Provost McGee ([PDF](#))**

The Provost seconded the Speaker's call for faculty to attend the Thursday committee meetings of the BOT, adding that the full board meetings are also open to the public (on the morning of the 29th in the board room in Randolph Hall).

#### **Budget Update - Academic Affairs (AA)**

The Provost reported that all units of the College are working to address the mid-year cuts that he reported in December. He expressed his gratitude for the advice and counsel of the deans, the Faculty Budget Committee, the Speaker, and the group of former speakers, which advice and counsel he characterized as key in "creating and clarifying our tradition of budget transparency."

The review process for the second round of budget cuts in AA is nearly over, he reported, in order to meet a request that reductions be finalized in time for the upcoming BOT meeting. He said that in AA there will be "modest reductions" in recurring expenditures and elimination of one faculty and three staff positions. He added, however, that he anticipates that one vacant staff position will be converted into a faculty position to replace the one eliminated. While this seems a strange way of going about things, he assured the Senate that it makes sense within the process. He also noted that all cuts have been considered carefully and with the goal of minimizing impact on our academic mission at the forefront. He invited questions,

either to himself or any other member of the senior leadership of AA present at the meeting.

All told, the Provost said, there will be a permanent budget reduction of about \$360,000 in AA. Some non-recurring funds may be able to be used to reduce the impact of this year's short-notice cuts. He added that he expects cuts to be finalized well ahead of the Senate special meeting on the 26th and can be discussed at that time. He said he will attend that meeting alongside other invited College leadership.

### **December Commencement**

The Provost reminded the Senate of a memo he sent to the campus community last January regarding the December commencement, noting that a 2015 commencement would be held (and it was), but that a 2016 December commencement was not guaranteed, and that a decision on continuing the December ceremonies would be made after a study of participation at the 2015 event. The President and BOT have purview over the decision.

While the last ceremony is still under study, the Provost said that participation did, in fact, decline, as it has for the past few years. The expense of the ceremony is not prohibitive, but it does require funding and a great deal of faculty and staff effort. Here he recognized the considerable effort of the Registrar's Office to plan and execute these ceremonies.

The Provost said that we need to consider the relative value of the ceremony to the modest number of students who participate at a time when, although the ceremony's costs are not exorbitant, every effort is being made to cut costs and in light of our commitment to a unique spring ceremony. He called for any advice the faculty has on the December commencement, either sent directly to him or to the President. The decision needs to be made by early February to give notice and ample lead time for all involved. He noted that the official College calendar does not at present list a ceremony for December, but one can be added if the decision goes that way. Finally, he said that he is leaning against the ceremony, but he is not the decision maker in this case.

### **Course-Instructor Evaluations for Fall 2015**

The Provost noted that after his request last spring that instructors set aside class time for students to complete course-instructor evaluations, the response rate increased significantly (around 70%). Fall 2015's response rate was similar, at 69%. In the paper form era, the range was 70-80%. The change to in-class administration has made a significant impact and addresses the concern of senior faculty serving on evaluation committees that our response rates were too low to use the evaluations as part (but not all) of teaching assessments.

He added that chairs, deans, and the faculty advisory committee on tenure and promotion, are not making uncritical or simplistic use of these evaluations but, rather, using the data in thoughtful ways as one among many ways to help judge and improve instruction.

### **Faculty Activity System (FAS) Entries**

January 31 marks the ten-year anniversary of the launch of the FAS, thousands of entries have now been made, and the Provost thanked academic units who have made use of the FAS. Voluntary use of the FAS, however, is now ending. It is critical, he said, that roster faculty enter their activities into the FAS for the purposes of institutional assessment and decision making. All roster faculty are required to enter their activities into the FAS by May 15, 2016 for the 12 months proceeding the date. Faculty can expect reminders of this requirement.

The Provost said that he recognizes the dissatisfaction some have voiced with the system (such as particular limitations) and noted that there have been conversations with the vendor on many occasions since fall 2014, when the Provost announced the movement toward compulsory use of the FAS. We must, however, not delay full implementation of the system while we await improvements, he said.

### **SACSCOC Accreditation**

The Provost deferred discussing reaffirmation, given Dr. Bhati's report at the meeting (after his), but expressed his appreciation for the efforts of all involved.

