Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meetings on 7 and 14 April 2015

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting on Tuesday 7 April 2015 at 5 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115) and again, same time and location, on 14 April.

The 4/7 session was called to order at 5:05 PM and adjourned at 7:29 PM. The 4/14 session was called to order at 5:04 PM and adjourned at 6:40 PM. The first session adjourned following the report of the Academic Planning Committee. The second session began with the report of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs (item 4. G. below).

1. **Calls to Order:** 5:05, 5:04, respectively.
2. [10 March 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes](#) were approved as posted.
3. **Announcements and information:** none.
4. **Reports**
   
   **A. Speaker of the Faculty McNerney**
   
   In the interest of getting underway with reports and business immediately, the Speaker declined to offer a report.

   **B. President McConnell**

   The President thanked the faculty their service to the College and to our students, which service he characterized as a “sacred trust for all of us” and a great benefit to our students. To emphasize the importance of faculty service, he referred to an email he received from a Class of 1993 alumn who spoke to the impact on her life of Professor Goodwin Uwah. She was recently on campus for New Student Weekend with her son and stopped by Professor Goodwin Uwah’s office, but he was not on campus. She said in her email,

   I am the teacher I am today because I had teachers like you. I have often spoken of you, sharing the impact you had on my younger life, and though they have never actually met you, my husband and children feel they know you. Thank you for making such an impact on my life and giving me the tools I would need to become an effective and successful teacher.

   The President noted that this wonderful, heart-felt testament to Professor Uwah’s effect on his student is but one story of thousands of the “lasting impression faculty make and are making” on our students. “When alumni gather,” he added, “they talk about their professors...you’re part of their memory of what it was to be here, in fact, a great part of their memory of the College of Charleston.”

   In reporting on matters of facilities and parking, the President noted that the campus master plan approved by the Board of Trustees three years ago has strategically guided decisions about facilities at the downtown campus, North Campus, and Dixie Plantation. Due to the nature of our downtown campus, he pointed out, we have to be
aware at all times of square footage that becomes available for lease or purchase on the peninsula.

He announced that the College has purchased the former Department of Employment and Workforce building at 176 Lockwood Boulevard. The state listed the building at $4.5 million, but we secured $2 million from the state in order to purchase the building as excess property, and thus, we were able to purchase it for only $2.5 million. The building will house administrative operations and this will free space for office and classroom use on the historic campus, as well as opening up some much needed parking spaces.

Turning to the question of parking, the President reported that for the current academic year, we had 1,881 parking permits available near the campus and at the Aquarium garage: 1015 allocated for employees, 840 for students. The College’s initial arrangement with the City of Charleston allowed the College to sell 750 permits at the Aquarium garage, but we were informed later that only 500 permits would be allocated for the College for this academic year. The city now says that for the 2015-16 academic year we can only use 100 spaces in that facility. The College, he said, is in conversations with the city to increase this number, and, in addition, we are making other plans:

• we have an RFD out for 400 spaces
• we are working on potentially either buying or leasing a new garage at an “undisclosed site” at a good location on the peninsula
• we are considering the Brumley development on St. Philip Street.

These efforts are contingent, he said, on whether we lease space at the Aquarium garage and, if so, how many spaces we can secure.

The President said, in accordance with the master plan, the College is pursuing other real estate opportunities. He reported that, due to outbidding by a competitor, the College could not acquire the YWCA property on Coming Street. While it appraised at around $4.5 million, it sold for $6.2 million.

The College will be looking to see, he added, if there are public/private partnerships that can help us expand our footprint.

The President also announced that, in accordance with the master plan’s mandate for new and renovated state-of-the-art classrooms, the College is developing a proposal for a state-of-the-art learning technology center to be built next to the Addlestone Library, an open-campus teaching facility that will provide re-configurable teaching spaces and cutting edge media labs for use by all schools, departments, and programs. The building will also house a digital lab that will allow the digitization of manuscripts and other materials currently in the Avery Research Center and Addlestone Library’s special collections. “This building will be to our future,” he asserted, ‘what Randolph Hall was for the College in 1829, a space that transforms how we imagine teaching and learning at the College.” He invited further input from faculty as this unprecedented proposal is being developed.
Shifting to budgetary concerns, the President explained that in the state legislature efforts are being made to pass a bond bill to support capital projects, which would help fund the College’s budget; however, whether such a bill will pass in a fluid political situation remains to be seen. If there is a bond bill, the College has added its budget requests.

Regardless of whether or not a bond bill passes, the President said that as state economic estimates are being revised, he expects more money to become available in the state appropriations process as it develops into early June.

He reported that we are currently asking the state for, in recurring funds, $750,000 to support the Supply Chain Management program and $2 million for the Computer Science program. He added that the emphasis on these two programs in this budgetary cycle is for numerous reasons. These programs have traction in the legislature, and they satisfy some of the needs of the local and state community. We have the only Supply Chain Management program in the state, and jobs are waiting for applicants in both of these fields. Finally, these programs open up possibilities for public/private collaborations with local and regional stakeholders. The President reaffirmed his high estimation of the liberal arts and sciences education at the College, emphasizing that the attention to Supply Chain Management and Computer Science in this budget cycle does not indicate that there are not “other deserving programs that we should champion.” This particular budget request, he said, is part of a larger strategy of engagement with Columbia in order to increase our appropriations to the College.

The College has also asked for non-recurring funds for capital projects:

- $5 million for the ongoing renovation of the Simons Center for the Arts
- $10 million for the repurposing of the pool wing of the Stern Student Center — 19,000 sq. ft. that will provide student study, day, and meeting spaces
- $20 million for the renovation of the Silcox Gym’s outside envelope and to begin internal upgrades
- $8 million to finish restoration and retro-fitting of the upper floors of the Sottile Theater to return it “to what it was in 1928: one of the finest theaters on the East Coast.” He added that the dome has now been relit. The retrofit will provide flex space in the theater’s long entryway off of King Street and provide access to the upper floors. In the future, the upper floors will provide meeting and flex space, and there will also be a rooftop meeting space that looks out over King.
- $6 million for upgrades to the Grice Marine Lab.

We will probably not get all that we request, but, the President said, we certainly will not get what we don’t ask for.

He reported that the House version of the state budget currently has given us $350,000 additional for Supply Chain Management and $2.5 million for the Stern Center repurposing. In the bond bill, the House completely funded the Stern Center project.

While this current House budget is not ideal, the President said that the College will continue to work to better our position in Columbia and secure as much in
appropriations as we can, “our fair share,” as he characterized it. The process is far from over.

The President noted that we are facing a potential budget shortfall this semester due to our not having met attendance goals for the 2014-15 academic year; added to a slight downturn in student retention in the spring semester. This has been dealt with by an effort to hold down costs. In recurring and non-recurring expenses, he said we have saved over $1 million over the last 7-8 months. This has meant that, in effect, there will be no shortfall.

He also reaffirmed his commitment to transparent, open budget processes that feature open lines of communication and collaboration with faculty to develop an Academic Affairs budget.

The President listed four academic programs/concerns that he said he hopes will be at the center of dialog and collaboration with faculty in the coming year:

1. The Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS)

The BPS program for transfer and non-traditional students has been and will continue to be vital to the College’s public mission. He thanked the Senate for their support of the program.

He said that he hopes discussions on the BPS will center on “reforms simplifying the on-boarding process for transfer students and provide even more options for degree completion.” More online, night, and weekend courses will encourage enrollment growth in the BPS program. He said that he hopes “roster faculty will remain open to meeting the needs of our students for such courses.”

The BPS and other initiatives in the School of Professional Studies should provide additional revenue to support the downtown campus.

2. The “Top 10%” Pilot Program (see September 2014 minutes, pp. 3-4)

This initiative would bring to the College students from seven SC counties who complete their secondary education in the top 10% of their graduating class. The details are being finalized, and the program has benefitted, the President said, from the input of the Faculty Senate. The pilot program will begin with admissions for the 2016-17 academic year.

3. Improving Campus Processes and Developing More Mature and Effective Approaches to Program Assessment

The President said, toward this end, that the administration will urge faculty to collaborate with program directors, chairs, deans, and the administration. This is work, he added, is work that we always should be engaged in, but it is particularly relevant to the 2017 SACS reaffirmation. The President observed that in his year in office, he has become aware that some of our challenges with assessment are due to two previous, but largely unsuccessful attempts to revise our general education curriculum. While some changes have been adopted, more opportunities for reform may be identified as a result of the current effort to assess our current general education curriculum. He said that he would
encourage such conversations, especially in the context of the SACS reaffirmation.

4. Exploring in Depth Potential Partnerships with other Institutions

While, in the past, we have tended to see other institutions (he specifically mentioned Clemson, the Citadel, Francis Marion, and technical colleges in the state) as competitors for students and state support, the President asserted that he would like us to view them as potential collaborators to work with “to secure a better future for the citizens of the state and offer them more educational opportunities. Practically, I believe,” he added, “that political leaders will reward those institutions that emphasize and have the vision of collaboration, instead of competition.”

The President closed by saying that it is a privilege to serve faculty and the College and by asserting that “jointly, our dedication, our energy, our ideas can take this college forward. We need to insure that result by communicating our thoughts and working positively.” He thanked, again, the faculty for their dedication to the College and to our students. In our shared efforts to insure that the College is on an “upward trend” programmatically, academically, and financially, the President said, “I need your support, your ideas and criticisms, your constructive ideas of how to change course or what we should be doing as we make choices and chart a future.” That, he said, will be his message to the Board of Trustees in a few weeks.

Questions / Comments / Discussion

Joe Carson, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), noting that the President has talked about improving diversity at the College, asked him for an update on those efforts.

The President said that he studied the issue, put some ideas in place, met with some interest groups and stakeholders, but he said that, ultimately, following an event with students, he was convinced that we need to review what we are doing on diversity. He said that he put together a diversity review panel comprised of participants from the College and respected people from outside the school and charged them with taking a “management performance look” at our recent practices and our plans for diversity and what has been suggested by prior efforts and to make a report on whether or not we are doing the right things and, among other concerns, whether or not we are too fragmented in our approach.

The review panel conducted a comprehensive study and returned, as well, to a large, prior study that was done. They found that in the current plan for diversity, there are no measurements for outcomes; however, in the earlier study there were measurements.

The panel will produce a report. This will be reviewed by the President’s Advisory Committee on Diversity, who will respond to it. Other involved parties will respond, as well. The responses will help determine what recommendations need to be followed and what restructuring in the programs, if any, needs to be done.

5
The President said that he is committed to the issue of diversity. He noted that he has been "out front" with legislative committees when they ask about out-of-state students, noting that such students add to the geographical diversity of the school and, with their higher tuition, support in-state students, but if the legislature wishes that to change, they need to provide the funding.

The panel, he said, is headed by Trustees John Bush and Demetria Clemons and is a strong committee. "Some say it should've been broader," he asserted, "but I don't need a bunch of talking at this point...we need results." The emphasis, he said, is on results, and there has been "no let up" on that front.

He added that we have made progress on other fronts, too. He reported that he met recently with a group of African American graduate students who want to help recruit more African-American students to come to graduate school at the College. He also met with the African-American alumni caucus who also wish to help with recruiting and have gotten some assistance to that end from the alumni office.

Irina Gigova, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), asked for an update on what has happened recently in our efforts to collaborate with other institutions.

The President replied that the Collaboration Council of MUSC and CofC have met and our “first foray” will likely be in Public Health. One problem that we will have to overcome is that our registrar computer systems are incompatible.

We also have talks ongoing with Clemson University, he said, who wants to bring a graduate Engineering program to Charleston. CofC would be involved with the Citadel on this, and there have been, as he described them, frank discussions about how the collaboration will work. We have a “happy understanding” he said about who will take the lead, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication.

We have also had initial conversations with Francis Marion, but we have not pushed forward with that yet, he said.

He reported no communication at this point, on the other hand, with any other university.

Tom Carroll, Health and Human Performance, noted that there is a substantial amount of money proposed for the repurposing of the Stern Center pool wing, yet there apparently was not money available to save the pool from closure. He asked for the President to elaborate on this.

The President replied that the $1.5+ million needed just to fix the chillers (apart from the other needed mechanical systems repairs and upgrades on a 40-year old pool) would have to come out of the operating budget, and that only 200 people a month were using the pool. He said that “had the pool been 15 years younger, two feet deeper,” and somewhat shorter, the decision might have been different.

The money that would come from the legislature for the repurposing is capital reserve money that the legislature has to spend on capital improvement projects. It is one-time, nonrecurring money. It comes from a pool of 2.5% of the state’s appropriated income, which is kept in reserve for six months, and if it is not needed
during that period, it becomes available to be disbursed. It is money, he explained, that we would otherwise not get. The President said he made pitches for other projects, including the Arts Center, but the pool wing repurposing was the one that caught their attention. "And if they like it, and they're cutting a check," he said, "I like it." The College doesn't have the operating funds to repurpose the wing right now: there are other priorities. But if the state is funding it, we will do it.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if the requested funding for the Supply Chain Management and Computer Science programs is primarily for their undergraduate programs, for graduate programs, or for some mix between the two.

The President replied that the request is for the undergraduate program. We are not, he said, funding graduate programs at this point. He stressed that the College will not take from the core, undergraduate mission to support or fund graduate programs. The goal, rather, would be to strengthen undergraduate programs before building graduate programs.

For Computer Science, the President said the request is for funding “six professors, assistants, and facilities”; for Supply Chain Management, most of the funding is for professors, but part is for scholarships, as well.

**Kirk Stone**, Senator - Communication, asked the President, in regard to potential tuition increases, what he thinks the ideal mix is between in-state and out-of-state students.

The President said that it is not a question of “locking in percentages,” so much as a question of determining the necessary funding to “carry out the mission of the school.” The President said that he would not be “bashful” about asking for budget increases, if needed, particularly “if [he has] been a tight steward of the money,” reducing waste where he sees it. He said that we would decline to go into the cuts the College has made, unless asked in Q&A.

He said we will remain as aggressive as we currently are in recruiting out of state, if not becoming more aggressive. And we are being aggressive about recruiting in state: we now have our largest numbers in our history to this point of applications, both in-state and out-of-state. We also have a 15% increase in minority applications.

He reiterated that decisions about the mix of in-state to out-of-state students admitted will depend on what is needed to carry out the mission of the school, and this will inform the request he makes to the Board of Trustees. We have to position ourselves to handle costs outside of our control and balance efficiency with “not being cheap: if we have to find talent, we have to find talent,” he said, adding “if we have to keep talent, we have to keep talent.”

**Irina Gigova**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), following up on the President’s mention of spending cuts, asked the President to elaborate on those cuts.

The President said that he has not filled some vacant positions, some vacant positions have been filled at lower pay, and he has cut unnecessary expenses.
He gave several examples of cuts.

Of the iCharleston program, he said, “there’s not going to be a bunch of college diplomats flying out of here overseas next year at the College’s expense.” We will continue to fund travel for faculty and staff needed in the program, however.

He said that he has also tried to use fewer office personnel.

There has also been an effort to increase energy efficiency by going to a single type of higher efficiency bulb for outside lighting.

In terms of maintenance, the plan is to catch problems earlier, before they become bigger problems.

The President also said, for another example, that we have been giving contributions to other nonprofits. But the President said, “unless I can translate it into how it enhances the student experience, I cut it.” The causes might be worthy, but the College, too, is a charity, non-profit organization. He mentioned in this connection the recent expenditure of thousands of dollars to support a sporting event in which the College doesn’t even participate. On the other hand, if an event is worthy of our support, then we may support it. He added that he has limited sponsorships to $600, as opposed to the $2,000 high-end he has seen recently.

“We are trying to do little things like that,” he said.

There were no more questions. The President left the podium to applause.

C. Interim Provost McGee (Topics – PDF, Presentation: PPT | PDF)

The Interim Provost expressed his appreciation for the support of the faculty and the staff of Academic Affairs over the course of the year.

He noted that his report will cover a range of topics, some of which he would have reported on at the March meeting, were he not in Columbia at that time.

[The minutes here follow the headings of the slides in the Interim Provost’s Presentation (PPT | PDF).]

Undergraduate Admissions Update for 2015-2016 (Slide 2)

The Interim Provost described this year’s recruitment as “not bad, but it was a little disappointing: we missed a few goals.”

His update focused on recruitment for next year, and he began by thanking faculty who participated in making calls to prospective students. While some departments and programs have made this a practice, it is not something we have typically done on a large scale. Anecdotal evidence suggests that our prospective students have appreciated these calls from faculty.

While before May at the earliest, the Interim Provost said, it is difficult to say much meaningful about projected yield, we do find year-to-year comparisons from the same time of year useful. We currently have over 11,500 completed undergraduate
applications, several hundred more than at the same time last year. He provided some “cherry-picked data” from applications so far:

- we’re doing very well with high-achieving in-state students, up from last year at the same time
- we’re doing as well, if not better than last year at the same time with high-achieving out-of-state students
- in-state applications and deposits are up substantially over last year and compared to four-year averages
- the number of out-of-state applications is comparable to last year, and the yield is much better than last year’s, “stunningly so,” he said, compared to the same point in time last year
- minority applications from African Americans, Hispanic, and other students of color are up very substantially

A very strong class appears to be coming to the College in the fall, both in terms of students and in terms of tuition needed to meet our financial objectives.

**Report on Deans’ Surveys** (Slide 3)

The Interim Provost explained that he had planned to give this part of his report in April.

Five Deans from the six academic schools were evaluated on their performance by roster faculty, excluding Dean Tillis of the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs due to his brief time on the job so far. The Interim Provost explained that this survey information will factor into the full evaluations of the Deans to be completed in May.

Response rates were strong: all schools’ response rates were over 30%, four of the five had rates of over 50%, and one school had a rate of over 2/3 of the faculty responding.

Strengths: faculty found that Deans were excellent advocates for meeting their departments’ and programs’ resource needs for the classroom, research, and service. Some comments focused on strengths of Deans as communicators.

Weaknesses: Some comments, on the other hand, pointed out areas in which Deans could improve their communication. In some schools, the survey revealed a desire for greater transparency about how decisions are made. In some schools, results suggested the importance of providing faculty access to their Deans. Across the schools, there also seemed to be some concern that Deans’ attention and energy was devoted more to some programs than others.

The comments that faculty allowed the Deans to see, the Interim Provost said, have already been shared with them, as have the quantitative data, so they need not wait for the full evaluation to be completed in May to begin acting on the responses.
Report on Tenure, Promotion, Third Year Review (Slide 4)

The Interim Provost thanked the departmental review committees for the significant quantity and quality of the work they did; the Deans, who have to read many files in a short space of time; the college-wide, elected faculty Tenure and Promotion committee, who read and evaluated an enormous number of cases; and the staff of the Academic Affairs office, for their extensive work collaborating with the Deans, the chairs, and all the faculty involved.

There were 70 tenure and promotion cases this year. Below are the actions and results:

- 27 Third-Year Reviews (all positive)
- 22 Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor (21 positive, one negative)
- 15 Promotion to Professor (14 positive, one negative)
- 1 Promotion to Senior Instructor (positive)
- 0 Faculty Librarian Tenure/Promotion

Revisions to the Faculty/Administration Manual (Slide 5)

The Interim Provost reminded the Senate of a prior Senate discussion regarding a potential change to the F/AM that would change how we refer to our adjunct faculty by creating the title of “Adjunct Lecturer,” or in cases of very experienced adjunct faculty, “Adjunct Senior Lecturer.” Many committees have vetted this measure.

[Note: this measure was not on the agenda for the meeting]

The Interim Provost also noted that on the agenda are two potential revisions to the F/AM brought by the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual: to more clearly define “Graduate Faculty” and to add “University Professor” as an honorary rank, a successor to an honorary rank of “Distinguished Professor” once extant at the College.

He also called attention to two documents that also would change the F/AM for next year and which he distributed prior to the Senate meeting.

One (PDF) would change the section of the F/AM dealing with Tenure and Promotion by

- instructing departmental evaluation panel chairs to seek out at least 20 recent graduate reviews
- asking chairs to provide more clarity about the selection process for external reviewers
- clarifying that, for faculty colleagues who have not yet been promoted to Professor, service as department chair, program director, and Associate Dean will count as service alongside other kinds of service

The other (PDF) summarizes a change in summer compensation, clarifying both a reference to an obsolete state law and limits on summer compensation.
He offered these two documents for discussion in Q&A.

**Comments on the Senate Agenda** (Slide 6)

The Interim Provost thanked the Budget Committee, who did an enormous amount of work this year as the budget process was revamped. The process was transparent, with Deans, Associate Vice Presidents, and others reporting to the Interim Provost and making requests “in the full light of day.” The Interim Provost has produced a budget out of this process, which he described as very labor intensive for those involved, particularly the faculty committee. He noted that members of the committee informed him that they spent more time on this committee than they have ever spent on any other committee in the history of their time at the College. This was an important change, the Provost said, in our organizational culture and a welcome move toward transparency in the budget process.

He noted that Academic Planning’s work on the course repetition policy represents an important change, and he thanked Associate Vice President Lynne Ford and the Academic Planning Committee for their work on it.

Finally, he noted that in the ‘Constituent Concerns’ section of the current agenda, a faculty colleague will be discussing enrollment limits in Distance Education classes. The Interim Provost observed that there has been discussion about how to set enrollment limits, especially for summer and DE courses, with department chairs, deans, and other faculty colleagues, most recently in an Academic Forum meeting the week prior to the Senate meeting. Additionally, he noted that a meeting of the Academic Council slated for Wednesday 4/8 will also take up the issue. The Interim Provost assured the Senate that class size, as part of a conversation about the quality of education at the College, is being discussed in balance with the awareness that classes also need to enroll at a reasonable level so that we can continue to offer a high quality education.

**At this point the Interim Provost paused to answer questions about the above. There were none.**

**Compliance with State Law, Options, and Motion** (Slides 8-11)

[Also referenced in the following is the Provost’s Memo to the Academic Planning Committee of March 18, Re: Sections 59-29-120 and 59-29-130, South Carolina Code of Laws (PDF)]

The Interim Provost **made a motion to suspend the Senate’s standing rule number two in order to immediately consider a motion on complying with state law (see below), asking unanimous consent for the suspension.**

The motion to suspend standing rule two was accepted.

The Interim Provost, to provide context for the motion, explained that in Title 59 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, chapters 100 and above deal with higher education, and chapters 1 to 99 cover K-12 education. A few years ago, he went on, a University of South Carolina student discovered a law passed in 1924 and buried in
chapter 29 dealing with instruction in the essentials of the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and the Federalist Papers, an excerpt of which reads:

All [public] high schools, college, and universities ... shall give instruction in the essentials of the United States Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Federalist Papers ..., and no student ... may receive a certificate of graduation without previously passing a satisfactory examination upon the provisions and principles of [these founding documents], and, if a citizen of the United States, satisfying the examining power of his loyalty thereto.

Both high school graduates and college and university graduates of SC schools are required by this law to have instruction in the documents and to pass a test in order to earn a “certificate of graduation.” The student who discovered the statute questioned why his own university and other SC state colleges and universities do not comply with the universal law. And “the long and short of it,” the Interim Provost observed, is that this caught the attention of some state legislators.

By last year, CHE had contacted the four-year universities in the state and polled them as to whether or not they comply with the law. CofC replied, as did many of the other schools, the Interim Provost said, by pointing out the large number of applicable courses we teach and that we have appropriate programming (Constitution Day) every year, but we could not say that students are required to take classes in these documents and pass a test on them. We do not comply with the law and have not since the College went public in 1970.

After telling the legislature earlier that we were contemplating how to comply, a few months ago the College informed the legislature that we will comply with the law.

The law applies to both undergraduate and graduate degrees.

Also, he noted the law as written requires a loyalty to these documents, which is unconstitutional, and in reference to which, the College informed CHE that we interpret this to mean “familiarity” with the documents (loyalty assumes familiarity).

The law also asks for a year of instruction, which is not necessarily consistent with an academic year, per se. The Interim Provost said that in conversation with CHE, the College advised them that we interpret this as instruction across multiple academic semesters. A speaker series over fall and spring semester with at least one lecture per semester and coverage of the documents, the Interim Provost suggested, could meet the “year” requirement.

Compliance options include revising the undergraduate and graduate curricula, but, as the Interim Provost observed, this is not likely something the Senate wishes to do and, furthermore, it is not required by the statute.

Another option, the preferred option, is to provide for non-credit instruction. There will be a graduation requirement in both the undergraduate and graduate catalogs that must be completed, along with the students’ other degree requirements.
Students will be steered to a lesson in OAKS, they will complete a tutorial, and they will have to pass an exam in order to complete the requirement.

While this all sounds easy, it is not, he cautioned. It will need to be set up over the summer. We will need faculty to build the instruction and test. IT, with a very “heavy lift,” initially, will be involved, and Senior Vice President/Chief Information Officer Cape assures it can be done. If the website “blows up” or there’s some catastrophic failure, then we might have to temporarily suspend the degree requirement for the relatively few students who might graduate next year under the new catalog.

The Interim Provost admitted that he is “not eager” to have to meet the requirements of the law, but it is a law and there is no excuse for not moving towards complying with it. Additionally, he said that he does not wish to have legislators think that the College is willfully ignoring something they are very interested in pursuing.

He thanked the faculty who have been working on the issue, particularly Associate Vice President Lynne Ford.

The Interim Provost introduced the following motion:

To assure compliance with Sects. 59-29-120 and 59-29-130 of the S.C. Code of Laws, an additional graduation requirement shall be inserted in all future editions of the College of Charleston undergraduate and graduate catalogs, consistent with the Interim Provost’s memorandum to the Academic Planning Committee of March 18, 2015, with this graduation requirement to be removed from future catalogs following any deletion of the relevant statutory provisions by the South Carolina General Assembly.

[the above text includes a “friendly amendment” to include “be” between “to and “removed” in line six above]

The Interim Provost called attention to the last phrase of the motion: should the law be repealed, he said, we can remove the requirement from future catalogs. That said, he added that he doubts it will be repealed.

The motion was seconded.

Discussion

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, asked if the law has ever been enforced.

The Interim-Provost replied that “there are legislators that are highly interested in our compliance with it.”

He added that he can imagine a couple ways in which enforcement could occur: someone might be fired for non-compliance (nothing like that, to his knowledge, has occurred) or funding might be threatened for non-compliance. On the latter, he said “I do not think it would stretch the definition of ‘threaten’ to say ‘yes.’”

Bill Manaris, Computer Science, noted that the law speaks to US citizens: would our requirement apply to international students as well?
The Interim Provost replied that it would apply to all degree-seeking students, international or otherwise.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, asked, since the law governs all SC high school students and most of our students are SC high school graduates, couldn't the requirement operate “transitively,” with these students satisfying the CoC degree requirement by virtue of their high school diploma?

The Interim Provost said that “unfortunately, the law is written to brook no exceptions.” If, he said, all our students were SC public high school graduates, we might be able to make that argument, but this is not the case.

Anguelova countered that at least those that did graduate from SC public high schools could be excepted.

The Interim Provost replied that the managerial problem would be “profound,” since it would require a sophisticated screening process.

He pointed out that a CoC graduate who pursues a second degree at CoC will not have to repeat the requirement again for the subsequent degree. But the practical reality for now is that it is simpler to have all graduates complete the requirement.

[Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, at this point offered the friendly amendment to add “be” to the text (see above)]

Joe Carson - Senator - SSM, asked if the Interim Provost knows how institutions like MUSC and others are planning to comply.

The Interim Provost shared what he knows on this from universities’ responses to CHE’s question. Coastal Carolina University represents themselves as already complying with the law. MUSC’s stance is difficult to discern, the Interim Provost said. USC-Columbia has “stated that they would love for the law to be modernized” and discussed steps they might take to increase students’ access to the founding documents, but this does not clarify how they are complying with the requirements of the law.

Carson asked if our approach is consistent with the other institutions.

The Interim Provost replied that Coastal Carolina has said they comply with the law and, on the basis of complying alone (but not how they comply), we are consistent with them since we will comply with the law. The other institutions he declined to comment on, but he did say that in providing an online access to materials, USC-Columbia's approach is similar to ours, though they do not have a graduation requirement that satisfies the law, as will we.

Larry Krasnoff, Department of Philosophy, expressed concern about a gap between what students are required to do as laid out in the memo and the year's instruction required in the statute itself. The speaker series would constitute the year's instruction as required by the law, according to the memo, Krasnoff said.
The Interim Provost added at this point that the online instruction would also count as instruction.

Krasnoff went on to say that the memo suggests, however, that the instruction is what occurs online. He found this somewhat worrisome because, on the one hand, for compliance, the speaker series is being represented as the year-long instruction, whereas in the memo the instruction seems to be taking place in the online element. He suggested that this might be cleaned up, such that the online elements are not represented as instruction, per se, but as additional materials. The speaker series could then represent more cleanly the year-long instruction required by the law.

Krasnoff went on to say that the statute does not require instruction before the exam, but merely that a student pass the exam.

The Interim Provost replied that it is significant that the language in the statute says "shall give instruction," which does entail that instruction is received.

Krasnoff pointed out that the Interim Provost's language in the memo says students will "complete instruction," not receive it.

The Interim Provost replied that Krasnoff was correct, and that while the language of the statute was parsed carefully in order to write the memo, the language of the memo can continue to be refined. He invited Krasnoff and any other senators who may be interested to assist in revisions if they are so inclined. He said he would share with Krasnoff another draft.

Phil Jos, Senator - SHHS, asked if there is a report from the Academic Planning Committee, given that the memo to the committee is dated March 18.

The Interim Provost deferred to George Pothering, Chair of that committee.

Pothering noted that the committee discussed the memo and provided feedback to the Interim Provost, in essence giving their assent for him to present it to the Senate.

Kirk Stone, Senator - Communication, said that he would just like to make sure that there is no chance that the faculty will also have to demonstrate their knowledge of the founding documents.

The Interim Provost assured Stone that faculty will not be tested, but he offered to join a reading group on the Federalist papers, should Stone wish to initiate that.

Phil Jos, Senator - SHHS, commented that “it's a sorry affair that we have to trivialize these important documents and the important ideas that they contain with an online test.” He said that he and many others inside and outside of Political Science “take those documents very seriously”

The Interim Provost responded by saying that Coastal Carolina went the route of writing their general education curriculum around this legal requirement, and there is nothing stopping the CofC faculty from doing the same, he said, and dispatching the requirement in that way.
“Except,” Jos riposted, “severe threats from people like me, being in a department that would have to mount 700 sections of American Government.”

“A point also well-taken,” the Interim Provost agreed.

**Andrew Shedlock**, Senator - SSM, inquired if other states also have similar founding document requirements, or is this just a “South Carolina-ism”?

The Interim Provost, having worked in Texas, said that there is a requirement there for instruction in state politics. He then deferred to AVP Ford, who has some expertise in Texas requirements. She noted that Texas also has a state legal requirement for a full year’s (two semesters) instruction in federal government. Thus, every nationally-distributed American Government textbook has a special Texas edition.

The Interim Provost added that in Texas the instruction is required to be credit-bearing.

**Roxane DeLaurel**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked if anyone has inquired into the legal status of the degrees we have granted over the years.

The Interim Provost said that, on this question, he not only claims ignorance, but “invincible ignorance.”

DeLaurel asked if the motion under discussion could be edited to “grandfather” in the degrees already conferred before we come into compliance.

The Interim Provost replied that, though he wish it could, he did not think the Senate has that authority.

**Bonnie Springer**, Chair - Faculty Curriculum Committee, recommended that the Interim Provost consider partnering with the office for students with disabilities in constructing the test questions, since there are ways of constructing questions to better meet the needs of students with disabilities.

The Interim Provost agreed that this is a good suggestion and, he added, a committee will need to be formed to do this work. Volunteers, he said, will be gratefully accepted.

**Betsy Baker**, Senator - English, asked for a clarification: will students graduating next year be affected by the new requirement?

Only, the Interim Provost, responded, if they graduate under the 2015-16 catalog. This requirement, thus, will be phased in over time: eventually all students will be subject to the requirement, but it will take a while.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator - Philosophy, said we did without this requirement for a long time. Doing it now demonstrates compliance to the public and the legislature, but a reasonable reading of the law’s “year” requirement would construe that as meaning two courses over two semesters. Is there any worry that our means of complying will appear not really as compliance but as a way of getting around compliance? In which case, the political backlash could be worse?
The Interim Provost said that others may diverge from his opinion, but he said it is "pretty evident that we are moving in greater strides in our attempt to comply with the law and are putting more effort into it earlier than are many other four year institutions," and this will not earn us punishment.

The legislature, of course, might also amend this law, and there is an attempt to amend it afoot right now, though it would not change any of what we’re complying with (it would remove the loyalty oath). “We are creatures of the legislature, strange as that is to believe, and if they tell us we have to do certain things to comply—and I’d rather they didn’t, but they can,” he said—“I’d say at this point, we’re more likely to get credit for the effort of working toward compliance than we are to be punished for complying in the wrong way, when they’ve given us so few cues.”

The President agreed.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SSM, asked, as long as there are efforts underway to amend the law slightly, is there any way to suggest to the legislature in a friendly way that they might change it to limit it to undergraduate degrees?

The Interim Provost said there have been numerous attempts to suggest revisions. He added that our endorsement of the motion might add credibility to any suggestions we have for changes.

There was no more discussion.

The motion was approved on a voice vote with one abstention.

D. Budget Committee

Chair; Julia Eichelberger

Report: [PDF] [PPT]

Budget Memos to Provost: 1-21-15 ([PDF]), 2-4-15 ([PDF])

Eichelberger echoed the Interim Provost in praising the work of the committee members (slide 1), noting the breadth of experience they brought to the table and the hard work they put in to live up to the committee’s charge.

She suggested that Senators and guests consult the committee’s report during the presentation, as well as the two memos from the committee to the Interim Provost (see above for links).

She explained the process for developing the 2015-16 budget (slide 3), specifying that budget requests follow an “historic” budget model, in which units are expected to receive about the same amount as they have in the year prior, with requests being for funds above this amount.

15 different entities presented their requests at a public hearing, the schedule of which appears in slide 3.

The Budget Committee reviewed and discussed the documents from these 15 presentations, met with the Interim Provost, and submitted a memo to the Interim Provost on 1/21 ([PDF]) (slide 4). The memo does not rank-order requests
or make very many specific recommendations but, instead, offers guiding principles for what the committee considered in the best interest of the faculty and the College.

With the committee’s memo to consider, among other things, the Interim Provost drafted a budget request presented at a public forum on 1/26. The committee reviewed this budget, drafted a second memo to the Interim Provost (2/4 PDF), and then met with him to discuss it (slide 5). Eichelberger stressed that the committee’s input proceeded and contributed to the development of the budget, rather than coming as a reaction to an already-decided-upon budget, as in the past on the Budget Committee.

She summarized the committee’s take on the results of the process (see slide 6). The committee, though they did not always agree with the Interim Provost’s decisions in his final budget proposal, felt they were sound ones, nonetheless. She noted that there will be a 1.5% inflationary increase in operating budgets built into the budget, which has not always happened and which the committee felt is a good idea to help offset the effects of inflation on departments.

Given the limited budget landscape, many worthy programs that would be very good for the College will not be funded, which Eichelberger noted is very tough to see, but is a reality of a tight budget.

Eichelberger also pointed out that one potential source for income to offset costs currently being talked about is program or course fees, which the committee endorses under particular conditions and restrictions (see slide 8). These fees would not be subject to the same kinds of limitations from the legislature that tuition increases (universal fees) are. Other institutions have such fees, such as the fees at Clemson’s College of Business and Behavioral Science assesses on majors in the college, $1,000 per semester (slide 7).

The committee recommends implementing school-based fees, with restrictions (slide 8):

- Schools do not keep all the fee; at least 25% is returned to the general fund, to offset the higher cost-per-credit-hour that the institution is absorbing for instruction in other schools
- Money can only be spent in ways that directly benefit students; spending must be publicized
- Faculty from the school should assist in setting up a system to oversee the spending of fees (for scholarships, initiatives to enhance student learning, undergraduate research, and so forth)

If the College decides to implement fees, these will not likely be assessed until the 2016-17 academic year.

Eichelberger explained how special appropriations work (slide 9), noting that the President (see above) has already explained these as monies given by the state for special projects or initiatives and the funds are not attached to our regular funding. These are projects and initiatives the legislators want to support, and
the College’s legislative team asks for appropriations for items that they think the legislature will support.

Faculty, she observed, are not part of the process of planning and talking to legislators. She added, as a personal opinion, that she thinks faculty ought to be.

Special appropriations are essential “windfalls,” and while, as such, they do not affect our budget, they may benefit certain people, projects, or units and if we are worried about what units need the most support, it would be good for us to keep track of where these windfalls land.

There is hope that through special appropriations we might secure lines and funding for construction projects and scholarships. And there is, it would appear, more money available this year in the state for special appropriations than there has been in the recent past.

Eichelberger endorsed, on behalf of the committee, the transparent budget process and provided the committee’s recommendation for multi-year appointments on the committee, since the learning curve for new members is very steep (slide 10).

She commented, as well, that there will be no growth in the downtown undergraduate population, which has implications for planning, and so adding new programs may require reducing other, existing programs (slide 10). We should continue to innovate, but we need to understand the financial universe in which we are operating.