### **New and Revised Academic Policies**

The Provost enumerated a number of policies currently being worked on or developed, noting that this work on policies is needed to strengthen our policy apparatus and improve our footing for reaffirmation. The policies he listed include course numbering, syllabus, divisional faculty credentialing, undergraduate program review, and curriculum workflow and alignment.

He said he recognizes that the work on policies done by faculty leaders and committees is "time consuming and painful," but stated that the efforts have been productive and, in line with the purpose of assessment, the work is helping make us "a stronger and more consistent institution."

### **IRS Audit of the College**

The Provost noted that around a year ago, the College received notice of an impending audit by the Internal Revenue Service. The reasons for the audit are unclear. After eight months of auditing and questioning, especially of Payroll Director, Everett McInnis, the IRS concluded that, as the Provost put it, "we had absolutely no deficiencies whatsoever"; it was "a perfectly clean IRS audit." The Provost added that for an organization of our size, "this should be impossible."

Mr. McInnis, the Provost said, deserves great credit, congratulations, and pats on the back for his work.

### **Questions / Discussion**

**Linda Bradley McKee**, Senator - School of Business, added for the record that Mr. McInnis is a graduate of our Masters in Accountancy program.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences and Faculty Budget Committee Chair, asked what the Provost's plan is for distributing the list of budget cuts.

The Provost replied that revisions to the list of cuts made since the Faculty Budget Committee saw the list on Monday, January 11 have gone out to the deans. He said that, to his understanding of previous discussion, the ideal would be to "push out all of the cuts across the institution simultaneously, not just those for Academic Affairs, and that's what [he] will endeavor to do later this week, in working with the President." He specified that the cuts have not changed much since the Faculty Budget Committee saw them.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, asked for and received a confirmation from the Provost that in his report he specified a net loss of two faculty lines in the latest round of cuts. The Senator noted that these cuts are in addition to the three specified in the first round of cuts.

He then asked the Provost what the number is of faculty lines that would ordinarily have been replaced yet, at present, for which searches are being held up.

The Provost said that the question is a good one. He explained that for the purpose of these decisions, faculty lines fall into three categories: lines that may be headed toward reduction; lines whose replacements are being "slowed down" but have not be eliminated or targeted for elimination, yet may become resources if our budgetary situation worsens; and faculty searches that are ongoing right now because they are perceived as critical and time sensitive. The Provost then confirmed with Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker that there are "around a dozen" lines in the second group. The Provost said that he released one of these lines on the day of the meeting.

Are these lines either vacant or currently occupied by a person who is retiring?, asked Senator Krasnoff. The Provost affirmed this, adding that staff positions are somewhat different in that they can be vacated a any time in the year, whereas, in most cases, faculty lines are vacated between academic years. Ordinarily, in the case of the lines being discussed, searches would have already begun for replacement beginning next academic year.

Senator Krasnoff stated that faculty would like assurance that some level of lines would be able to go forward. He added that for "this year, essentially, searches are suspended." The Provost disagreed. Krasnoff countered that in the case of retirements, replacement is suspended. The Provost said that it depends on the line.

The Senator asked the Provost if the faculty can have some assurance of replacement hiring so that departments can work on appropriate timelines for their searches. He suggested, for instance, that departments might be notified by September 15 if they can conduct a search.

The Provost said that in the case of lines that are still on hold this year, in early February he will give deans a definitive answer on whether or not they can proceed on searches for tenure-stream faculty and visiting faculty, or not at all. This will give certainty about those lines for the rest of the year.

As to next year's lines, the Provost said that he is not sure it would be "financially prudent" to give a September 15 guarantee, since the financial indicators are not strong that early, as we have learned, he said, from our recent experiences. There are

positions, however, he said, that will be essential to allow students to graduate in a timely fashion and positions critical to a secondary accreditation in one or more of our departments. These are critical replacements. The goal, he said, is always to give a full year for faculty searches, if possible, but this has to be balanced with our financial situation.

**C. Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, Divya Bhati ([PDF](#))**

Dr. Bhati explained that the SACSCOC reaffirmation is essentially a self-study that clarifies where we have been, where we are going, and how we will get there (slide 2).

**Slide 3**

SACS reviews take place on a ten-year cycle, and the College is among the class of 2017. There is a three-stage review of different standards. The standards are related to the principle of integrity and compliance certification. Two types of reports are reviewed in the three-stage review: compliance certification and quality enhancement.

The compliance certification report consists of core requirements (signified by numbers beginning with 2). These are foundational, and the institution is required to be in compliance with them.

Comprehensive standards are related to the core requirements (beginning with the number 3). There are also requirements from the federal government (beginning with 4).

In the first stage of the review, an off-site review committee (consisting of our peers) will review the compliance certification report (see slide 8), which we will submit in September 2016.

In the second stage of the review (on-site), a review committee will come to the College. The committee will provide a list of persons they wish to talk to. They will most likely meet with the working groups, the steering committee, the QEP committee, and similar groups. They will review the compliance certification report, but also the Quality Enhancement Plan (see slide 8).

Providing we pass stage one and two, the third stage will commence, which is a review by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees, which will take place in December 2017. We will receive the resultant letter in January 2018.

All total, Dr. Bhati said, it is a two year process.

**Slide 4**

The possible outcomes include reaffirmation, monitoring, warning, probation, and loss of accreditation.

We will send a response report after the off-site committee does its work. We must respond within two to three months to any questions the off-site committee has.

**Slide 5**

In Class of 2014 institutions' off-site reviews, as slide 5 shows, 94% of institutions were cited for noncompliance in the area of "Faculty Competence." Most of this top ten list of citations, Dr Bhati observed, are in areas of institutional effectiveness (IE).

In the on-site evaluation (stage two), the most frequently cited area is the QEP (47% of institutions). Again, IE problems crop up prominently in the top ten citations.

In stage three, the top most-cited area is the IE standard for educational programs (12%).

### **Slide 6**

The standards (97 in all) institutions are evaluated on are related to the seven key areas listed on this slide:

- President (CEO) & Board Authority
- Faculty Roles, Responsibilities, & Qualifications
- Academic Program Quality Assurance
- Institutional Effectiveness & Continuous Improvement
- Federal Concerns: substantive change, online programs, student welfare, & consumer protection
- Support Services & Resources
- QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan)

### **Slide 7**

Dr. Bhati emphasized the need to provide evidence to back the claims we articulate to meet SACS expectations. This slide lists four areas of high expectations:

- Demonstrate how well institution fulfills stated mission
- Commitment to student learning and achievement (Student Learning Outcomes)
- Commitment to quality enhancement through continuous assessment and improvement
- Documented quality and effectiveness of all programs and services (Assumption: IE processes are mature and incorporated throughout university)

### **Slide 8**

The Compliance Certification Report, which covers past and present practices, must, Dr. Bhati stressed, be submitted in September of 2016, no matter what. This is submitted to the off-site committee, and upon their review, should they have questions, we will have an opportunity to file a response report in two to three months. We cannot build policies and procedures in that period, she said, so it is very important that we build these and improve our existing policies and procedures ahead of time.

The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is submitted six weeks prior to the on-site visit. Our on-site visit is set for March 2017, so the QEP will be submitted in January or February 2017. The QEP committee will present the plan to the on-site committee, and the evaluation occurs at that time.

### **Slide 9**

This slide features a timeline running from November 2014 to January 2018, encompasses all the stages of review. and identifies milestones.

Dr. Bhati explained the process for the constitution of working groups in July 2015. The 97 standards were broken down and clustered into related groups, and working groups were formed to write the narratives related to these clusters. Each working group was assigned a coordinator, and the coordinators are members of the steering committee. Each working group was also assigned an internal reader, either an executive vice president or a dean, to read the narrative.

Dr. Bhati reported that she has meet with every working group coordinator and the primary writers from each group to explain the standards, how the narratives should be composed, what evidence to collect, and other expectations. The groups had to complete and submit the narratives by December 11, 2015. Not all have been completed at this time, she said, but she hopes all will be complete by the end of January.

The vertical line capped by arrows on either end crossing the upper timeline marks where we are now. There is a long way to go, Dr. Bhati, pointed out.