Additionally, she conveyed the committee’s suggestion that departments work toward predicting student demand for their programs in order to better allocate resources.

The College, the committee also recommended, should develop some means of better assessing department and program needs. The historic budget model may result in relatively well-funded programs continuing to be well funded, while other relatively-starved programs continue to be starved. The committee does not, at present, have a plan for this, but has identified the need.

The historic budget model may also obscure the fact that the demand for some programs may have gone down, while the funding remains roughly the same. In such cases, a transparent process of reallocation may be appropriate.

**Questions / Comments / Discussion**

**Bob Mignone**, Senator - SSM, asked for a clarification. Are not special appropriations non-recurring? And if so, why are faculty lines being spoken of in that context (slide 9)?

Eichelberger replied that her understanding is that special appropriations can be made for recurring funding.

The President confirmed this: special appropriations can be either recurring or non-recurring.
Phil Jos, Senator - SHHS, commended the committee and commented that the report underscores the necessity for the Senate to scrutinize program proposals carefully and perhaps to ask for a higher level of "market research" on likely number of majors and growth. And we should also consider staffing, even though that carries us across a fuzzy line, in that the Senate is typically concerned with curriculum and not staffing. Proposals may need to ask for funding up front. Jos cautioned that if we make decisions with a "fixed pie," we may be making decisions that change the shape of the College without having a plan to do so: somewhere, other departments may end up with fewer resources because we have approved other programs.

Eichelberger agreed. We have a responsibility to deliver whatever we approve and, thus, resources have to be considered, not just curriculum.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked how much the Budget Committee is likely to be involved in decisions on school-based fees, and if they are approved, how likely, he asked, is the Budget Committee to be involved in publicizing how the fees are spent.

Eichelberger replied that she hopes the Budget Committee will be directly involved. The Interim Provost and the President both agree with having safeguards around school fees, she added. The Budget Committee would be a natural committee for this, but there might be other committees that would be appropriate to do it, as well.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, added her commendation and thanks for the committee’s work, saying that she is proud to be represented by the committee.

She observed, however, that she is disturbed by the classification of students as “customers.” We have to be careful, she cautioned, not to "run after what's hot" and spend our resources on that, because what’s hot will not always be hot and we might find ourselves committing additional resources to supporting it. Being good stewards of the College consists in "knowing who we are," she said, "and being the best at that." This does not mean becoming static, but we should resist the idea of the student as a customer that needs to be fed hot commodities. Instead, being vigilant about making sure all programs truly benefit students is the better course.

She expressed concern about school-based fees, worrying about the funds falling into "a black hole" and, thus, outside of faculty oversight and stewardship.

She encouraged the committee to continue its good work and urged the Senate to adopt a serious, conscientious stewardship stance toward curriculum and budget matters.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, noted that the President in his remarks stressed the core role of undergraduate education at the College and how other programs need to enhance and support undergraduate education. He added that the North Campus and also the MBA program were supposed to make money, and
this was a selling point for the latter, particularly. He asked Eichelberger if the committee has looked into this, adding that while the planned profitability of those units has been often referred to, he, himself, has never seen figures that back up those claims.

Eichelberger replied that the committee has not seen such figures either, adding that it is important that there be follow up. If a program makes certain promises about paying for itself, or even producing a profit, then we should check in to see how they’re doing.

Krasnoff agreed — echoing Jos’s concern expressed earlier — that program approval tends to be a one-way thing. We approve it, and then we’re done. There is no oversight of what actually happens.

The Interim Provost agreed that with the help of the Budget Committee, we can look into the finances of the North Campus, the MBA program, and any other program, for that matter.

Addressing the MBA program specifically, he observed that tuition in that program is new revenue to us because the students are only there for that specific program. The program also assesses a fairly large fee, and the Interim Provost noted that he has had a conversation about the fee income with Dean Shao. As a result, next year some of the fee income will be put into the general ledger. "The program is sufficiently mature," the Interim Provost remarked, "that it ought to be returning some resources to the institution in that way."

Of the North Campus, he said it is providing a promising return. We had hoped to have 100 students pursuing the BPS there, but we have not hit that number yet and, thus, we have yet to see the returns that we would like to see. It is, he said, "a work in progress." He added that "more precision" can be added to this discussion in the coming academic year.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - Mathematics, noted that there is a lack of transportation to the North Campus, which prevents both students from the downtown campus who might wish to take classes there from being able to do so and teachers from the downtown campus from being able to teach there. Providing a shuttle would help.

Anguelova also raised a concern she has with the Office of Institutional Diversity (OID). It is, she said, a well-funded operation, but "not very effective." She wondered if some of the money dedicated to this office might be better used for scholarships.

Eichelberger noted that OID is not covered under the Academic Affairs budget, but that the President did speak to a study of diversity efforts in his report.

Anguelova added that a significant part of the high cost of running the College is the cost of administrative offices, and she said her "personal pet peeve" is the OID.

Kevin Keenan, Political Science, advised that there is CARTA express service with a transfer to the North Campus, to which Anguelova replied that express
service stops at 7:30 PM, to which Godfrey Gibbison, Dean of the School Professional Studies, added, the North Campus has parking.

**Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker** observed that Kristi Brian of the OID runs "an incredible faculty diversity series," that she recommend to Senators for next year.

**Bob Mignone**, Senator - SSM, said that "in my many decades here, my several stints on the Budget Committee, this is the most promising turn of events that I think I have experienced with regard to the budget. The fact that you all have worked so hard this year breaking trail, the fact that President McConnell and Provost McGee have facilitated having faculty in the process, in the loop, is wonderful. I just hope it continues, and I will do everything I can to help."

Someone exclaimed, "Hear! Hear!," and applause broke out.

**There were no more questions or comments.**

Eichelberger added that the Budget Committee also prepared a report on the closing of the Stern Center pool. She explained they did not want to take time to present this at the meeting but that it will be posted on the Senate website the following day. She encouraged Senators to review the report.

E. **Faculty Compensation Committee** (Report: [PPT](https://example.com))

**Susan Rozzi**, Chair

Rozzi explained that the committee's report is dedicated to an update on progress made toward recommendations made in the committee’s resolution approved by the Senate in March 2013:

> College of Charleston faculty salaries will meet or exceed the median salaries of the CUPA-HR salary peers- institutionally and at each rank and discipline. The College will make every effort to achieve this goal by September, 2018. The Compensation Committee, in cooperation with all relevant administrative offices, will assess the progress being made in its annual report each spring to the Senate.

The committee, she noted, works in cooperation with the Academic Affairs and the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Information Management, and she thanked both offices for their help, without which the committee could not do its work.

Slide 3, "Peer Institution Salary Comparison," shows data from IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) comparing CoC faculty salaries across the board to those of 20 peer institutions. The data is from 2013-14. New data, Rozzi said, comes out a week or two from the date of the present meeting.

Slide 4 shows a just-under-$1,000 increase in our average salary (across all ranks and all disciplines) from 2012-13 to 2013-14. Even so, we ended up dropping one rank by comparison, from 13 to 14 out of 21, respectively.

Slide 5 shows our progress over five years, from 2009 until last year; comparing the College (burgundy line) to the mean of the means of the other schools (blue
line). She noted that this slide demonstrates that we are making progress, observing also that, at times, our ability to move toward the salary averages of another institution is a function of the other institution’s drop in average salary. Although, this at times is the case, she pointed out, we are still making progress.

Slide 6 breaks down the comparison by rank (but not by discipline) for median salaries. She noted that there might be some uncertainty in the IPEDS data because we cannot tell if all the reporting institutions are reporting all of their data for all of their faculty in all ranks, and what is reported may vary from year to year. The slide demonstrates that we are making progress at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks, and that we are doing well at the Senior Instructor and Assistant Professor ranks.

Slide 7 makes the same comparisons as Slide 6, but for mean salaries (the resolution calls for comparison on medians).

Slide 8 accounts for the causes of our progress toward reaching the goal as stated in the resolution: competitive salaries for new hires (particularly Assistant Professors), increased Associate and Professor promotion increments, across the board salary increases for 2013-15, and merit/market increases in 2013-14.

Rozzi recommended, on behalf of the committee, that the College try to determine the true drivers of comparative increases in CofC average salaries, continue to raise salaries at the Associate and Professor ranks, and allocate funds to meet the goals of the resolution before the resolution’s stated date of September 2018.

Questions / Comments / Discussion

Beth Meyer-Bernstein, Senator - SSM thanked Rozzi for the report and asked if the committee analyzed data for comparisons by discipline.

Rozzi said that the committee has looked at that but they have not reported on it.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker added that Academic Affairs does provide discipline-specific data for salary every year to the chairs and deans.

Irina Gigova, Senator - SHHS, asked what she characterized as a "self-serving question." It is commendable, she said, that promotion increments have increased over the past couple of years. She noted that her tenure and promotion came before the increments were increased and asked if there has been discussion about what can be done for faculty in the same position as she.

Rozzi replied that for those who have already been tenured and promoted, post-tenure review increments have been increased, as well, which is helpful.

She deferred to the Interim Provost, who explained that the approach of the last two Presidents of the College has been to raise promotion raises somewhat incrementally over time so as not to create big gaps in pay from person to person separated by only a few years as they move through the promotion cycle. For those in the position that Gigova described, the Interim Provost said that they will see some benefit from the increased increment for promotion from Associate
to Professor. Additionally, he said there have been increases in the Post-Tenure Review increment for those with a superior rating. He noted that some feel that that increment ought to be even higher, and this has been an ongoing discussion, he said, which he takes quite seriously. He emphasized that across two presidential administrations and two Provosts there has been an effort to create a wider range of opportunities for salary growth in the Associate and Professor ranks, while simultaneously also pushing for merit-based increase opportunities year-by-year.

The answer to the question of whether or not there will be some kind of adjustment made retroactively for those who did not benefit from recent promotion increment increases, however, the Interim Provost said is "no."

Except that, Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker countered, Deans and Chairs might, when we have merit/market processes, be granted some discretion to address such individual salary issues. There are, she affirmed, individual issues as much as system issues. One should not feel, she said, as if "my problem can never get fixed."

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, noted that "compensation is multiple things" and asked if the committee had plans to look at the issue of insurance. He added that it is his sense that the quality and diversity of insurance options is going down. The state plan, he said, even has a "grandfather clause" to get out of ACA obligations, such that certain kinds of basic care mandated by federal law the state plan does not have to provide. Insurance, too, he argued should be part of the conversation.

Rozzi said that she agrees and that the committee agrees. The committee has had conversations about widening the understanding of compensation, and she said she will pass his comment on to next year’s committee.

There was no more discussion.

F. Academic Planning Committee (PDF)

George Pothering, Chair

Pothering passed his duties as Parliamentarian on to Larry Krasnoff in order to deliver his committee’s report.

Pothering explained that the committee has brought to the Senate changes to the course repetition policy in four different spots in the undergraduate catalog (see PDF). Associate Vice President Lynne Ford, he explained, brought the issue to the Academic Planning Committee, and it also went to the Academic Standards Committee. The Academic Planning Committee took input from all the parties, came up with language and sent it back to Academic Standards and AVP Ford.

The changes are meant to clarify catalog language. Pothering went through the changes specified in the document, reiterating the rationale as provided therein.

For the change on p. 26 under “General Repeat Rules” that would strike the entire bullet, "Prerequisite Rule: A student may not take a course that is a prerequisite for a course that he/she has already passed and received credit for the second
course,” AVP Ford explained that “the way it is stated [in the current catalog], there is absolutely no way we can enforce that rule using the systems that we have in place” (Banner; DegreeWorks). Additionally, it is “unmanageable” to enforce it at the department level.

Questions / Comments / Discussion

Jon Hakkila, Physics and Astronomy, asked a question after Pothering went through the foreign language policy that disallows credit when students take a numerically lower numbered language course (such as taking SPAN 101 after already completing 102).

Hakkila explained some related problems in the Physics major. There are two entry points into the upper-level physics courses, an algebra-based or a calculus-based course. He gave an example of a student who took the calculus-based course, got into upper-division classes, but later went back and took the algebra-based course. Is this allowed?, he asked. Is there a way to stop it?

AVP Ford replied that it is up to the department to write the rule into its curriculum.

Rick Heldrich, Senator - SSM, asked for a clarification: what cannot be enforced system wide can be enforced at the level of the course within the department?

AVP Ford and Pothering answered in the affirmative.

Pothering added that departments should periodically review the specific catalog language governing course repetition for their curriculum.

Tom Kunkle, Senator - SMM, asked what the approval process would be for a department to make a specific addition to their course repetition policies.

Pothering suggested that those might be sent to AVP Ford, Academic Planning, or Academic Standards: all three will be reviewing them.

AVP Ford replied that it would be important to figure out if what is being proposed is a curriculum change or just a wording change/clarification. A consultation between the department, the Registrar, and the Chair of the Curriculum Committee would help determine what the next step is..

Dan Greenberg, Psychology, asked, in the hypothetical case of a student who retakes a course he earned a “D” in and then earns an “F” on the repeat, has the student exhausted his repeats?

AVP Ford replied “yes.”

The 4/7/15 session adjourned at this point in the agenda. The 4/14 session began with the item below.
G. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs (Powerpoint Presentation)
Jon Hakkila, Chair

Hakkila observed that the title of the committee indicates something about its inception years ago, when the items covered by the title had a kind of “leftover” status. Yet, much of the growth in the College over the past two years has occurred in these areas, making the committee’s work both exciting and challenging, and, he said, he hoped to impress upon the Senate some of the committee’s concerns, wishes, and hopes as we move into the future.

Hakkila thanked the official members of the committee (slide 2), and then shared an extensive roster of persons not elected to the committee but regularly in attendance (slide 3). The guests often outnumber the committee members, he observed, and given who these regular attendees are and the pressure the committee is under, he said, some of the junior committee members often felt somewhat uncomfortable. Most of these non-committee members have good reason to be at the meetings regularly.

Hakkila explained that this is an opportune moment at the College, conditioned by specific developments over the past couple years (slide 4).

- pressure from the legislature and local and regional business to expand graduate programs. We held conversations with the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, who, in the end, were not entirely sure what they wanted. There was, emerging out of that, pressure to merge with MUSC, to create a university by melding a graduate and undergraduate school. While this also faded, it nonetheless affected the discussion about the directions we might take.

- expansion of USC and Clemson into the area, fueled by the bona fide need to expand graduate education in the Lowcountry, whether we want them here or not, bringing potential for collaboration.

- development of new programs at the Lowcountry Graduate Center (LGC), with or without CofC’s help, though the LGC was originally to be home for the graduate efforts of the College, the Citadel, and MUSC.

- the College’s development of for-profit, non-credit bearing courses at the North Campus.

All of these issues, of course, have implications for the work of the committee.

Among the new programs and courses shepherded by the committee (slide 5), Hakkila singled out the MFA in English as a program that takes advantage of the distinctiveness of the Lowcountry setting, handled finances carefully, and offers two clever tracks (studio or arts management).

The MAT revision, he observed, smartly moved away from an either/or model for special education to an embrace of a more comprehensive approach.
He praised all the proposals across the board for their innovation and held them up as models for how to expand graduate offerings and programs.

Turning to the LGC (slide 6), Hakkila characterized the relationship between CofC and the LGC as “very strained,” adding that many on the committee are uncomfortable that the Director of the LGC, who reports to the state, is also an Associate Dean at the North Campus, which is the College’s campus and is supposed to bring in money into the College. Yet, if the LGC brings in programs or courses that compete with the College’s, then there’s a bit of a problem. He said that the College should certainly get the first opportunity to bring in programs on the North Campus.

The committee, he said, wrote a memo to the Interim Provost asking him to initiate a formal review of the memorandum of understanding that governs our relationship with the LGC and which was signed off on by the committee he [Hakkila] now chairs and a number of other committee chairs and staffers at the College. He explained that if a program is developed for the LGC by the College, it goes through a vetting process here and is signed off on by the College. Other programs developed elsewhere for the LGC are not developed and vetted by the College but still have to be signed off on by the College, and this, he said, occurs at the highest levels and only through memoranda of understanding. The committee is asking, he said, for a review of these programs, a clarification, and if possible, a method of providing for staff and faculty vetting and feedback on memoranda of understanding, just to be sure that we are not competing with ourselves or with other developing programs.

He asked, by way of closing this part of the report, “What is the role of Graduate programs at the University of Charleston, SC at the College of Charleston? How can we expand our graduate programs and create a better working environment with the LGC?” These are questions, he said, that he hopes will help clarify our relationship with the LGC.

Hakkila noted (slide 7) that the committee ceded the prerogative to review non-credit courses five years ago, an action approved by the Senate on the grounds that the courses are non-credit and the turnaround time on the proposals was tight. But while the Senate approved the move, the By-laws Committee, he said, did not, which is cause for confusion but ultimately may be immaterial to moving forward.

In the past five years, he said, there have been only two reviews of noncredit courses offered in the North Campus, and that was in the form of informational presentations. The Senate was shown a list of the courses, but feedback was not expected. He raised particular concerns:

- Few courses are staffed by faculty.
- Course assessment is non-standard. The committee is not sure, he said, at all how the courses are assessed.
• The North Campus relies on CofC’s reputation to charge more than our competitors for canned or prepackaged courses we buy from a vendor. The downside is that the main campus reputation can be affected by education at the North Campus.

The committee feels strongly that we need to ensure that North Campus programs strongly benefit the College.

The committee offered two possible ways to address the problem and provided them for discussion:

a) form a new Faculty Committee for reviewing non-credit courses, or
b) expand the size of the Graduate Committee so that a Non-Credit Subcommittee can be formed within it.

As it is, the faculty membership on the committee is small, relative to the non-committee members frequently present at meetings.

Hakkila raised a concern about huge inconsistencies in the numbering of graduate courses across the College, the details of which can be found on slide 8. The problem is a serious one. The committee proposed that a College task force be appointed, composed of faculty, staff, and administrators, to address this very involved problem.

Questions / Comments / Discussion

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship - asked if the committee has a preference between forming a new committee or expanding the size of the current committee to deal with vetting non-credit courses.

Hakkila said that the second option only came up at last meeting of the year, so he’s not sure if the committee has a preference one way or the other. To some extent, it depends on nature of review. The North Campus should have flexibility and, he said, the committee doesn’t want to interfere, but there needs to be some give and take.

Shaver followed up by asking if the formation of a new committee would require by-laws sanction.

The Interim Provost replied “yes.”

George Pothering, Parliamentarian, noted that the other solution (adding to the standing committee) would also require by-laws sanction.

Scott Peeples, Senator - SHSS, asked if there is any concern with the “canned” non-credit courses about potential student/consumer confusion as to whether those courses are being taught online by CofC faculty? He said that the information on the website appears that way. Is there any potential damage to the CofC brand?, he asked.