An advisory visit from SACS VP John Hardt will take place in May 2016.

We will submit our compliance report the following September. In November 2016, our off-site review and report will occur. We will submit our QEP in January/ February 2017. In March 2017 we will have our on-site visit (she noted that for the on-site visit, no one should be on leave). In July 2017, we will have a report from the on-site team as to whether we passed or failed, if they have any questions, and so forth. In December of 2017, we will have the official result from SACSCOC, with a reaffirmation letter issued the following January.

On the QEP, we are at the point where subcommittees have been formed. They are working under chairs or co-chairs and taking on different aspects of the QEP.

### **Slide 10**

The College's Committee Structure includes the following (from the "top" down):

- College Leadership Team (the President, the Provost, Chief Financial Officer, staff representative, Speaker of the Faculty, Dr. Bhati, and a member of the President's staff)
- Reaffirmation Steering Committee (all coordinators of 16 working groups, with Dr. Bhati as chair, and a representative of OIEP ex officio)
- 16 Compliance Certification Working Groups
- Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Steering Committee

- 5 Quality Enhancement Plan Sub-Committees

### **Slide 11**

Dr. Bhati stressed that all of us can contribute to the compliance document. She welcomed suggestions and asked for everyone's support, saying that "we all own reaffirmation" and are responsible for its outcome.

### **Slide 12**

"Staff" in this slide, showing participation broken down by category, includes deans and associate deans. She noted that Trustees are acting as readers.

### **Slide 13**

This slide shows the standards for which each working group is responsible. Groups are storing their information and documents in a central folder system.

**Slide 14** lists QEP subcommittees and chairs.

### **Questions / Discussion**

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked how often the College has to go through reaffirmation.

Dr. Bhati replied that "it never goes away." Every ten years we go through this process, but every five years we submit an interim report on a subset of the standards. Since SACS oversight is ongoing, we should integrate these procedures and processes into the way we function.

Senator DeLaurell asked how the last reaffirmation turned out.

Dr. Bhati replied that we did well ("happy, smiley face") on all standards except general education, for which we were put in a "monitoring" status. For one of the standards, we had to submit after two years another report, which we passed on the second submission.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator - Mathematics, returning to slide 5, expressed difficulty in understanding how it is possible that 94% of institutions were cited for faculty competence violations. She asked how competency is judged.

Dr. Bhati explained that these are judgments made about credentials, and the on-site team will painstakingly go through files for hours. They may ask whether faculty are qualified to teach their classes. They may look at graduate transcripts for the number of hours of coursework completed in particular areas, and so on.

**Jason Vance**, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), observed that the off-site review non-compliance figure for faculty competence dropped significantly in the on-site review stage (see slide 5). He asked if the off-site review team does not have the same information as the on-site team.

Dr. Bhati replied that the off-site review can raise questions that the institution will have a chance to address (for instance, by submitting additional evidence) and, thus, make a case for compliance. She gave the hypothetical example of a faculty member without a PhD in Physics teaching a Physics class. There may be a way in which that faculty member is qualified to teach the class, but the evidence was simply not in the

credentials. The institution might make the case for qualification by submitting additional evidence (courses taken, publications, participation in grants, etc.).

**Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker** offered some additional insight on credentials.

SACS provides a great deal of guidance, she said, about what kind of information is needed to credential faculty. She said that in addition to her responsibility over faculty credentials for Academic Affairs, she is writing the narrative for SACS standard 3.7.1 (faculty qualifications). Based on those experiences, she said that we need to be very attentive to SACS's expectations and have good policies and processes in place. Aside from a little trouble with specific details and with housing and accessing data, our practices, she said, have been very good. However, we have not had a robust written policy in place. Currently there is an effort to work on policy and, especially, to ensure that data can be given to SACS in the format in which they want it.

From the standpoint of presenting information to SACS, she said she has looked at reports and "focus reports" (responses to off-site teams) on faculty credentials, and her sense is that there are three different causes for citation for non-compliance in this area:

1. The institution is doing a bad job of managing credentials and documenting them (this is not our situation, she said)
2. There is a lack of precision (uncrossed t's, undotted i's, etc.). She said our credential audit will help keep that from happening, as well our policy, which will guide practice, ensuring everyone knows what to do, our objectives, and so forth.
3. There is a failure in communication, a faulty presentation of the institution's credentialing decisions in particular cases. This could happen in our case, she said, if we are not careful.

Our goal, Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker said, is to minimize the occurrence of the second and third types of problems, she said. The aim is to pass the off-site review with no problems flagged at all, and while the office pursues this goal, she asked for the patience of department and program chairs with the meticulous attention toward credential paperwork at the present time.

Dr. Bhati thanked Associate Provost Caveny and reiterated the need to follow policy.

**Martin Jones**, Department of Mathematics, asked if part of the frustration of the SACS credential audit is that there is a very low threshold for a citation for noncompliance: whether you have many or just a single problem, you can be flagged. He asked for a verification of how the review works: are they taking a sample or looking at every faculty member?

Dr. Bhati replied that the latter is the case and that SACS has increased its rigor in recent years. She said that if one bad case crops up in the off-site review and it can be addressed in follow-up, then the on-site review will pass us.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker explained that aiding in the review teams work of examining credentials is a required faculty roster (a 3-4,000 row table that lists every faculty member, every course they have taught in 2015-16, and their credentials). The reviewers examine the rows to see if they can catch problems, and if they spot problems, they are likely to dig deeper.

There were no further questions or discussion.

**D. SACSCOC QEP Curricular and Co-Curricular Sub-Committee: Charge and Progress**

Robert Mignone, Co-Chair

Professor Mignon (Math) said that the charge of his QEP subcommittee, which he co-chairs with Dr. Jeri Cabot (Interim Executive Vice President for Student Affairs), touches on the purview of the Senate and for this reason a report is in order. He said that, in addition to the update from the subcommittee at the present meeting, he wishes to update the Senate on the subcommittee's work periodically on the curricular and co-curricular implementation of the QEP, whose focus is sustainability.

In its initial two meetings, the subcommittee has extracted from the QEP proposal its goals (five) and the strategies for achieving the goals, placing both in a grid. The subcommittee will examine one-by-one each of the strategies, goal-by-goal, and expand on them, discuss how they can be implemented, and so on. The process will be completed by April 15. Many items involved in the QEP may be coming to the Senate (such as curricular changes) and the sub-committee will be involved. Items that do not require the Senate's approval the subcommittee will also bring to the Senate as items of information and potential discussion.

Professor Mignone invited input and attendance and contributions at the subcommittee meetings (about every two weeks), which he said he will make sure are announced. He stressed the need for faculty involvement, and pointed out that the timeline is relatively short (report due April 15).

**Questions / Discussion**

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, asked if the subcommittee's grid takes into account, in addition to the QEP plan circulated, the survey or other responses people have made to the plan.

Professor Mignone replied that he has not been privy to the responses, and that he extracted the grid's information from the plan as a beginning point. It seems, he added, to be a logical starting point, since the plan is approved for the QEP. He said, however, that as the subcommittee does its work, things may change.

Dr. Bhati added at this point that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning is in the process of analyzing the results of the survey Senator Krasnoff referred to, which results have been forwarded to the Deans, will be disseminated to the subcommittees, and will be posted on the web. She invited questions regarding the survey, addressed to her or the chairs of the subcommittee.

**There were no further questions/discussion.**

**E. Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness**

Professor Martin Jones (Mathematics) reported for the committee.

In September the Provost came to the committee with a charge having to do with the SACSCOC reaffirmation. In the SACSCOC five-year interim report, it was indicated that the College needs to provide a review of all undergraduate programs. A number of programs, Professor Jones reported, have already had suitable external reviews by professional bodies, associations, or societies. Those programs that do not have these regular outside reviews need to be reviewed internally on a regular cycle.

The committee is charged with conducting such reviews, and its goal for this academic year is to review at least one program in each of the schools. The programs remain to be decided upon, but Professor Jones said that since he and the committee's new chair, Professor Brenton LeMesurier, are in the Department of Mathematics, they are considering that department as one to be evaluated.

At present, the committee is developing a 14-point assessment rubric, with the hope that much of what is covered in the rubric deals with information already collected or readily available to program chairs and deans, such as in annual reports, Compliance Assist, Institutional Research, and so on. Within a department, all undergraduate programs will be reviewed (BS, BA, and so on).