Jo Ann Ewalt, Political Science and MPA Program Director, a member of the committee, replied (though she specified that she was only speaking for herself). She said she was concerned, and if the information as to the nature of the class is
not there on website, we need to address that because we value both transparency and our reputation.

Peeples followed up by saying that while he doesn’t believe anything “nefarious” is taking place, he was “a little bit shocked” on seeing writing courses being offered and that it would be reasonable to assume that these courses are taught by CofC faculty and, thus, that the Department of English is responsible for what happens in those classes.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHSS, agreed, saying that we could be more vigilant about the online “canned” courses. There is nothing wrong with retailing a canned course, per se, but the online courses might be especially confusing. She reported that, looking at the website, she can see how it might unclear. As we offer more online CofC courses, she said, it is more important to monitor packaging of the non-credit courses so that we do not aid a false association between our faculty and courses that we do not teach. As it is, the website, she asserted, makes a tempting association: “the College of Charleston has vetted these courses.”

Dean Gibbison replied that so far, in his experience, there has been no expression of confusion from students that they are taking a College of Charleston course.

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, said that Eichelberger’s point wasn’t so much that students taking a course would be confused about the course itself so much as expressing a concern that we are legitimizing the courses by association with the CofC brand.

DeLaurell then asked how large the market is for these courses. How many non-credit courses are we retailing?

Dean Gibbison said that we have a number of noncredit courses on the list, but we’ve had fewer than 50 people take them so far, many of them CofC students and faculty. This is not an uncommon arrangement: “Clemson University,” he said, “plays in this space”, as do a number of leading universities worldwide. It is not unusual to partner with a third-party to provide non-credit courses.

DeLaurell followed up with what she called a “vulgar question”: are these courses making money?

Dean Gibbison said “yes.” Most of them are offered for $119 for 30 hours of instruction. We make enough money to market other non-credit courses, many of which are taught by College of Charleston faculty in community education, face-to-face settings.

DeLaurell suggested that if we are making money on these courses and they may be trading on the CofC brand, CofC could be held accountable for the quality of the courses. While this might not be a concern for those in other disciplines, she said that in the discipline of Accounting it is very important to not leave a false impression about the nature and quality of courses. She asked the committee to consider potential accountability for non-profit courses.
Dan Greenberg, Psychology, suggested that adding a new, separate committee might just fracture the process further. Is there an advantage, he asked, to having a separate committee over having a subcommittee of the larger committee?

Hakkila remarked that one of the biggest concerns he actually sees is continuity. It’s rough going when committee makeup changes quickly. Neither of the proposed solutions, he said, is good, given that it is already hard enough to seat the existing committees we have.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy and Director of the Pre-Law Program, as someone who offers a non-credit program that was vetted by the committee under the old process, spoke in favor of some kind of vetting process to protect the credibility of the course. The LSAT prep course offered by Pre-Law is always taught by faculty.

PreLaw also charges a lot less than commercial courses, he said: it’s a student service. He went on: when the goal of the people who are running the non-credit courses is to make as much money as possible, though, certain tensions can arise. So far there has been no pressure to raise the course fee, though there has been some pressure to increase enrollments.

“To be honest,” he said, “since the non-credit office was set up, I think there has been more pressure to make money, precisely to pay the salaries of the people who run that office, even though they didn’t do anything to create the course.” Having some sort of authority vested in the faculty would be good.

Hakkila replied that the committee has only the best interests of CofC in mind, and mainly desires to foster consistency.

Associate Vice President Lynne Ford responded to Krasnoff. While Krasnoff developed the course, she pointed out, before we had the office that Alice Hamilton now runs for continuing education and non-credit courses, faculty who wanted to do what he does, she said, would “literally take cash.” There was no monitoring quality of such courses. The office, while it may not develop the course — “that’s your job,” she said — does provide enrollments, marketing, and the protection of offering a legitimate course under the umbrella of the College of Charleston.

Further speaking of legitimacy, Ford asserted, “the North Campus is the College of Charleston, not a branch of the College or another university. We need to acknowledge that the North Campus is serving the broader community in a way that the downtown campus simply cannot. The North Campus houses a diversity of programs for that mission. The Bachelor of Professional Studies is a direct response to what the community has asked for.

The online courses that we have been talking about, Ford went on, are hosted by ed2go (Ed to Go) and are available nationally. We serve as a portal for students to access those courses 24 hours a day, five times a year for $119. The College makes enough money to offer the courses and ed2go makes enough money to vet the courses, the same courses offered all over the country, including at Clemson.
She encouraged faculty to take a look at the courses, which are not intended to make you an expert, but to offer you a service. She gave some examples of some courses: Excel skills, test prep, double-entry accounting for small business owners.

She said it is important not to confuse these different kinds of courses and programs.

**Roxane DeLaurelly**, Accounting and Legal Studies, asserted that the point AVP Ford made, the North Campus is the College of Charleston, argues in favor of the need to be involved in vetting non-profit courses. She said that we could distinguish between courses developed by a CofC faculty member (like the one Krasnoff referenced) and those offered through ed2go with some kind of disclaimer so that the purchaser understands that the College has not vetted those courses. By this means, the consumer can make an informed choice and we will only need to vet some of the non-credit courses.

Hakkila pointed out that the offerings are not limited to those two types. He said, for instance, that there are also non-credit courses taught by members of the community. In some cases, a course will be offered initially as taught by a CofC faculty member, but then that doesn’t pan out, and a community member steps in, instead: how would such a course be categorized?, he asked.

DeLaurelly replied that if the course is prepared by a CofC faculty member and vetted by the committee, it would be a CofC course. A disclaimer, however, would have to accompany courses like ed2go offerings. That might, she said, protect our brand.

Dean Gibbison said that we do offer a number of instructor-led, face-to-face non-credit courses, and, he said, we look for CofC faculty to lead such classes, but if no CofC faculty come forward, he said, we look for others in the community who are qualified.

He added that the North Campus has no problem with a committee vetting such courses, but this is a “rapid response” situation. Turnaround is tight, and if we have to wait for approval, it might come too slowly.

He encouraged faculty who have said that they do not know what is going on at the North Campus to peruse the website. You can find out a great deal there, including reading the bios of instructors. He also strongly encouraged faculty to drop by.

The **Interim Provost** at this point, mindful of the hour and the business remaining to be completed, said that the committee chair has gotten what he sought—thoughtful discussion of the issues he laid out—but that until the Faculty By-Laws are amended, the program under discussion continues to fall under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs. He suggested that we return this matter to the
committee to consider next fall in light of the feedback received at the meeting, if that is acceptable to the Senate.

Hakkila asked what the review expectations would be of the committee next year.

The Interim Provost replied that the committee could take up its own suggestions, informed by the Senate discussion, and that he or his successor would happily sit down with the committee to discuss how to address the concerns, and, given that Dean Gibbison has expressed no opposition to some Senate screening function, come back to the Senate with a concrete proposal next year.

There was no further discussion.

H. Faculty Curriculum Committee: Special Topics, Variable Topics
Bonnie Springer, Chair
Steven Jaumé, Secretary, reporting

Jaumé read into the record the following report from the committee chair.

[A] task force took on the task of looking at issues related to courses that would fall into a broad category of Variable credit or content courses. It was discovered that courses of this type pose several challenges for curricular integrity as well as administrative management.

Outcomes of the initial study this year led to the following issues which will be acted upon by next year’s curriculum committee

1) There appears to be lack of clarity around the differences between Special Topics, Varying Topics and Variable Topics courses. Faculty need guidance through the development of definitions and purposes of these different types of courses so that courses proposed meet the curricular needs of the department and/or program.

[Basically, Jaumé added, we have different groups of courses that have variability to them. At issue is how they fit into their departments and programs and how the Curriculum Committee should assess their content.]

2) There appears to be a lack of consistency in the use of the 3 in 5 year rule for Special Topics courses and the monitoring of those courses.

[This is the rule that says, Jaumé specified, that you cannot offer the same special topics class more than three time in five years without having having to propose the regular course for inclusion in the catalog].

In 1994 the Senate adopted a rule indicating that the Registrar’s Office would monitor Special Topics courses to insure that the rule was met. Over time, it has become apparent that the monitoring of Special Topics courses involves knowledge of the content as well as the title of each course, and therefore is clearly a curricular responsibility that is more appropriately monitored at the department level.
It is really hard for the Registrar’s office to monitor content in such courses, he said. Therefore, it needs to be done at the department level.

3) Next year the Curriculum committee will be bringing forward suggestions for changes to the 1994 Senate decision related to the Registrar’s role in monitoring Special Topics courses. And will be working on the creation of clear definitions and purpose statements for the range of courses under the "special topics/variable topics umbrella.

There were no questions.

5. Old Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee

New Course Proposal: LNSA 101 – Language and Cultural Competencies for Studying Abroad (PDF)

The Speaker explained that discussion and a decision on this proposal was postponed from the March meeting, the questions posed at that meeting being thought to require the presence of someone more expert in the proposal.

[See March minutes, pp. 7-11]

Questions / Comments / Discussion

Sean Morrison, Associate Dean - School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs (LCWA), offered to answer questions.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, noting that LNSA 101 would not be required for all study abroad experiences, but that it would be required for some, asked what would trigger such a requirement? He added that it is odd for the Senate to approve a course that is sometimes a requirement and sometimes not.

Associate Dean Morrison explained that LNSA 101 is a course that LWCA would like to be made available for any faculty member offering a study abroad experience in a non-English speaking country to prepare students linguistically and culturally for when they go. The student would find the requirement to take LNSA 101 in their course of study as represented on the study abroad website.

Krasnoff asked if LNSA 101 could be required for any study abroad program.

Associate Dean Morrison replied: it’s only for our (CofC) programs, if faculty choose to require it.

Krasnoff asked if there is any particular mechanism for a department to make the requirement?

Associate Dean Morrison explained that if a department wants to require LNSA 101 for a study abroad program, it should contact LCWA, who will assist in locating a faculty member who might be able to offer the course.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, raised a different issue: what if the faculty member going abroad wants to teach the course?
Associate Dean Morrison noted that there are faculty members who do their own language prep as part of their course of study. LNSA 101 would not interfere with that at all.

**Decision:** the proposal passed on a voice vote.

6. **New Business**

**A. Nominations and Elections: Election to Senate Committees**

Denis Keyes, Chair

Richard Nunan, a member of the committee, stood in for the Chair, who could not make the meeting due to a teaching obligation. He explained the committee’s business before the Senate was to elect members for the three standing Senate Committees: Academic Planning, Budget, By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual. Nunan presented a slate of nominees for each, and called for further nominations from the floor.

The Speaker explained that these three committees are elected by the Senate, while the other committees are standing committees of the college and are elected by the faculty at large.

There were no additional nominations.

**The slates for the Senate standing committees for 2015-16 were approved on a voice vote.**

The Speaker noted that the Committee on Nominations and Elections has also concluded their business of constructing the slates for the standing college committees, and the Speaker said that he would share those via a campus email. Additional nominations may be made at that point. An election will follow shortly thereafter.

The Speaker then explained that the Committee on Nominations and Elections cannot put forth a slate to replace itself; therefore, nominations are needed to seat this committee. He called for nominations, advising that there is need of seven members, all of whom must have been at the College for at least three years.

Irina Gigova nominated Jennifer Kopfman.
Larry Krasnoff nominated Carmen Grace.
Tom Kunkle nominated Richard Nunan.

Seeing no more nominations, the Speaker said that he will, in the same email mentioned above, call for additional nominations for the committee from the campus.

Nunan asked if a week turnaround is expected for this. The Speaker replied in the affirmative.

The Speaker said that an election would probably occur in the next week, once the Adjunct Senator election has concluded (our system, the Speaker noted, can only do run election at a time).
Nunan asked those who have questions about committee assignments or service to direct them to Denis Keyes, Chair of the committee.

**B. General Education Committee** ([webpage](#))
Karen Smail, Chair

Smail observed that, since the General Education curriculum is “frozen” at present for assessment purposes, these changes, if approved, will not take effect until the 2016-17 academic year.

- Request for General Education Certification, Social Science Requirement: URST 361 - Water Use Law ([PDF](#))

**There was no discussion.**
**The proposal was approved on a voice vote.**

- Request for General Education Certification, Social Science Requirement: URST 313 - Sustainable Urbanism ([PDF](#))
  no discussion

**There was no discussion.**
**The proposal was approved on a voice vote.**

**C. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs - Proposals to Change Programs**

1. **Proposal to Change a Program: M.A. in English** ([PDF](#))
   Add new courses:
   - ENGL 574 – Special Topics in British Literature Before 1800 ([PDF](#))
   - ENGL 575 – Special Topics in British Literature After 1800 ([PDF](#))
   - ENGL 576 – Special Topics in American Literature ([PDF](#))
   - ENGL 703 – Seminar in British Literature Before 1800 ([PDF](#))
   - ENGL 704 – Seminar in British Literature After 1800 ([PDF](#))
   - ENGL 705 – Seminar in American Literature ([PDF](#))

   *Scott Peeples,* Chair - Department of English, explained that these proposals make the degree audits simpler.

   *The Interim Provost at this point sought and received unanimous consent to treat all the proposals moved by the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs as approved by a single motion.*

   **All the proposals were approved by voice vote**

2. **Proposal to Change a Program: M.Ed. in Science and Math for Teachers**
   Change Credits & Edit Description for course SMFT 540 – Fundamentals of Physical Science ([PDF](#))

**D. Faculty Curriculum Committee** ([webpage](#))

1. **Course Changes**
a. Deactivation: HBRW 290 - Special Topics: Advanced Hebrew (PDF)
b. Change Course Title: CLAS 270 - “The Romans in the Cinema” to “The Classics in Cinema” (PDF)
c. Change to Honors College Requirement #8 (Independent Study and Tutorial) (PDF)
d. Course Change: COMM 310 - Message Design and Influence course change (PDF)
e. Course Reactivation: BLAW 499 - Bachelors Essay (PDF)

There was no discussion.
The proposals above were approved on a voice vote.

2. New course proposals
   a. MATH 449 - Linear Models, with changes in multiple programs (PDF)
   b. Physical Education Activity Courses (PDF)
      PEAC 106 - Beginning Table Tennis and Pickleball
      PEAC 122 - Social Dance I
      PEAC 124 - Stand Up Paddleboarding
      PEAC 132 - Intermediate Yoga
   c. LING 101 - Introduction to Language, with change of minor (PDF)
   d. LTHI 250 - Hindi Literature in Translation, with change of minor (PDF)
   e. THTR 283 - Model Making for the Stage (PDF)
   f. HIST 226 - American Monsters: History as Horror, with change of minor and change of major (PDF)

There was no discussion.
The proposals above were approved on a voice vote.

3. Combined proposals – Program changes involving new courses, course changes etc.
   a. Religious Studies: Change of Minor (PDF)
   b. Accounting (PDF)
      - New Course: ACCT 418 - Intermediate Accounting III
      - Change Course Descriptions for ACCT 316 - Intermediate Accounting I and ACCT 317 - Intermediate Accounting II
      - Change Program Requirements and Prerequisites
   c. Public Health - BS Program change, course changes, deactivation and delete minor (PDF)
   d. Urban Studies - Changes to program, adding existing courses, deleting courses (PDF 1) (PDF 2)
e. Public Health, BA: Changes to Requirements for Major (PDF)
f. British Studies Minor: Program Changes (PDF)
g. Business Language in French: Change to Minor (PDF)
h. International Studies Major (PDF1) (PDF2) (Letters of Support)

[PDF 1 - INTL part 1]
- Deactivation: INTL 300 - Comparative Methodology in International Studies
- Add Courses to and Delete Courses from Requirements in All Concentrations
- Change of Course Description for INTL 350 - Cross Regional Studies
- Add Course to Requirements and Modify Africa Concentration
- Add Course to Requirements and Modify Asia Concentration
- Add Courses to and Delete Courses from Requirements and Modify International Comparative Literature Concentration
- Add Course to Requirements and Modify Latin American and Caribbean Concentration

[PDF 2 - INTL part 2]
- Add New Course to and Delete Courses from Requirements and Modify Europe Concentration
  - New Course: INEU 101 - Introduction to Europe

i. International Studies Minor: Add Courses (PDF)
j. Bachelor of Professional Studies: New Course Proposals and Addition of Courses to All Concentrations (PDF)

  PRST 220: Introduction to Analytical and Critical Reasoning
  PRST 230: Professional Presentations
  PRST 360: Special Topics
  PRST 420: Independent Study

k. Real Estate Minor and Concentration: Change Requirements (PDF)
l. Philosophy (PDF)
  - New Course: PHIL 105 - Contemporary Moral Issues
  - New Course: PHIL 252 - Topics in Continental Philosophy
  - Deactivation: PHIL 250 - Marxism
  - Changes to the Major
  - Changes to the Minor
m. Computing in the Arts - Changes in Courses and Changes in Program (PDF)

n. Global Logistics and Transportation: Change Prerequisites for TRAN 431 - Issues in Global Logistics and TRAN 432 - Global Logistics Systems Management (PDF)

o. Supply Chain and Information Management
   New Course: DSCI 323 - Computer-Based Decision Modeling; and Program Change (PDF)

p. Business Administration: Concentration in Marketing - Change in Requirements (PDF)

q. Environmental Studies: Change in Minor (PDF)

r. Psychology (PDF)
   - Deactivation: PSYC 376 - Mass Media and Human Development
   - Neuroscience Minor: Add Course to Requirements

s. Historic Preservation and Community Planning (PDF)
   - Deactivation: HPCP 250 - Architectural Drawing and Drafting I
   - Deactivation: HPCP 251 Architectural Drawing and Drafting II
   - Change Course Title: HPCP 375 - “Landscape Preservation and Design” to “Landscape Preservation and Design Studio”
   - Program changes to Major and Minor in HPCP

t. Exercise Science (PDF 1) (PDF 2)
   - New Course: EXSC 322 - Chronic and Communicable Diseases
   - New Course: EXSC 497 - Mentored Research
   - Program Changes

   There was no discussion.

   The proposals above were approved on a voice vote.
E. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual
   Rick Heldrich, Chair

1. **NOTICE OF INTENT:** To Change Faculty/Administrative Manual to More Clearly Define Graduate Faculty ([PDF](#))

   Rick Heldrich explained that the language in the notice has been through several committees, and he believes it is now in a form that the Senate can accept.

   **Questions / Comments / Discussion**

   Irina Gigova, Senator - SHHS, commended the committee for a job well done in clearly explaining the distinctions.

   **There were no further comments or discussion.**

2. **Notice of Intent:** To Change Faculty/Administrative Manual with Addition of University Professor as an Honorary Rank ([PDF](#)) ([List: Distinguished Professor Programs at U.S. Universities](#))

   Rick Heldrich explained that the language in the notice is the idea of the Interim Provost and that it got full support by all parties involved in vetting it. He added that he thinks the faculty will support it as well.

   The Speaker noted that this change to the F/AM would introduce an honorary rank of University Professor along the lines of the old honorary rank of “Distinguished Professor” at the College, which disappeared in the early 1990s.

   **Questions / Comments / Discussion**

   **Larry Krasnoff,** Senator - Philosophy, noting that the language provides for a committee of University Professors to make selections, asked how selection will work at the beginning, when there are, as of yet, no University Professors.

   The Interim Provost replied that buried in the language is a provision for a screening committee until there are enough University Professors to do the job.

   **Betsy Baker,** Senator - English, asked why the title “Distinguished Professor” was not used.

   The Interim Provost replied that we use the word “distinguished” in a couple different ways already on campus and that this program is meaningfully
different than the prior one, so a clean break is desirable. But he added that the Board of Trustees will have to approve the program, and they can change the program or its title as they see fit.

There was no further discussion.

F. Resolution from the Interim Provost to Award Degrees (PDF)

The Interim Provost moved the following resolution, which was seconded.

Resolved: The Faculty Senate approves the May 2015 degree candidates for graduation, as certified by the Registrar’s Office, subject to review and determination by the College of Charleston Board of Trustees.

The resolution passed on a voice vote.

6. Constituents’ Concerns

David Desplaces, Management and Marketing, noted that he was an early adopter of distance education (DE) at the College, holds a Masters degree in Instructional Design, Development & Evaluation, and served as a DE mentor. He said that while he believes DE has a place at the College, he finds troubling signs regarding how we do DE at the College.

He sees inconsistencies. For one, we have policies for DE that we do not have in face-to-face courses. He maintained that students in DE classes cannot possibly get the same quality experience they get in a regular class. As faculty, we should be concerned with this.

Students used to face-to-face classes, he said, are taking distance education classes and are simply not prepared for the online experience.

He added that he will not be teaching DE courses any more at the College. While we have a focus on pedagogy and quality instruction at the College, he asked for DE, where is the quality assurance? Where is the review?

He reiterated that he has not brought an action before the Senate, but he is asking the Senate to look into DE at the College.

Questions / Comments / Discussion

Irina Gigova, Senator - SHHS, asked what Desplaces would like to see done to alleviate his concerns.

Desplaces replied that he would like to see better preparedness, pedagogy-driven decision making, faculty discussion about DE, consistency between DE and non-DE courses. He added that we need to question whether we are doing DE for the right reasons, or are we doing it just to generate revenue?

He said the he was a member of the DE task force, the first principle of which was the DE should not be done to make money.

He questioned how faculty could have a “meaningful learning engagement” with 30 students in four and a half weeks?
He added that he was told that he might need to lower his expectations in DE, which he took as a bad sign.

**Jannette Finch**, Senator - Library, said that she, too, was a member of the task force (actually, she noted, several task forces). She said that there is a DE quality rubric at the College developed from three other programs. TLT and others adapted the rubric to DE at the College. There is now a DE readiness course that faculty have to take in order to teach online, and, she said she thinks that the rubric is being applied in the class. However, she noted that the rubric is not being applied to existing classes. She said that DE needs to do a better job of making the college community aware of what’s going on in the program, and she said that she hopes to have a report in the early fall.

**Margaret Cormack**, Senator - Religious Studies, said that she has no intention to offer DE courses, but called attention to Desplaces’s observation that students, too, need training for DE. Perhaps, she went on, students should not be allowed to take a DE course until they have demonstrated the necessary responsibility, time management, and so on. They could undergo a tutorial before taking a course.

Finch replied that we do, in fact, have an online tutorial for students.

**John Hakkila**, Physics and Astronomy, mentioned that he was disturbed to see a recent story about the University of Phoenix, who have lost over the past two years over 50% of their enrollments, causing investors to dump them. He speculated that the students might going elsewhere or there’s a serious problem of some sort with the model. He asked if anyone could fill in the gaps.

Dean Gibbison said that U of Phoenix’s students were “going” to that institution because they could not get the programs they wanted and on the schedules they needed at traditional schools, but as more traditional schools, like the College, go online, with some even offering complete online programs, Phoenix’s market is tightening. They are also, apart from market concerns, strategically reducing enrollment to ensure higher quality and higher rates of degree completion.

There was no further discussion.

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

**Irina Gigova**, Senator - SHHS, introduced a resolution that she said she was asked to introduce by a number of parties:

**A Resolution Celebrating Jack’s Cafe**

WHEREAS, the original Jack’s Café was a signature College of Charleston diner over the past four decades;

WHEREAS, Jack Sewell, former owner and operator of Jack’s, manned the grill to a faithful college crowd and community members every weekday for the past forty-two years;

WHEREAS, Jack Sewell sold the restaurant and had his last shift on Friday, October 31, 2014;
WHEREAS, Jack’s is a relic of time and a Charleston institution;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT —

RESOLVED, that The Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston hereby acknowledges the pride and passion that Jack Sewell demonstrated for the culinary arts;

RESOLVED, that The Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston hereby expresses its gratitude to Jack Sewell for providing a special dining experience for forty-two years; and

RESOLVED, that The Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston hereby conveys its highest respect, admiration, and thanks for the lasting and transformative impact that the original Jack’s Café has had on the College of Charleston community and the City of Charleston.

The Interim Provost asked and received unanimous consent to allow the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was seconded.

There was no discussion.

**The resolution was approved on a voice vote.**

---

Larry Krasnoff - Senator - Philosophy, asked the Senate to thank the Speaker, Secretary, Secretariat, and Parliamentarian for their service.

Applause followed.

7.  **Adjournments:** 7:29 PM, and 6:40 PM, respectively
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 10 March 2015

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 10 March 2015 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115)

1. Call to Order: 5:04PM
2. 10 February 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and information: none.
4. Reports
   A. Speaker of the Faculty
      Speaker McNerney noted changes to the night's meeting agenda: the Interim Provost was in Columbia at a CHE hearing and could not deliver his report. The Speaker said that the Interim Provost may circulate a written report or may decide to wait until the April meeting to make a report in person. The Faculty Budget Committee decided to delay their report until the April meeting, given that the Interim Provost would not be available to answer questions.

      The Speaker noted that, the last meeting having been cancelled, due to the bomb threat in February, he had nothing to report from meetings with the President. The next meeting, the Speaker added, will be Thursday, March 12. He also noted that the President will address the Faculty Senate, as is customary, at the April meeting.

      The Speaker reported that there was a meeting between a small number of faculty (the Speaker, Dean Auerbach, Kelly Shaver, George Pothering, Simon Lewis) and two representatives of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce last month, the intent of which was to lay the framework for future conversations with business leaders on identifying specific areas of need in the business community, needs beyond what can be gleaned from Department of labor statistics and so forth. The Speaker reported that once the conversations become more targeted and include particular business and industry leaders, he may contact specific faculty from appropriate disciplines and programs to participate. It seems likely that the business community desires not simply more graduates in certain majors, but also specific skills provided by a college of liberal arts and sciences, so-called "soft skills" like critical thinking, writing, and communicating. The College cohort at the meeting, he said, expressed a desire for local business to provide more internships and other opportunities for collaboration between the College and the business community.

      The Speaker reported that the MUSC/CofC Collaborative Council held its first meeting over spring break, the purpose of which was also to establish a
framework for future conversations. The CofC contingent at the meeting included the President, the Interim Provost, Dean of the School of Science and Mathematics Auerbach, Dean of the School of Professional Studies Gibbison, Student Government Association President Spraker, Vice President for Administration & Planning Paul Patrick, and the Speaker. They discussed current collaborations, such as ongoing mentoring and advising across institutions, which exposed the variety of ways in which MUSC/CofC are already collaborating. The council decided that there is a need for both institutions to do a better job of sharing with the public already ongoing collaborations, perhaps through some sort of website that also encourages new collaborations. The Provosts of both institutions will soon meet to determine a schedule for future meetings, which the Speaker said he will pass along.

Finally, the Speaker reported that the two by-laws changes on adjunct instructor committee and Senate representation on the slate in the last election were both ratified. An official announcement is forthcoming and will include a call for nominations from the adjunct faculty.

**B. Distance Education at the College of Charleston** (PDF)
Douglas A. Ferguson, Faculty Coordinator for eLearning and Distance Education

Ferguson remarked on the growth of online courses offered at the College of Charleston over the last seven years and discussed faculty training for distance education (DE). The text below reflects his comments that are not specifically also mentioned in the PDF he provided the Senate and which was projected on screen during his report. Please consult the PDF.

Online courses remain a relatively small proportion of courses offered at the College, but, nonetheless, the growth of these offerings and in enrollments has been impressive.

Ferguson noted that only five current Senators have gone through faculty DE training, and he highly recommended it to those who have not. He said that while many feel that there are things you simply cannot do in an online class, there are many classes one can only teach through DE.

**Questions / Comments / Discussion**

Irina Gigova, Senator – School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), asked for if Ferguson could share information about the DE offerings by level (100, 200, etc.).

Ferguson replied that he has not run a report on that but observed that while intro courses are easier to conceive, we have also offered a number of successful upper-division courses as well.

Associate Provost Beverly Diamond noted that there is quite a range of courses offered via DE, adding that in the School of Business, many upper level courses have been offered.
Ferguson added that graduate courses, too, have been offered online. We do not, however, he noted, have any fully online programs. He estimated that around 75% of the universities and colleges in the country have at least one fully online program.

**Tom Ross**, Senator – SHSS, asked for a clarification or elaboration on Ferguson’s statement that “by 2014, summer online enrollment began cutting into face-to-face enrollment.” He asked if Ferguson is afraid that traditional courses that previously had sufficient summer enrollment may no longer be able to run due to student preference for DE courses.

Ferguson yielded to Associate Provost Diamond, who said that the statement is an inference. The summer enrollments in face-to-face courses up until the year before 2014 were stable, with online enrollments increasing dramatically, but the summer of 2014 showed a decrease in face-to-face enrollments. There has not been any analysis showing a movement of enrollments in particular courses from face-to-face to DE.

Ferguson stressed that there is no devaluation of face-to-face courses in favor of DE courses or an attempt to take the College online.

Ross replied that his concern was not that so much as a concern relating to enrollment management and summer scheduling.

**Andrew Shedlock**, Senator – Biology, asked whether or not we can tell if summer online course offerings are reducing transfer credit from students who might otherwise take summer courses elsewhere but can now do so through DE courses at the College.

Ferguson agreed that this is something worth investigating.

Shedlock added that DE summer courses could be promoting continuity for students who cannot be here in the summer.

**Kirk Stone**, Senator – Communication, wanted to know if there is anything distinctive about student evaluations of DE courses.

Ferguson said that in his personal experience teaching DE courses and face-to-face courses he has found no difference in course evaluations. We have not had, he added, negative feedback from students about DE courses.

**Marvin Gonzalez**, Senator – School of Business, asked how the DE program maintains the same quality for DE classes as face-to-face classes.

Ferguson noted that the program adopted quality standards last year and that every DE instructor must go through a course quality assessment. The DE steering committee meets regularly and discusses quality issues. Most research shows, he said, that when DE courses are properly conducted, their quality is equivalent to the quality of traditional courses. Ferguson congratulated TLT on their impressive DE readiness course, which he said is as good a course as any in the country.
5. **Old Business**: none.

6. **New Business**

   **A. General Education Committee** ([webpage](#))

   Motion to Approve Alternatives to the Foreign Language Requirement Master List (updated February 10, 2015) | [PDF](#)

   Karen Smail, Chair of the committee, explained that the committee has been working hard to align the foreign language requirement alternative program to general education and student learning outcomes in general education and an assessment plan. The committee’s national research revealed that the College’s program is unique, which is a strength, but also means that it has taken a good deal of time to try to develop appropriate student learning outcomes. The committee's goal is to continue to develop the learning outcomes and an assessment plan and to bring this to the faculty in the early fall for approval. This will be followed by a recertification process that will open up to all programs the potential to offer foreign language requirement equivalent courses.

   But in the meantime, we need to have a program in place for the fall, she said. The committee took the list currently being used in the SNAP office and updated it by eliminating all courses listed that are no longer offered and by removing special topics classes, which not offered on a regular basis. The format of the document remains the same.

   One change, however, was made to the document. The current list stipulates that for 202 credit students have to take two classes from a single region but that they needed to be courses with two different program/department acronyms. Smail said that the committee agreed that the requirement for two different acronyms needed to be eliminated, since in some sections of the document, the requirement was no longer applicable.

   This list is a short term solution, she observed, while the committee continues to work on a better plan.

   There were no questions or discussion.

   **The Senate, on a voice vote, approved the Alternatives to the Foreign Language Requirement Master List (updated February 10, 2015).**

   **B. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs - Proposals to Change Programs**

   1. **MAT in Special Education**

      a. Add existing course and add new course ([PDF](#))

      b. Change course title for EDFS 724: Teaching Reading and Language Arts to Students with Disabilities – to “Literacy Development and Intervention for Students with Disabilities” ([PDF](#))
Jon Hakkila, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs, said that the program changes move Special Education beyond minimum state requirements and strengthen the existing program.

Meta Van Sickle, Chair – Department of Teacher Education, added that the proposal brought cheers at a recent meeting of district officials.

Hakkila said that, in the program, teachers in training will be taking courses from a variety of different Special Education areas, rather than from a single track. All the participants will take all the courses.

There were no questions or discussion.

**The Senate, on a voice vote, approved the proposed program changes to the MAT in Special Education.**

2. **MS in Mathematics**
   
a. Add new courses
   
   - MATH 660 - Stochastic Processes ([PDF](#))
   - MATH 661 - Time Series Analysis ([PDF](#))
   - MATH 690 – Graduate Teaching Seminar ([PDF](#))
   
b. Permission to cross-list
   
   - MATH 660 with MATH 460 ([PDF](#))
   - MATH 661 with MATH 461 ([PDF](#))

Hakkila explained that MATH 660 and 661 offer education in key areas of statistics, and he remarked that the proposal for MATH 690 is an innovative teacher training course.

To support MATH 690, Bob Mignone, Senator – School of Science and Mathematics, and Chair – Department of Mathematics, added that the Mathematics department hires many adjuncts to teach many courses for general education and to support the sciences, but, from the standpoint of credentials, these adjuncts are not very different from our own graduate students who have reached the 18-hour threshold. We have hired our students, he said, but they lack classroom training. Graduate students would take the new course (690) in their first year, while they are not teaching, and during their second year, they could teach a course. While the department could hire adjuncts who completed their graduate coursework elsewhere, since our own graduate students often end up teaching in colleges, it should be part of our responsibility to train them to teach. The plan is to have this training, plus supervision for graduate teachers.

**Questions / Comments / Discussion**

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator – Management and Entrepreneurship, inquired if the training course is required for students who would go on to teach.
Mignone replied in the affirmative.

There were no further questions of discussion.

**The Senate, on a voice vote, approved the proposed program changes to the MS in Mathematics.**

3. **MS in Marine Biology**
   
a. Add new courses
   
   BIOL 623/623L – Genomics ([PDF](#))
   
   BIOL 649 – Comparative Genomics ([PDF](#))
   
   b. Permission to cross-list BIOL 623/623L with BIOL 423/423L ([PDF](#))

Christine Byrum, Department of Biology, explained that these courses tap into the different techniques recently developed for looking at and better understanding organisms’ genomes. These involve both laboratory work and a great deal of computational work. The courses have been approved and taught already in Biology and are being formally added to the catalog with the current proposals.

Andrew Shedlock, Department of Biology, added that he and Professor Byrum have worked together to make the two courses (his, 649, and hers, 623) highly complementary and to reflect developments in the field of genomics and career development in the field for both graduate and advanced undergraduate students.

There were no questions or discussion.

**The Senate, on a voice vote, approved the proposed program changes to the MS in Marine Biology.**

C. **Faculty Curriculum Committee** ([webpage](#))

Bonnie Springer, Chair – Faculty Curriculum Committee, explained that the Senate would take the items listed below by number, with the opportunity to vote separately on any single item if the Senate wished to do so.

1. **Course Change**
   
a. PSYC 390 - new name and description ([PDF](#))

Springer explained that this proposal updates a decades-old course to reflect current best practices.

There were no questions or discussion.

**On a voice vote, the Senate approved the PSYC 390 proposal.**

2. **New Courses**
   
a. EDFS 301 – Introduction to Leadership ([PDF](#))
   
b. LNSA 101 - Language and Cultural Competencies for Studying Abroad ([PDF](#))
c. Management and Marketing (PDF)

MKTG 334 - Integrated Marketing Communications
MKTG 337 - Sports Marketing
MKTG 345 - Social Media Marketing

Springer introduced the courses above, noting that the EDFS 301 is a course being proposed by former College of Charleston President Lee Higdon as part of an initiative in School of Education, Health, and Human Performance to foster leadership. She said of LNSA 101 that it offers a unique means to prepare students for study abroad with the basic language and cultural competency they will need when they enter their destination country. She described the three new course proposals in Management and Marketing as keeping up with developments in the field and expanding the program.

The LNSA 101 - Language and Cultural Competencies for Studying Abroad proposal was debated for some time (see below for a record of the discussion), but, ultimately, the Senate voted to postpone decision on this motion until the April meeting, when representatives from the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs can be present to address concerns raised.

The Senate, on voice vote, approved the other courses:
EDFS 301 - Introduction to Leadership
MKTG 334 - Integrated Marketing Communications
MKTG 337 - Sports Marketing
MKTG 345 - Social Media Marketing.

There was discussion on EDFS 301 (see below), but no discussion on the three MKTG courses. Also see below for discussion of LNSA 101, which will be considered in “Old Business” at the April meeting.

Questions / Comments / Discussion: EDFS 301

Kelly Shaver, Senator – Management and Entrepreneurship, observed that the nine-week time frame of the course seems unusual: longer than an express course, but shorter than a semester-length course. He wondered what this might do to a student’s schedule.

Springer noted that it is a one-credit class in which students engage in conversations that have a variable schedule. Sometimes it is a weekly; at other times there are gaps of a week between meetings. It has a variable time frame. Students are carefully selected by application, and she said that they create their own schedule.

As noted above, the Senate approved the course on a voice vote.

Questions / Comments / Discussion: LNSA 101
Phil Jos, Senator – SHSS, asked for a clarification. Does LNSA 101 apply only to College of Charleston study abroad programs or would it apply to any study abroad programs that CofC students can take for credit?

Springer said that she thought the intent was for it to apply to College of Charleston programs.

Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, replied that any student would be eligible to enroll in LNSA 101 for credit toward degree but not toward any particular program.