Deans will help decide which programs are being reviewed. Chairs of departments being reviewed will receive a memo with instructions for submissions. Professor Jones hopes, he said, that the initial reviews can be of programs with a well-established track record for good record keeping. With a very short timeline in mind, he likened choosing such programs to the unruly schoolchild's slipping a book into the backside of his (or hers -- Professor Jones did not specify gender) britches to protect against a paddling. He admitted that his analogy perhaps lies in the territory of nearly-dead figuration, but he insisted it makes the point: if we are going to be punished, we should try to soften the blow.

The committee will put together for a five-year cycle in which every program will be reviewed.

**Questions / Discussions**

**Provost McGee** thanked the committee for their work and said that once the committee completes its scheme for undergraduate program review, it will be shared with department chairs and deans for review. The Provost reiterated that the committee's charge included an emphasis on making use of "off-the-shelf data" so as not to add work for chairs and program directors.

He also said that while we have been doing a good job with reviewing graduate programs, we have not been doing as well with undergraduate program reviews for some time now.

**Idee Winfield**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, asked about the degree to which these program reviews would incorporate disciplinary best practices. She explained that in her experience serving as an outside reviewer in her

own discipline, programs are often reviewed in anticipation of accreditation reviews and the outside review includes a judgement of how programs are doing in terms of best practices in their discipline. She also added that in the past, program reviews were conducted by the Commission on Higher Education (CHE).

Professor Jones replied that while, to his mind, an external review is the "gold standard" and if departments can afford to do it, they should do it, the committee's reviews, relying on "off the shelf" data, will necessarily be less intensive and will not be disciplinary in nature.

Provost McGee pointed to Senator Winfield's observation that CHE used to do program reviews, saying that these reviews were suspended by the state some 14 years ago. The College relied on CHE exclusively for undergraduate program reviews, and we have resisted conducting program reviews ourselves, in case the state decided to get back into the business of conducting reviews. It is now evident, however, that we will have to do it ourselves.

Some universities have gone to outside reviews exclusively, and the College "made a gesture in that direction in the mid 2000s," he added, an effort that we have not continued and for which we have not set aside funds. In his research on undergraduate review cycles, the Provost said, he discovered that the majority of the programs he looked at do something similar to what we are doing: a self-designed, internal cycle, using internal expertise and institutional knowledge. In some cases, institutions use a mix of both this and outside review (such as flagging a program for external review if it did not do well with internal review).

The Provost said that we will learn as we go with our review system, allowing that we might, indeed, shift in the direction of more outside undergraduate program reviews. For now, though, we will "walk before we run."

Dr. Bhati added that undergraduate program review is assessed in SACSCOC Core Requirement 2.5 and is part of institutional effectiveness assessment.

Senator Winfield said that at issue for her is whether or not applying a standardized rubric to all programs will actually be informative.

Professor Jones replied that the committee has struggled to come to a plan that is both feasible to implement in the timeframe and comprehensive in some sense. The committee has narrowed down to 14 items on the rubric. Whether or not the rubric will work across all the programs, he said, is still an open question. There will be trial-and-error, he said, adding that the committee intends to make a good-faith effort. Fine-tuning the process may mean sitting down with program directors to develop a better rubric, but in the meantime, the committee will move forward with the current plan for the spring.

**5. Old Business**

None

**6. New Business**

None

## 7. Constituent's Concerns

**Jannette Finch**, Senator - Library, on behalf of her library colleagues raised concerns about Yammer. They feel, she said, that college-wide announcements are not getting to them, that they're own announcements are not getting to the community, and the email-output function for Yammer does not meet this concern. She said that she, herself, cannot promise to attend the upcoming IT forum, but that she would try to get someone else from the library to go in order to represent these concerns.

Joe Kelly, Senator - SHHS, concurred with the concerns raised by Senator Finch, adding that a number of people have voiced the same concerns with him. He said that in particular there is a concern that academic events cannot be announced via an email channel but that we continue to get sports events information in that way.

Margaret Cormack, Senator- Religious Studies, seconded these concerns and added that crime reports are issued now on Yammer, and one has to go out of her way to access these. Crime reports should be distributed over email.