Jos followed up by asking if taking the course would be a condition for a student to study abroad.

Springer and Ford both said “no.” Springer added that the course is an opportunity for students to prepare to study abroad.

Jos also asked if we know how many study abroad programs we have now are lacking this kind of preparation.

Springer replied that this did not come up in the committee's work.

Ford noted that LNSA 101 is the first curricular, formally-structured preparation the College has offered. Each of the programs offered through Center for International Education, she observed, prepare students for study abroad, but we have not had a formal instructional means of preparation. Not to say that students are unprepared now, she said, but LNSA 101 offers a number of opportunities for reflection and assessment.

Jos said that his concerns are somewhat alleviated knowing that the Dean of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs (LCWA) will not be making determinations about who has to take LNSA 101 and who does not.

Jos also added that he presumes that a range of faculty in and out of LACWA “could potentially offer that kind of preparation.”

Ford replied, “I am not sure I can answer that question.”

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, followed up on Jos’s query about requiring the course. It does seem, Krasnoff observed, that as the proposal is written, some programs could require the course. He asked how a requirement would be established, since the course is not now required.

Ford responded by saying that the proposal imagines that in the future, as faculty build study abroad opportunities, they could build in the expectation that students complete LNSA 101.

Springer said that LNSA 101 would be a way of supporting students who wish to study abroad in a country whose primary language they did not study for their degree program. In this way, she said, it would support the new study abroad options becoming available, for instance, in the sciences.
Krasnoff agreed that the course makes sense but that the question of when it can be required remained unanswered. It seems, he added, procedurally unclear as to when it could become required and how. While requirements are typically approved by the Senate, the proposal seems to suggest that programs themselves could make the decision. Would programs need to come to the Senate to ask for a LNSA 101 requirement? Furthermore, he inquired what is meant by “programs.” Academic programs? Particular study abroad programs, such as the one in Trujillo?

Ford replied that the course is conceived along the lines of a student’s initiative to prepare for a study abroad experience in a location with a language with which he or she is not comfortable. The course could take a number of forms, and serves as a vehicle to develop a better approach to preparing students to study abroad.

Krasnoff again noted that he doesn’t disagree with the course, per se, but that the issue of potentially requiring the course remained unanswered. Springer replied that, as a matter of curriculum, an academic program that wished to require LNSA 101 would have to bring that change through the Curriculum Committee and on to the Senate.

Krasnoff, as a means of quelling this concern, suggested striking the sentence on the first page of the proposal (PDF) that reads “Programs that have identified this course as a requirement will inform their students that they must take the section of LNSA 101 that corresponds to their study abroad program.” If it is true that no programs currently require LNSA 101, and any future plans to require it will have to involved coming back to the Senate, the line is misleading and should be stricken.

**Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker,** noting that she did not participate in the proposal’s development, said that one impetus for it is a particular study abroad lab science experience in which a group of students goes abroad without the local language, but in which some language facility is needed for the field work. There is a need for some way of helping these students prepare in a structured, faculty-supervised experience.

**Heath Hoffman,** Senator – Sociology and Anthropology, said that while he understands Krasnoff’s concerns, he was against requiring programs that might want to require LNSA 101 to have to go through a Senate approval process. This might stifle innovation. Study abroad courses are often developed out of inspiration on the part of faculty members with innovative topic ideas, and it may make sense to have prerequisites such as LNSA 101. He noted that there is precedent in two courses in Sociology, one 200-level, one 400-level, that were approved by the Faculty Curriculum Committee and by the Senate in which the proposals clearly stated that prerequisites may vary depending on the experience. There is
not a need to create a rigorous barrier in this case, he said, to programs that my wish to require the course.

**At this point the Speaker asked Krasnoff if he was making a motion to strike the proposal language he cited.** Krasnoff replied, “I think so,” but then asked who is sponsoring the motion to approve the course, to which the Speaker replied the Faculty Curriculum Committee brought the motion.

Krasnoff then addressed Hoffman, saying that we do desire innovation but the question is at what level there should be a decision as to what is going to be required. He asked a hypothetical question. “Suppose you want to start a summer abroad or study abroad program: can you, just as an individual faculty member require certain courses as prerequisites for it?” If the answer is “no,” he said, we shouldn’t allow it in the case of LNSA 101.

Hoffman responded by saying that, in essence, we do that already in cases where we make enrollment contingent on the permission of the instructor.

**Tom Kunkle, Senator – SSM, asked a point of order: has the motion to amend been seconded?**

The Speaker replied, “not yet,” but added that he asked Krasnoff for a clarification, and that he (the Speaker) did not think he actually heard a motion at that time.

**Krasnoff then moved “that that sentence be taken out.”** He added that his motion carries the assumption that programs would have to come to the Senate for approval for adding LNSA 101 as a required course.

Springer replied that this would depend on how we are using the word “program.” She said she believes that the way the proposal frames it, programs likely means study abroad programs, but not necessarily academic programs, such as in a major.

AVP Ford expressed discomfort with the fact that the Dean of LACWA is not present to answer questions, nor is the Associate Dean who brought the proposal to the committee available for comment. Given that an April Senate meeting is scheduled, she suggested a postponement in deliberating on this proposal in order that a knowledgeable party might come to the meeting to address concerns.

Krasnoff said that Ford’s suggestion made sense to him, and he asked to withdraw his motion. Parliamentarian George Pothering explained that a motion cannot be withdrawn once it is made, though it may be postponed. The Speaker added that he was still not sure if he heard a motion in terms of an expression of what exact language should be stricken.
A motion was made to postpone deliberation on LNSA 101 - Language and Cultural Competencies for Studying Abroad (PDF) until the April meeting and passed on a voice vote.

3. Combined proposals: program changes involving new courses, course changes, etc.

All proposals below were approved by voice vote, with the exception of URST 250/251, which passed on a division of the house (24 yes, 14 no). See each lettered section (a,b,c,d) below for comments and discussion.

a. **Global Logistics and Transportation Minor and Concentration**  
(PDF)

Kent Gourdin, Program Director - Global Logistics and Transportation Minor, explained that this proposal replaces the requirement that students take ECON 303: Economics of Transportation and Geography and INTB 332: International Business with a requirement that they take six hours of courses from a menu. ECON 303 and INTB 332 have become more sporadic in their offerings, which has required substitutions under the current programs. The menu of courses offers students more options, as well.

**Questions / Comments / Discussion**

**Wayne Smith**, Senator – Hospitality and Tourism, pointed out a typo to be corrected. In the second instance of “ECON 303,” the course title reads “Economic Geography,” but should read “Economics of Transportation and Geography.”

Springer took note and hand-corrected the form that goes to the Registrar’s office.

**The proposal was approved on voice vote, as stated above.**

b. **Chemistry: changes in courses and changes in Chemistry BA & BS and Biochemistry BS**  
(PDF)

Springer characterized the changes in this proposal as straight-forward, involving the math sequence to strengthen the Chemistry programs.

**There were no questions or discussion.**

**The proposals were approved on voice vote, as stated above.**

c. **Urban Studies Program: new courses and program changes**

URST 250 & 251  
URST 313 – Sustainable Urbanism (PDF for 313 & 361)  
URST 361 – Water Use Law

Springer characterized the proposal for 250 & 251, a sophomore ambassador program, as an innovative proposal for encouraging continu-
ity and building capacity in students. The first course offers preparation and the second application and field experience.

Questions / Comments / Discussion

There was lengthy discussion of the 250 & 251 proposal, but none at all on 313 or 361.

Phil Jos, Senator – SHSS, noted that the proposal offers a means of having a kind of internship-like experience, but having it last over multiple semesters, which works well for community issues since they do not resolve themselves according to academic schedules. Jos asked for a clarification. In this course is there a new cohort of ten students?

Kevin Keenan, Director – Urban Studies Program, replied that every year there would be a new cohort of ten students. Keenan further explained that 250/251 is a sophomore year sequence, and the same cohort that completes that sequence will go on to take a junior level sequence.

Jos asked if a new sophomore group would enroll in 250/251 when the other cohort had moved on to the junior level sequence.

Keenan replied in the affirmative.

Jos replied that, based on Keenan’s replies, he has two concerns. Once the program is up and running, staffing could be difficult and the program might even go beyond what one faculty member could handle, if the faculty member has to handle up to three groups of ten at one time, with all the community engagement, academic contact, and advising it would also require.

A second concern, Jos said, is that this proposal is only for the sophomore experience, but there is an indication that proposals for the junior and senior year experiences are forthcoming and to be discussed later. But since, logically, the three experiences fit together, it seems, he said, as if the Senate is being asked to vote on or endorse the whole program.

Keenan appreciated the concern over workload, especially in terms of getting things up and running before students enroll, but he noted that 250/251 are not slated to be offered next academic year. His plan, he explained, is to build the structure first and then begin offering courses later. Among the concerns for building the structure are developing an admissions committee and building community partnerships. The 250/251 proposal marks the first stage of building the structure, he said, and there’s no set year when students need to start being admitted.
Springer said she appreciates the concern raised by Jos that there’s an implication that in approving 250/251, we would be approving the entire program.

Jos replied that the concern is, as a Senator, he would like to be able to ask questions about the next two courses. But if we get up and running with an inaugural group of students and the Senate has concerns about the courses yet to be approved, this would end the program for that group of students at the close of their sophomore year.

Keenan responded by saying that there is no inaugural or already identified group of students set to start in the fall.

Jos noted that the proposal does mention Fall of 2015. Keenan said that it is a possibility, but no students have been identified for the program. He reiterated that the proposal is the first step of building the program structure, and this was done around the deadlines of the curriculum committee.

Keenan added, on the matter of workload, that another faculty member in Political Science, Kendra Stewart, who runs the Riley Center is also equipped with administrative support to deal with some of the administrative parts of the program and to provide program contact with students. It is not just one faculty member doing this.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, asked how the workload would shake out, especially as the program adds student cohorts. Would each student cohort count as one of your classes?

Keenan said that this program would be the responsibility of the Director of Urban Studies. There would be a small number of students.

Krasnoff observed that workload is not necessarily a concern of the Senate, but that we are concerned if a program is viable or not. If all the work implied in the proposal and the program will be in addition to the work of directing Urban Studies, then you may be setting yourself up, he said, for a good deal of uncompensated work. On the other hand, if there are releases, then this may not be an issue. But, either way, it concerned him, Krasnoff said, that there is no letter from Gibbs Knotts (Chair of Political Science) in support of the course and program.

Keenan replied that the proposal is coming from Urban Studies, not Political Science. Krasnoff countered that the two faculty mentioned in the context of the proposal (Keenan and Stewart) are Political Science faculty.

Keenan replied that he is not sure that departments stand in an approval role over programs, though perhaps they do and he simply isn’t aware of it, he said. Do departments approve, he asked, what academic programs do?
“No,” Krasnoff replied, but they do approve workload of particular faculty appointed in the discipline.

Keenan pointed out that as part of the proposal, there is no stated course release. He said he understands the workload issue, but that releases and workload considerations are decided upon outside of course proposals; those are arrangements made with department chairs and deans. There is, he said, a structure in place to address workload concerns in the form of annual review.

Krasnoff agreed that course releases can be worked out, but he aduced the Irish and Irish American Studies proposal as an example of a proposal in which a course release is established as well as a stipend for the director and a letter of support from the Dean with exacting language.

**Phil Jos** added to his earlier expressed concern about whether or not the Senate in voting on 250/251 would not also be voting on the program of which they are part. One issue not raised by voting on 250/251 but which would be raised by voting on an entire package is the total number of credits for the experiential learning experience. Nine credits is a fair amount of credit toward a particular program of study. This is an example of an issue that would be a new issue that could arise in the discussion of the next proposals in the program.

**Springer** asked Keenan if the courses not yet proposed to which Jos referred will be ready for consideration by the Faculty Curriculum Committee in the next round. Keenan replied in the negative.

**Heath Hoffman**, Senator – Sociology and Anthropology, asked Keenan, given that many students do not choose a major until their junior year, how the sophomore ambassadorship deals with that.

Keenan said that students would have to start in their sophomore year, but the program is open to all majors at the College.

Tom Kunkle, Senator – SSM, asked if juniors would be prohibited from taking URST 250/251.

Keenan replied, “yes.” Students in 250/251 would take the courses in their sophomore year under a contract (though not a legal document) that spells out their commitment, which will unfold over three years as an experiential, immersive educational experience that deals with issues of growth in the Lowcountry that develop over time, but not on an academic schedule. He said that students will be identified in their first year, enroll in the Sophomore Student Ambassadorship, and in their junior year transition into a Junior Student Ambassadorship. In their senior year, if their own department has an internship course or something similar, they will take that.
**Jon Hakkila** asked a hypothetical question about students signing up for the course at the junior level without having completed 250/251. Keenan replied that these courses are not open enrollment. Students will have to apply for the program.

**Wayne Smith**, Senator – Hospitality and Tourism, asked, out of the ten students who begin in 250/251, how many might make it to the senior-level course.

Keenan explained that the program is built, in part, on the model of the Schottland Scholars program in the School of Business, which builds in a recognition that there will be attrition, for all the usual reasons. But for those who do make it through, the experience will be profound, a high-impact experience of the Lowcountry.

**Heath Hoffman** asked at this point for a procedural clarification. We are being asked, he said, to vote on all proposals under the agenda item number three (3) for the Curriculum Committee business. Given the concerns raised so far, he moved that the URST 250/251 proposal be separated for its own vote.

The Speaker concurred that Hoffman could make the motion, but it would need a second. Hoffman’s motion was seconded. The Speaker asked for discussion on Hoffman’s motion.

Krasnoff raised a point of order. As he understands our procedure, he said, pulling out a single proposal would be automatic on the request of any Senator; thus, no motion is needed, unless Hoffman was moving to table.

The Speaker agreed with Krasnoff, but asked for clarification from Hoffman as to whether he intended a separate vote for URST 250/251 or whether he moved to table the proposal. Hearing from Hoffman the former, the Speaker asked for discussion to continue on the URST 250/251 proposal.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator – Management and Entrepreneurship, offered a clarification. Shottland Scholars, he observed, are renewed every year, and there is nothing about the program that continues over consecutive years, unlike the URST program being discussed.

**At this point, the Speaker asked for any discussion about the other proposals under item 3:**

- a. Global Logistics and Transportation Minor and Concentration
- b. Chemistry: changes in courses and changes in Chemistry BA & BS and Biochemistry BS
- c. New courses in Urban Studies: URST 313 – Sustainable Urbanism and URST 361 – Water Use Law
d. English: New Courses, Course Deletion, and Program changes in English Major, English Major with Concentration in Creative Writing, and Minor in Creative Writing

Seeing none, he asked for a vote and all these proposals were approved on voice vote.

Discussion now resumed on URST 250/251.

Rick Heldrich, Senator – SSM, asked if URST 250/251 would ever be taught without the rest of the program being put in place.

Keenan responded in the negative.

Heldrich countered that the proposal asks the Senate to approve only 250/251. If these courses cannot be offered without the other courses that are yet to be proposed, Heldrich asserted, then we should not be considering them separately.

Keenan said that he understands the objection, but that this is a proposal to create two courses. “That you can’t teach,” replied Heldrich.

AVP Ford inquired what harm there would be in just teaching 250/251. This would give sophomore students an intensive and valuable experience, whether or not a full program worked out. On a yearly basis, ten students would benefit from the program.

Keenan agreed that there would be no harm. There is a syllabus for the course, and it could be taught.

Heath Hoffman, Senator – Sociology and Anthropology, returned to the question of workload. He asked Keenan how much of his teaching schedule is determined by himself as Director of Urban Studies and how much of it is determined by the Chair Department of Political Science.

Keenan responded that all his teaching is in Political Science and the Master of Public Administration.

Hoffman suggested that, given Keenan’s answer, it seems all the more important to have a letter in the course proposal by the Chair of Political Science stating his willingness to work with the Director of Urban Studies program to staff the proposed course. While the current director is Keenan, Hoffman said, this may not be the case in the future, and such a letter would help ensure the long-term viability of the program in case there is a change in the department chair or directorship of Urban Studies.

Keenan noted in reply that the program would be supported not just by the Director of Urban Studies but by the Director of the Riley Cen-
ter, as well, and those positions are not up for renewal, he said, at the same time.

But more to the point of Hoffman’s and others’ questions regarding workload, Keenan observed that the Faculty Curriculum Committee form for the proposal did not include the requirement of letters from chairs and so forth. While he appreciates the point, he said, he completed every part of the form and has all the required documents that should be required for a successful proposal when it comes before the Senate.

**Hoffman** added that, for him, the real issue is that of considering the sophomore class (250/251) without at the same time considering the junior and senior classes with which they are supposed to go along.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator – Management and Entrepreneurship, asked for a clarification. There will be a junior year ambassadorship that will require as a prerequisite the completion of the sophomore ambassadorship?

Keenan confirmed that: a junior could not enter just take the as-yet-to-be-proposed junior course, since the goal of the eventual program will be to have students working on and tracking an issue over a three-year period, beginning in the sophomore year.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator – Mathematics, asked if it would be possible to offer the course as a special topics class to try it out before making it an official part of the curriculum.

Keenan said that URST has a special topics class, but it might not be appropriate for what 250/251 is trying to do. The course needs its own designation, status, and visibility as a distinctive, immersive experience.

**Scott Peeples**, Senator – SHSS, called the question; this was seconded and voted in the affirmative.

The motion to approve URST 250 & 251 was put to a voice vote, but it was inconclusive.

On a subsequent division of the house, the motion passed, 24 for, 14 against.

d. English ([PDF](#))

1. New courses
   - ENGL 375 – Studies in Creative Writing
   - ENGL 380 – The Literary Magazine, Publishing, and Editing
2. Course deletion - ENGL 406 – Crazyhorse Literary Publishing Practicum
3. Program changes in English Major, English Major with Concentration in Creative Writing, and Minor in Creative Writing

There were no questions or discussion.

The proposals were approved on voice vote, as stated above.

4. New minor or concentration

a. Marketing Minor (PDF)
   Rhonda Mack, Chair – Management and Marketing, explained that this minor is for non-business majors and is made up from courses already in place. Students entering the minor will take courses alongside business majors.

There were no questions or discussion.

The proposal was approved on voice vote.

b. Middle Eastern and Islamic World Studies Minor (PDF)
   Ghazi Abuhakema, Director of Asian Studies and Arabic programs, explained that this minor, too, is designed with existing courses.

There were no questions or discussion.

The proposal was approved on voice vote.

c. Irish and Irish American Studies Minor (PDF)
   Including new courses:
   IIAS 201 - Introduction to Irish and Irish American Studies
   IIAS 301 – Special Topics in Irish and Irish American Culture
   IIAS 302 – Special Topics in Irish and Irish American History
   IIAS 303 – Special Topics in Irish and Irish American Social Science
   IIAS 304 – Special Topics in Irish and Irish American Studies

   Joe Kelly, Department of English and a sponsor of the proposed minor, observed that the proposal as posted on the Senate website, had the wrong pages for pages 50 and 51, which should have been course proposal pages for IIAS 304 – Special Topics in Irish and Irish American Studies. He provided correct pages to Springer, who added them to the hard copy of the document and removed the incorrect pages.

Questions / Comments / Discussion

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, offered two questions to Kelly.

He inquired about non-IIAS courses in the proposal that do not obviously in their titles include “Irish” or “Ireland,” such as ENGL 325: Modern British Literature, ANTH 326: Peoples and Cultures of Europe, and POLS 367: Geography of International Conflict. In some minors, he noted, there is a kind of “asterisk” requirement for courses to count only if there is a certain percentage of the course time and
material devoted to the subject of the minor, such as a third. He asked how the IIAS program would handle this situation, given that different instructors may emphasize different things and curriculum in these courses could change over time. In the Modern British literature course, he speculated, an instructor might cover Joyce, but can one count on Joyce being covered as specifically Irish? Similarly, “Peoples and Cultures of Europe” is likely to cover the Irish, but to what extent and depth? Finally, while the Geography of International Conflict course, according to a current course description, includes attention to conflict in Ireland, among conflicts in other areas of the world, is there reason to believe the course will always include attention to Ireland?

Should these courses, Krasnoff asked, always count for IIAS or should they count only under the right description?

Kelly replied that the original proposal for the IIAS minor listed around 50 courses that could count when 1/3 of the content had to do with Ireland or the Irish. Under consultation, the proposal working group decided instead to go with the plan represented in the proposal. The courses in the list now are all exclusively taught by persons involved in developing the proposal. He said that he understands the concern, but they needed to make a decision about which approach to take.

Krasnoff replied that the asterisk method could still work, unless there’s specific objection to it or to having 50 courses potentially count for the minor. However, while the courses as taught now may clearly meet the requirements of IIAS, there is no guarantee that this will always be the case. That said, Krasnoff added that he does not have strong feelings about this.

Krasnoff then asked about staffing, particularly of IIAS 201, since that has to be offered on a regular basis. Are there faculty available to regularly staff the course? While there are letters of support for History and Anthropology, they appear, he said, to be courses their faculty might teach other than 201.

Kelly replied that should the Senate approve the minor, he will teach the class in the spring of 2016, and his department chair has approved that. Scott Peeples, Chair – English, concurred and said that the department can support Kelly teaching it once a year.

Krasnoff inquired if once a year is a good frequency for offering IIAS 201. Kelly replied in the affirmative.

Jerry Hale, Dean of HHS, agreed that, based on conversations with the Chair of the Department of English, the school can support the teaching of IIAS 201.
There were no further questions or discussion.

**The proposal was approved on voice vote.**

d. Bachelor of Professional Studies Concentration in Healthcare and Medical Services Management (PDF)

Including new courses:
HMSM 302 – Structure of Healthcare Delivery in the U.S.
HMSM 303 – Healthcare Law and Regulation
HMSM 320 – Healthcare Financial Management
HMSM 346 – Leadership and Management in Healthcare Organizations
HMSM 410 – Healthcare Operations Management

Godfrey Gibbison, Dean of the School of Professional Studies (SPS), stated that the proposal satisfies a gap in the region. Healthcare makes up a significant part of the regional economy, and there are no similar programs to this one in the area.

The proposal includes five new courses, two of which provide students with a broad, structural sense of the healthcare industry and three that focus on the internal operations of the industry.

**Questions / Comments / Discussion**

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator – SHSS and Chair- Budget Committee, noting that the budget committee discussed the proposal, raised budgetary concerns that she said the Senate might want to consider.

She observed that the School of Professional Studies (SPS) will foot the bill through tuition for adjunct instruction for the HMSM courses. Students will also take courses from Economics, Management, and other CofC departments, and the proposal includes letters of support from Economics and Management that state that those departments can offer 10 seats to HMSM students in the program's required courses from their departments. However, she said that, should demand grow beyond the 10 students planned for the initial offering of the program, budgetary problems might arise. If, say, 30 students were enrolled that might put pressure on departments or create a bottleneck for students, she said.

She said that, while this may not be a reason to not approve the proposal, it is a concern the Senate should consider in its deliberations. The new program in Public Health, for instance, she said is experiencing a bottleneck due to greater-than-expected demand, and there are not enough lines available to add to the program to fix that.

While SPS may be able to support more students in the HMSM courses, it may not be true that the departments who offer courses that HMSM students may select have the seats for additional students,
She added. She asked Dean Gibbison if he had had conversations with those departments about available seats.

Dean Gibbison remarked that all the non-HMSM courses in the proposal are currently offered on the North Campus and that they are part of the Bachelor of Professional Studies degree program. Those courses are currently offered with capacity for HMSM students.

Eichelberger agreed that for now the capacity seems to be there, but cautioned the Senate that if the new program becomes wildly successful, we may find ourselves in a different situation.

Roxanne DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, agreed that Eichelberger's caution was well taken. DeLaurell noted that with the BPS, there has been a lot of creation, but new resources are not necessarily following. In addition to the constraints Eichelberger talked about, DeLaurell added, for all those courses in business that HMSM students may take, if they are completely staffed by adjuncts, it may create a problem for School of Business accreditation. Additional lines might be needed to meet demand and ensure accreditation, but those lines do not seem to be forthcoming. DeLaurell said she will vote against the proposal for these reasons.

Associate Provost Beverly Diamond observed that there are two visiting lines providing capacity in the BPS program, one in Management and one split between Computer Science and Management. [Correction: the second of these lines is permanent, not visiting.]

If the proposed program were wildly successful, we have capacity for it at the North Campus facility, and the increased enrollment would generate revenue. Additionally, Dean Gibbison, she said, has been working hard to ensure that programs at the North Campus do not threaten the School of Business's AACSB accreditation. Diamond said that Dean Gibbison and the Interim Provost will continue to work to ensure that the resources are available.

Heath Hoffman, Senator – Sociology and Anthropology, asked Dean Gibbison how many students are currently enrolled in the BPS.

The Dean said around 52, since the fall of 2013.

Kelly Shaver, Senator – Management and Entrepreneurship, asserted that availability of seats in classes is not the real issue. For example, MGMT 301 is only taught at the North Campus and in the evening. But if we should lose the visiting line for MGMT 301 on the North Campus, we will not be able to serve those 10 HMSM students with MGMT 301 downtown, since it is never taught at night.

Jon Hakkila, extending Shaver's observation, expressed confusion: is it not true that there are no lines specifically housed at North Campus?
Shaver said “that's right.” What we have are visiting lines in Management and Marketing and some of the visiting instructors teach at the North Campus.

Associate Provost Diamond specified that those faculty are hired and credentialed by the department chairs in their fields. They do not, as such, “reside” at the North Campus. There is an important difference.

Roxanne DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, added that those faculty are credentialed and hired by departments for accreditation purposes, and therefore, they “count” for accreditation.

Dean Gibbison assured the Senate that School of Business accreditation is not in jeopardy due to programs on the North Campus.

There were no further questions or discussion.

The proposal was approved on voice vote.

D. Resolution to Create a Faculty Position on the Board of Trustees
Larry Krasnoff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution to Create a Faculty Position on the Board of Trustees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whereas highly effective boards typically have the mutual trust and respect of members of the faculty,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whereas many institutions, public and private, have faculty representation on their Boards of Trustees,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whereas this campus could benefit from improved dialogue between the governing board and other constituencies on campus,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston calls upon the Board of Trustees to create a non-voting position on the Board for a faculty member, who will be elected by the faculty to a two-year term and will attend all Board of Trustees meetings, including executive sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be it resolved that The Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston calls upon President McConnell to appeal to the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to convert the faculty position on the Board of Trustees to a voting position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Larry Krasnoff noted that Faculty Senate recently passed a resolution supporting student representation on the Board of Trustees (BOT), and at that time many felt that if we could push to have student representation on the BOT, we ought to do the same regarding faculty representation on the BOT.
He explained that the resolution has two “resolved” clauses. The first of these, he said, would require no statutory action by the South Carolina legislature. The second one, however, would require legislative work. He noted that he and Speaker McNerney had reviewed the relevant sections of the SC Code of Laws.

Regarding the first “resolved” clause, he said, the BOT can manage its own affairs as it sees fit, which might include creating an opportunity for a faculty member to be there at all times at its meetings.

However, creating a voting position on the BOT for a faculty representative would require legislative action, since there is a clause that spells this out in SC law, and this kind of change in the law is the focus of the second “resolved” clause. Krasnoff expressed doubt that such a change would be coming any time soon, but said it is worth pursuing.

**Questions / Comments / Discussion**

**Katherine Walker**, Interim General Counsel, took issue with the interpretation of SC law that Krasnoff forwarded, namely that the BOT currently has a right to place a nonvoting member on the BOT. In her review of the statute, she said she came to a different conclusion. The BOT, she said, has no such right. The BOT, she explained, is appointed by the legislature, and there is a statute that creates the CoC BOT, as well as all the other Boards of Trustees for all the other higher education institutions in the state. The statute identifies 19 members of the CoC BOT, some are ex officio, non-voting members (such as the Governor). In addition, the legislature specifically contemplated non-voting student members on BOTs and created a statutory exception. There is, she said, “a separate statute that says, notwithstanding any other provision of law, all institutions of higher education in the state have the right to appoint an ex officio, non-voting student to the Board of Trustees.” There is no comparable statutory exception allowing the College to place a faculty member on the BOT. She closed by saying that she “respectfully disagree[s] that we legally have the right or that the Board of Trustees legally has the right to place a faculty member on the Board, whether they are voting or non-voting, without a statutory change.”

**Krasnoff** asked the Faculty Secretariat to project on screen for reference as he responded to Walker sections of the South Carolina Code of Laws: Title 59, Chapter 101 and Chapter 130.

Krasnoff said that he doesn’t see why, if the BOT can create a student member that they cannot also create other memberships.

He pointed out that the first “resolved” clause in the resolution does not actually call for a membership, but for a “non-voting position.”

Krasnoff called attention to two provisions in Chapter 130, SECTION 59-130-30. Powers of board., (6) and (17).
“(6) make bylaws and regulations for the management of its affairs and its own operations not inconsistent with law;”

Krasnoff interpreted this provision as allowing the BOT to include faculty at meetings if they so choose, unless, he said, you interpret the general statute allowing the creation of a student member as disallowing this, with which Krasnoff said he disagreed.

“(17) appoint committees of the board or officers or members of the faculty of the college with authority and for purposes in connection with the operation of the college as the board considers necessary;”

Krasnoff read this provision as allowing the BOT to have faculty at meetings if they consider it necessary to the good operation of the college.

Walker replied that the resolution specifically asks the BOT to “place a faculty member as a non-voting member” of the BOT.

Krasnoff said, in reply, “position.”

Walker countered that there is no position on the BOT that is not a member of the BOT.

Krasnoff responded by saying that there are people who attend all the meetings but are not members, such as Elizabeth Kassebaum. If the BOT said that there could be an elected faculty member that comes to the meetings, then that would be, Krasnoff argued, in their purview by virtue of the provisions he cited above. Krasnoff added that he and Walker obviously have a disagreement about what the law says but that he does not think that the text demands one reading over another.

Phil Jos, Senator – SHSS, asked if there is a way to combine the two “resolved” clauses and essentially ask the BOT to “do whatever you have to do” to make this happen.

Krasnoff said that it could be left up to the BOT. But he added that it is really a matter of whom the BOT allows to its meetings. It is not, he stated, really a matter of making someone a member because that implies voting. The BOT, he asserted, could act now to allow faculty at its meetings. If it wants to redefine executive session, it could do that, as well.

If the statutory change is necessary, he added, then we should urge that, but he said he remains unconvinced that it is necessary.

Iana Anguelova, Senator – Mathematics, pointed out a problem in wording. When the second “resolved” clause speaks of a “voting position,” she wondered what the difference is between a “voting position” and a membership.

Krasnoff replied by suggesting that the wording could be changed. “Position” could be changed in the last clause to “membership.” Krasnoff said he would accept that as a friendly amendment if offered. It was not.
Heath Hoffman, Senator – Sociology and Anthropology, asked the Interim General Counsel if she advises the BOT on interpreting the law when resolutions like this come to them.

Walker replied “yes.”

Hoffman went on to say, “your interpretation is that this would be in violation of state law. Your recommendation to the Board would be 'this is in violation of state law.'”

“Correct,” Walker replied.

Hoffman observed that the Senate needs to keep Walker’s response in mind.

Walker concurred.

Bob Mignone, Senator – SSM, observed that he has always supported something like what the resolution is asking for. It would be a “wonderful gesture,” and many other institutions have it. It’s time, he added, that faculty have a seat at the table.

We could appoint anyone go to the meetings, which are all open, except executive sessions, which are a different matter. Merely attending meetings, waiting to be recognized to speak, if that even happens, does not seem very useful. We should “go for it,” he said: ask for a voting membership that allows participation in all meetings, including executive session. We have a President with a good deal of influence at the state level; perhaps he could assist in this case. If it is against the law, then perhaps, he added, that needs to be changed first.

Krasnoff replied that if we ask and it is rejected, then it’s clear from the resolution that we would want the statute to change.

Andrew Shedlock, Senator - Biology, argued that “going for it” with “an illegal apparatus that is going to get shut down is not an intelligent approach to this valuable opportunity.” If a faculty representative does not have executive session rights and is not part of a shared governance, then the position will be seen as a “watchdog,” which is “not how we want to engage” the BOT. It’s important, he said, how we approach this so it is not misinterpreted.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked the Interim General Counsel whether or not it would, in her opinion “pass legal muster” if “we were able to combine the intent of the first ["resolved"] clause and the intent on the second into one that effectively asks both the Board of Trustees and the President to seek appropriate change in the law to permit a voting representative of the faculty to be on the Board of Trustees.” Shaver stated that he was not proposing this as an amendment but just testing it out.

Walker replied that there is another, entirely separate concern that she has: an employee of the College serving as a voting member of the BOT could be
seen as a conflict of interest and a violation of the statutory ethics rules for state employees.

Nonetheless, she said, you could ask the President and the BOT to explore the issue and consider proposing a statutory change.

Shaver replied that he was suggesting not merely that the President and BOT explore the possible change but that they ask for a change, in which case we would be able to see if they actually did or not.

Walker added that the possible conflict of interest has been looked into before.

Shaver countered that, clearly, such concerns have been resolved in states where faculty serve as members of boards of trustees.

Walker replied that it has not been resolved, to her knowledge, in South Carolina.

“That's a given” in South Carolina, Shaver responded.

**Morgan Koerner**, Department of German and Slavic Studies, observed that this resolution is a “kind, friendly gesture” toward the BOT, given that over 11 months ago the Senate voted no confidence in the BOT. The resolution, he said, is a gesture for something the BOT can do to win faculty trust. He added that he finds the loophole Krasnoff suggested promising, but that how the Speaker frames the resolution as he introduces it to the BOT will matter a great deal. It should be framed, Koerner said, as a PR victory for the BOT and way to reconcile without really giving up any power.

Krasnoff replied that provision 6 (cited above) is not a loophole, but a way of allowing the BOT to govern its own affairs. Having faculty in meetings is “just governing its own affairs.”

Mignone disagreed with Krasnoff’s reading of provision 6. “Management” and “operations,” Mignone said, are different matters than talking about appointing a member.

He also offered what he called “an analogous, positive story.” There used to be a Council of Chairs in the state made up of faculty speakers from the public higher learning institutions, which Mignone said he chaired for a while. The Council attended meetings of the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (ACAP) in the Council of Higher Education, an important committee that decides on new programs. Mignone said that he wanted the Council to have a seat on ACAP, and that then CofC President Sanders worked with ACAP to secure a seat for the Council. This, he said, was an instructive success story representing good faith on all sides.

**Roxanne DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, stated that the law can be changed, and that law gets changed all the time. The only way to get change in law, she added, is to have group agitation for it. This resolution might be a means of communicating that.
Law, too, she added, is subject to interpretation. The South Carolina courts “might actually agree with Larry [Krasnoff]...Weirder things have happened.” While we cannot compel anyone to do anything that is illegal, we can, as she put it, “let them know what we are interested in accomplishing.”

Scott Peeples, Senator – SHSS, said that he “appreciates the danger of wordsmithing on the Senate floor,” but offered a possible amendment to the resolution and asked for Krasnoff’s opinion on it: deleting the first “resolved” clause, and editing the second so that it reads: “Be it resolved that The Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston calls upon the Board of Trustees and President McConnell to appeal to the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a voting faculty position on the Board of Trustees.”

Krasnoff stated that, if one were worried about the first “resolved” clause Peeples’s proposed amendment would make sense. However, he said, keeping the first “resolved” clause might offer the BOT more options. Additionally, he said, keeping the clause makes us make our case to the Board and perhaps would engender a serious conversation about what membership and non-membership means. Krasnoff suggested this is not an aggressive move.

Andrew Shedlock, Senator – Biology, added in reply to Krasnoff’s remark about aggression, that this is a very important opportunity, and the faculty member that is at a board meetings needs to be engaged, not seen as a watchdog. He pointed out that the Interim General Counsel has said that she will advise the BOT that the resolution is illegal. “I don’t think this is the best way” to do it.

Krasnoff replied, “I’m sorry, but there are different interpretations of the law.” He asserted that the Interim General Counsel is not simply interpreting the law but is “also working for particular people who have appointed [her] and who may have particular interpretations and agendas that they want to advance.”

Walker replied that she “takes issue” with Krasnoff’s statement. She said she was asked for her objective opinion and was not instructed to offer any particular interpretation. This is her neutral opinion of the law, she said.

Krasnoff said that he was simply replying to Shedlock’s statement. He added that simply because the College’s legal counsel has an opinion does not mean we have to defer to that interpretation.

Shedlock responded the he was simply suggesting what we might expect to happen with the resolution.

Shaver added that we should expect a very short conversation, not a “law conversation.” The first question might be, “is this legal?” The likely resounding “no” would end the conversation. If one were trying to end the
conversation, he went on, that would be the approach. But with Peeples’s suggested amendment, Shaver said, the matter of legality is irrelevant and the focus turns to fixing the problem.

Krasnoff added that staying with the standing resolution language allows a non-voting membership, which is why, Krasnoff said, he sees it as opening the conversation, not closing it down. But we could go either way.

**Heath Hoffman** returned to Morgan Koerner’s comment that the Senate voted no confidence in the BOT, and in that context, the resolution might be seen as hostile. We might consider, he suggested, moving forward in a different way than proffering a resolution: starting a conversation with Brian McGee, the Speaker, the President, etc.