Melissa Thomas, Senator - Adjunct, added that issuing major procurement deadline notices over Yammer is also an insufficient means of getting that word out. This information, too, she said should be distributed over email.

Jon Hakila, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, reported that, as Campus Director of South Carolina Space Grant Consortium office, he was "bawled out by the state office" for advertising programs on Yammer, "where nobody saw them." He said he had them "go over his head," and was able to get announcements sent over email to School of Science and Mathematics faculty, but this meant announcements missed other possibly interested faculty. He said that for the latest announcement he sent the information to Lisa Calvert, SSM Operations Manager, who posted it on a SSM-faculty Yammer page. The problem remains unresolved, he said.

Steve Litvin, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, said Yammer "really stinks" [applause] and added another two examples.

While he is "really is pleased" to no longer receive nuisance email notices (properties for rent, founding felines needing lodging, and so on), he said that in Yammer communication the spontaneity is gone. The President, he asserted, should have been upset by a Yammer announcement that food was leftover in his residence from an open house, this accompanied by an invitation for anyone interested to help themselves, an announcement that came a day late.

He added that a presentation on Fulbright opportunities (last year a full house), announced this year on Yammer, garnered no attendees. While he agreed that this may not be all Yammer's fault, in light of the problems adduced in this discussion, we should re-examine Yammer, keeping in mind a middle-ground between professionalism and spontaneity.

**The Speaker**, at this point, echoed his invitation to the upcoming IT forum. Senator Thomas added here that the meeting was announced on Yammer with only a week's lead time (she, for one, had already scheduled student appointments at that time, she said). The Speaker said he would be present and would convey the concerns being raised.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, said that she submitted an email to the Faculty Technology Committee to voice concerns about Yammer and to ask for instruction. She noted that after eight months she has not had a reply.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, said that it's one thing to try fix Yammer and mandate its use, but that the administration's continued use of the Faculty/Administration listserv suggests that listserv technology is not at all insufficient or out-dated, as it was portrayed in the arguments for Yammer. Provost McGee, Senator Krasnoff said, "embraces" this technology "at every moment," and the Senator characterized the argument against listservs as "deceptive." While "the administration can send the faculty all the emails they want [in order to] communicate," he said, "we can't communicate to ourselves, and that's not good."

**Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker** pointed out that automated lists are not the same as listservs. There are technicalities, she said, with opt-in listservs that are not the same as for automated lists (such as FacultyAdmin@cofc.edu). The latter's addresses are populated based on each individual's characteristics within the Banner system.

Senator Krasnoff replied that surely there could be a faculty-accessible list populated in the same way.

**Jason Vance**, Senator - SSM, said that he recalls opinions voiced in several committee meetings about the unsuitability of the name of the system, "Yammer." The name indicates what information is present therein: "stuff that we wanted out of the Faculty/Staff listserv." While "that yammer is in Yammer," unfortunately so also is the official information we need for business. Senator Vance argued that having a more widely-accessible listserv (alongside Yammer) would offer a fix to the situation.

**Provost McGee** observed that only 60% of the faculty and staff ever used the faculty and staff listserv. "It was a charade and an illusion and a dangerous one," he asserted, "to believe that you were reaching all your colleagues with the faculty/staff listserv. You were not." We have, he insisted, "romanticized the quality of our deliberation" and the breadth of outreach with the faculty/staff listserv.

He added that knowing that the reach of Yammer is limited is probably better than it was to assume, in the days of the faculty /staff listserv, that you were. He said that we may find a better solution than Yammer, but, for his part, finds it easier to use than the faculty/staff listeserv was, though he agreed that in the room it is a minority opinion.

**Jolanda-Pieta van Arnhem**, Anthropology, said that listserv is still a mainstream technology, that Yammer might be replaced with Google groups as an alternative, but said that her main concern with Yammer is "the way that it was rolled out, without any real best practices," such as timesheet notices pushed out to a group that one has to join, instruction in creating groups, and failure to run Yammer concurrently with the prior arrangement to give people time to transition to the new system.

**Senator Thomas** (Adjunct) asked what percentage of faculty and staff are on Yammer. There was no reply to htis query before the conversation shifted.

**Robert Mignone**, Chair - Department of Mathematics, added that he finds email, which he uses most frequently, a fine medium for calling information to his attention. For him, going to Yammer for information amounts to an additional step he is not likely to take. He said,

however, that if no one sent emails anymore and, instead, communicated exclusively via Yammer, he would do so as well.

**Iana Angelova**, Senator - Mathematics, reported that the listservs worked well for her and that Yammer has another drawback not yet mentioned. She said that she is now afraid that she might miss an important announcement and finds that she ends up spending a good deal of time on Yammer sifting through relatively unimportant information. Also, giving the example that the special meeting of the Faculty Senate was announced four times, she said there is duplication of effort with Yammer that ends up using more time.

**Melissa Thomas**, Senator - Adjunct, added another concern. Yammer, she asserted, is "fractioning staff and faculty," "fractioning so many different things." She expressed concerns of, on the one hand, getting duplicate announcements, and on the other, of never seeing announcements. She also reported difficulty getting onto the Yammer faculty group, requiring multiple emails to IT.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked if the Faculty Technology Committee could be charged to revisit Yammer.

An unidentified guest or Senator replied that "revisit" implies that there is a solution.

Senator DeLaurell replied that the committee could revisit the acceptance and adoption of Yammer. She added that she "would love to make a motion to kill Yammer," but it wouldn't be productive. She suggested that the Senate use our ordinary deliberative process by making a directive to the committee.

The Speaker said that a motion to charge the committee could be made, but he said that he could also just convey the concerns to the committee. Senator DeLaurell agreed with the latter.

-----

**Bill Olejniczak**, Department of History, asked Provost McGee for a few words on where we stand with admissions for fall 2016. He asked, also, that the Provost speak to what the strategy for admissions is.

Provost McGee began by saying that Senators might consider addressing questions to Jimmie Foster (Assistant Vice President for Admissions & Financial Aid) at the upcoming special meeting (1/26/16). The Provost said that we are continuing to be selective, and that we are not interested in admitting students not prepared to be at a selective institution, which "differentiates us from access comprehensive institutions." We expect to enroll a majority of in-state Freshmen with a substantial minority from outside the state. He said states like North Carolina, Georgia, New Jersey, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois have provided many enrollments in the past, which we expect to continue.

For years, the plan for enrollments was to incrementally raise non-in-state enrollments to around 37%, having been at the 34-35% range for a few years. 37%, as the Provost said he has pointed out on other occasions, is not a sustainable target. Next year's incoming Freshman class, he noted, will likely look much like this year's, with an out-of-state number of around 34-35%. Relative to current sophomore and junior classes, the senior class has more non-residents. Next year, all classes considered, we expect, he reported, to have fewer non-resident students after the current senior class graduates.

We are, he added, recruiting differently, having less success in Florida and Georgia, who have excellent scholarships for in-state students. Consequently, more of the strong students in those states seem to be staying home. We are, however, still doing well in New Jersey, New York, New England, and Pennsylvania, traditionally strong markets for us. In some cases, we don't need any more presence in the market than we have had in the past, while in some states, he said, more visits and time spent in the market is needed for the same outcome as before. Additionally, more discounting is needed in some markets than in others: for instance, more discounting is required to recruit from North Carolina than from New Jersey. There are many metrics at work, and the Provost added that all these are bound up with our goal and expectation to have more diverse classes of freshman than we had several years ago (a goal on which we are making progress, he said).

To sum up, he said "it's a mixed bag": the environment for recruiting is changing and we are adapting to it, continually improving our analysis of recruitment and retention indicators, and trying to use our limited resources in the most effective way to recruit the best class of new students.

**Senator DeLaurell** (Accounting and Legal Studies) asked what the impact of the top ten-percent program has been.

Provost McGee said, with few deposits in so far and with the pilot program available only in seven counties, it is hard to say, but the projections are for few enough students that there is likely to be no system financial impact. He added that our caution in rolling out the program to a small number of counties at first will help us not "over-promise and under-deliver." He noted that in a couple months he will be able to speak with more specificity about the program's impact.

**8. Adjournment:** 6:27 PM