**Scott Peeples, Senator – SHSS, moved that the resolution be amended by striking the first “resolved” clause entirely and rewriting the second “resolved” clause (now the only “resolved” clause) to read: “Be it resolved that The Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston calls upon the Board of Trustees and President McConnell to appeal to the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a voting faculty position on the Board of Trustees.”**

The motion was seconded.

Peeples explained that the amendment has the virtue of asking for what we want and avoiding, as Shaver suggested, setting ourselves up for a quick “no.” We might consider, Peeples added, removing the word “voting,” but for now, he said, he wished to keep it in.

**Discussion now turned to Peeples’s motion to amend.**

Iana Anguelova, Senator – Mathematics, expressed concern that the amended resolution might still be illegal due to conflict of interest. She suggested consultation with legal counsel.

Krasnoff replied that the resolution as amended does not say by what statutory means the legislature would address the issue. Because we are calling for a statutory change, conflict of interest issued could be addressed in the statutory change.

**Bob Mignone, Senator – SSM, said that he thinks the motion is a good one.** He pointed out that the legislature just voted to disband the Commission on Higher Education because they want to form a Board of Regents. This resolution at least opens the conversation that might lead to having faculty representation on a Board of Regents if the state moves that way.

**Daniel Delgado, Senator – Hispanic Studies, called the question, which was seconded, and which passed with a 2/3 majority on voice vote.**

**The amendment was voted on and passed on a voice vote.**

The resolution now read as follows.
Resolution to Create a Faculty Position on the Board of Trustees

Whereas highly effective boards typically have the mutual trust and respect of members of the faculty,

Whereas many institutions, public and private, have faculty representation on their Boards of Trustees,

Whereas this campus could benefit from improved dialogue between the governing board and other constituencies on campus,

Be it resolved that The Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston calls upon the Board of Trustees and President McConnell to appeal to the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a voting faculty position on the Board of Trustees.

Discussion on the amended resolution.

Iana Anguelova, Senator – Mathematics, asked for a quorum call, which revealed, with 27 Senators present, that there was a quorum.

There was no further discussion.

The resolution as amended passed on voice vote.


Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 10 February 2015

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday 10 February 2015 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115) for a regular meeting.

Agenda

1. Call to Order: 5:06PM
2. The 20 January 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and information: None.
4. Reports
   A. Speaker of the Faculty
   The Speaker commended Faculty Secretariat Pearson Hoak for her work in updating the Faculty Senate web pages, and he asked Senators to forward any suggestions they have for the web pages to him. He also called attention to the conference room booking link on the Faculty Standing Committees page, and encouraged Senators to make use of the conference room for their committee meetings.

   He also thanked the President and Interim Provost for the open budget process, and he recognized and thanked by name all the members of the Faculty Budget Committee for their significant time and effort in the budget process: Julia Eichelberger (Chair), Tom Carroll, Rohn England, Steve Johnson, Rhonda Mack, Courtney Murren, and Tom Ross. Applause followed. He noted that the Chair of the committee will be bringing a report to the Senate, possibly in March.

   The Speaker reported on the January Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting. The BOT approved the MFA in Creative Writing. In budget matters, it made a slightly downward adjustment to the budget, due to a decrease in out-of-state students. The Speaker noted that the College keeps a rollover fund for such enrollment variations, which helped cover the decrease. The BOT also approved a 3% increase in the room fees for students beginning next year (with a 0% increase in board).

   Updates on building projects included
   • a delay in the completion of field stations at Dixie Plantation, with expected availability in March or early April.
   • expected fall 2016 completion date for the Hollings Science Center work.
   • expected start of work on the Simons Center after the Hollings Science Center work is finished, with a completion date on Simons still to be determined.
- effective completion of renovations in the Addlestone Library, though, as of the January BOT meeting, the books still were not closed due to some remaining costs still coming in. It appears to be coming in under budget.

- expected fall 2016 completion dates for renovations of the Rutledge and Rivers residence halls.

- the Jewish Studies addition getting back on track after the discovery of Civil War ordnance at the site, with an expected completion of spring 2017.

The Government Affairs Committee of the BOT also announced upcoming CofC recognition events in Columbia. The legislature will recognize the baseball team on February 12 for their recent achievement in advancing to super regional competition. Also, February 25 will be College of Charleston Day at the State House.

The Speaker noted that a planned meeting of CofC faculty, local business representatives, and the Chamber of Commerce on January 26, 2015 was postponed and should be rescheduled in the next week or two.

He also reported that a “Collaborative Council” has been created by President McConnell and MUSC President Cole in order to have specifically targeted conversations about collaborations between CofC and MUSC. At this point, the College’s membership on the committee includes Interim Provost McGee; Deans Auerbach, Gibbison, and McCandless; SGA President Spraker; Alumnus and Adjunct Professor Dr. Robert G. Ball, Vice President for Administration & Planning Paul Patrick; and the Speaker of the Faculty. The first organizational meetings will occur in early March.

The Speaker noted that he presented to the BOT resolutions approved by the Faculty Senate since the October BOT meeting. These were the Senate’s resolution in support of student representation on the BOT and in support of freedom of expression (Charlie Hebdo). He also gave them an update on the fall faculty/BOT shadowing program, the spring version of which will begin soon. The Speaker said that the faculty who participated in the program in the fall found the program to be quite informative and valuable for them in getting to know members of the BOT and in giving the BOT a glimpse of our work.

The Speaker also said that he encouraged the BOT to invite faculty to attend the BOT’s public meetings. He also encouraged Senators to attend these meetings. He said that after attending three of these meetings himself, he can attest to how much he has learned about how this institution operates and about the depth of some of the issues we face. It is important, he stressed, because we want to have a voice, that we attend BOT meetings. There is no reason preventing us from doing so, and, he added, should there ever be a rea-
son “that we are not allowed to do so, I should hope we would make some noise about it.”

B. **Interim Provost** (Topics – [PDF](#) | **Powerpoint Slides - PDF**)  

**Emergency Procedures**

The Interim Provost said of the bomb threat earlier in the day that, on the whole, emergency plans worked very well. Police and emergency personnel effectively moved people away from the threatened area, searched buildings with “exquisite care,” and declared “all clear” on the timeline they gave. He said that there will be a full after-action review of the events and response. The erroneous message that a bomb had been found, he said, was the fault of old software that had not been maintained. The after-action review will attend to what went wrong, why the software was not updated, and how to ensure it does not happen again.

He asked for the faculty's patience, sympathy, and support for their students who may not have been able to attend class or were delayed due to the situation.

**At this point, he paused to take questions about the bomb threat and the College's response.**

Asked by **Hollis France**, Senator - Political Science, what exactly happened, the Interim Provost replied that the College received a credible threat, deemed so for its specificity, in addition to other attributes, and as a result, the College took immediate action. He said that, as to how much he could say about it at this point, after having conferred with the President and Public Safety, the conclusion was that he needed to “be vague” at present, as there is an investigation underway to determine who made the call. He added that “we are going to move heaven and earth to catch” the responsible party. He hopes, he said, that in a couple months, he will be able to say much more.

**Scooter Barnett**, Health and Human Performance, noted that a parent raised a concern with her that students were locked in a residence hall, and she asked why this action was taken.

The Interim Provost said that there was a period as the events unfolded in which the College wanted people to stay where they were and to “shelter in place,” unless they were being moved out of a threatened building or area. This was not for a very long time. Some students not in the shut down buildings were, he agreed, inconvenienced. He also added that over social media repetitive and sometimes inaccurate details were passed from student to parent and vice versa. Many parents also got the Cougar Alert messages as well.

**Bob Mignone**, Chair - Mathematics, observed that there was about a two-hour delay between the first alert messages and the President’s email about how to proceed in relation to meeting classes in the buildings not being cleared. This caused some confusion for instructors, he said, who contacted
him for how they should proceed. A little more guidance in that two-hour pe-
period would have helped, he said.

The Interim Provost replied that he was “desperate” to give guidance to
deans, chairs, and faculty at the time and that they discussed this at great
length in the President’s office, but they lacked the information needed to
provide clarity and the focus was wholly on safety concerns, rather than
managing class times and schedules.

After 1:15, he said, he concluded that people had already made decisions
based on the insufficient information they already had and that it was worth
waiting a bit longer to get accurate information. Additionally, email mes-
sages are not written in the middle of events: we rely on Cougar Alert for
that. Cougar Alert, however, takes some time to get out. Care is taken, there-
fore, not to send out too many messages on the heels of one another so as to
avoid stacking up the messages. Also, the speed of the system, which is not a
significant issue with a situation like hurricane preparations, needs to be ad-
dressed, as the President acknowledged in an email. These factors affected
how quickly information and instructions got to faculty and students about
whether or not classes were to meet. This was a regrettable situation, he not-
ed, acknowledging the bind it may have put faculty and administrators in,
but also noting that, on the other hand, the leadership was doing precisely
what their prioritization scheme demanded.

Andrew Shedlock, Senator - Biology, asked how much of the system that
didn’t really work would we be relying on in the case of an active shooter on
campus.

The Interim Provost replied that the speed issue showed up in both the
bomb threat and a recent system test. In the situation of an active shooter or
a bomb threat, we need the system to work more rapidly. The system we
currently used was purchased in the post-Virigina Tech shooting era and we
pay a good bit of money for it. While there are some technical explanations
for the problems it had in the present situation, it is not working rapidly
enough. We have recognized the shortcoming, he said, and are trying to ad-
dress it quickly. “We’re not where we should be. We are trying to get better,”
he added.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, pointed out that the message that
went out identifying which buildings were closed and suggesting that all oth-
er buildings were open for business was, in fact, inaccurate because when
people tried to enter buildings that were not announced as closed, such as
his building on Glebe Street, police officers shut off access to those ostensibly
open buildings and indicated that the message was wrong. Krasnoff asked,
“was it wrong?

The Interim Provost said that the message sent was the product of confer-
ring with the incident commander and, thus, they considered it accurate. He
noted that there were not only communication problems from the adminis-
tration to the campus, but also from the incident command structure to the administration. The administration, he emphasized, is committed to addressing these issues, beginning tomorrow, having cancelled a number of important meetings in order to fix these problems as soon as possible.

**Hollis France**, Senator - Political Science, observed that it was confusing and unsettling in a class she was teaching in Maybank Hall to have the notification that some buildings were closed while others remained open in the face of a bomb threat and the erroneous message that a bomb had been found, which sparked terror, she said.

The Interim Provost replied that a very conservative perimeter was established by the security professionals. This situation raises an “eternal question”: when there is no inkling of a threat to other buildings on campus and we also have an armed security presence on the scene undreamed of on an ordinary day, is it a disservice to students and faculty to discontinue classes in unthreatened buildings? We know that canceling classes for the day adds many complications down the road, such as possibly triggering a make-up day and adding other challenges (such as rescheduling science labs). We’re trying to balance our interests as a teaching and learning organization with safety, which always comes first, he emphasized. He acknowledged the emotional effect of the situation, but also noted that there was not a safety threat to Maybank.

France responded that, the Interim Provost’s remark about the security presence notwithstanding, there seemed to be an absence of authority figures on the scene near her classroom who could instruct students what to do.

In the late morning and early afternoon, the Interim Provost said, there were security officers in the near vicinity of Maybank Hall. He called attention to the effort of security personnel and the administration to create a safe environment, but the very idea of a bomb is a challenge simply in terms of the emotional response it elicits. He reiterated that there is no single, good answer to a situation like we had, other than our ongoing attempt to balance safety first and the ongoing challenges that result from such events.

The Interim Provost closed this Q&A session by asking Senators and guests, if they feel so inclined, to thank the public safety officers they may see over the next few days. These officers went into threatened buildings, putting themselves in harm’s way, in order to get us out of them, he said.

At this point, the Interim Provost returned to his report.

**Performance Evaluation for Deans**

The Interim Provost reported that roster faculty surveys for evaluating line-school Deans (excluding the Dean of the School of Cultures, Languages, and World Affairs, who is in his first year) have been completed. The survey was designed by the Faculty Welfare Committee. There was a 48% response rate, which the Interim Provost called “a little disappointing.” With the exception
of one school, which had a lower response rate, all the schools were over 50%, and two were over 60%. He thanked faculty for providing survey feedback to be used in the Dean’s performance evaluations.

He reported that he will meet soon with the Faculty Welfare Committee to discuss their proposed FAM language changes on Dean evaluations, which are aimed at clarifying and specifying evaluation guidelines.

**Academic Affairs Draft Budget Proposal**

Before providing budget figures (see page 4 of [Powerpoint slides](#)) and discussing them, the Interim Provost thanked the Faculty Budget Committee for what he called their “enormous service.” He noted that the budget for Academic Affairs comprises a very significant portion of the total $253 million-dollar institutional budget. The 2.7% increase the Interim Provost proposed for Academic Affairs amounts to slightly over $2 million in recurring funding. This is a small percentage increase relative to past years’ requests, but, he added, in past years, large increases have not be secured and the goal, he said, of this year’s proposal is to recognize that next year is likely to be a “very modest budget-increase year” and, accordingly, to bring a “scaled-down and modest ask to the table.” The proposed increase would pay for

- faculty and staff salary increases (a 1.5% salary pool to be used toward merit increases, 2.2% for increases in adjunct pay).
- inflationary operational costs, plus funds to fix budgets of continually underfunded units.
- eight new faculty lines and five new staff lines (in the form of temporary-to-permanent conversions, for positions that have long been filled by full-time, but temporary employees, and these employees, the Interim Provost asserted, should not only have healthcare benefits mandated by the Affordable Care Act, but also the dignity of a retirement program).
- faculty development.
- graduate student support, making a financial commitment to support these students, just as we have made financial commitments to the development of undergraduate student research.

Academic Affairs, he said, will be offering their budget to the President soon, and a process will begin shortly thereafter of matching up the budget proposals from the various divisions across the College, followed by entering into conversations about the same with the Board of Trustees.

**Business Before Faculty and Senate Committees**

Our Dean’s List criteria are on the table, the Interim Provost remarked, since they appear to be out of line with those of most other institutions.
He also pointed out that several faculty and Senate committees have been reviewing graduate faculty membership, titles for adjunct faculty, and are beginning to have conversations about the possible return of the honorary rank of Distinguished Professor, which was discontinued in 2002.

The Interim Provost noted that a modest number of students (under 200) with disabilities that preclude their ability to take foreign language courses, instead take foreign language alternative courses to satisfy that requirement. The alternative course model dates back at least as far as 1989. The list of alternative courses is faculty-approved. However, while additions to and deletions from this list have been reported to the Academic Standards Committee, the list itself has not been closely managed and expressly reviewed by faculty.

The General Education Committee and Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience Lynne Ford, he said, have cleaned up the current list, removing many courses no longer offered, and a final version of the list may be brought to the Senate for consideration and approval in March. Since, as SACSCOC dictates, the faculty have primary control of the curriculum, it is important that we document the endorsement of the faculty for the current approach. He stressed, however, that this would be an interim measure only, for a couple of reasons. Thus far, for one, we have not figured out a way to assess this academic program, and assessability is a SACSCOC requirement. Also, we need to be able to advise students for registration for next fall.

While a more permanent solution is pondered, the General Education Committee will bring an updated list to the Senate for consideration, with one significant change from the current document. The current requirement in one area that courses be drawn from two different disciplines will be struck, due to its impracticality: due to course availability, the requirement is sometimes very difficult to meet. Also, the Interim Provost asserted, the intellectual rationale for this requirement is not clear.

**Today's Faculty Senate Agenda**

The Interim Provost complimented the efforts of those involved in both the newly proposed changes in the Math/Logic requirement for general education and the sweeping revision of the Hispanic Studies Program, both of which were on the Senate agenda for the evening.

**Discussion/Questions/Comments**

**Bob Mignone**, Chair - Department of Mathematics, speaking in relation to the foreign language alternatives, urged consideration, as well, of the Math and Logic alternatives. He said that the current Math alternatives make little to no sense. Different proposals have been made over the years, he said, but they have not been adopted. Currently, he said, the Math alternatives are, to his estimation, often more difficult than the MATH requirements they are meant to replace. Thus, he said, in line with the conversations underway on
foreign language alternatives, we should also review Math and Logic alternatives.

The Interim Provost asked if the Speaker and he should confer with the General Education Committee to have them consider this for their agenda. Mignone replied that the committee is already aware of the issue, but that he simply wanted to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate more broadly.

5. Old Business

None

6. New Business

A. General Education Committee (webpage)

a. Removal of AAST 300 Special Topics in African American Studies from the list of approved humanities courses (PDF)

Karen Smail, Chair - General Education Committee, explained that the General Education Curriculum is frozen for this year and next year due to assessment for SACSCOC, so any approvals of proposals by the Senate will not go into effect until the 2016-17 academic year.

There was no discussion.

The Senate approved the proposal on a voice vote.

b. Change the Math/logic General Education requirement (PDF)

Small explained that the assessment process made clear that our current requirement of six hours from an approved list of courses is not consistent with best practice for general education Math/logic requirements. She added that proposal was vetted and is supported by the Department of Mathematics, Department of Philosophy, and the Honors College.

Discussion/Questions/Comments

Jason Overby, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM), expressed strong support for the proposal since, as the requirement currently stands, it penalizes the student who is actually good in Math because it forces them to take a higher level of Math, whereas a lesser-skilled student wouldn't have to do so. However, regarding the provision in the proposal that stipulates the “removal of MATH 220 Calculus II/HONS 215 Honors Calculus II from the list of approved courses,” he asked why MATH 229, a higher-level, calculus-derived course approved for General Education (GE) credit, was not also to be removed in the proposal, as is MATH 220.

Bob Mignone replied that MATH 229, to his recollection, has never been approved for GE. Overby countered that in Chemistry their understanding is that 229 is approved for GE but there was an error in the course proposal form (a box left unchecked). Mignone replied that, either way,
it doesn’t matter: if MATH 229 is, in fact, approved for GE, we should remove it from the list. Smail concurred that if 229 is on the list, it should be removed.

The proposal was approved by voice vote.

B. Faculty Curriculum Committee (webpage)

Bonnie Springer, Chair - Faculty Curriculum Committee, thanked Faculty Secretariat Pearson Hoak for her work in getting the curriculum proposals in order for presentation to the Senate.

The Speaker suggested that the Senate discuss and vote according to the arabic-numbered groups on the agenda. Individual proposals, he said, could be discussed separately if requested.

1. Course Prerequisite Changes
   a. HIST 104 (PDF)
   b. PHIL 399 (PDF)
   c. ARTM 340 (PDF)
   d. HEAL 225, 230. 403 (PDF)
   e. REAL 376 and change of program (PDF)
   f. HPCP 290 (PDF)

   There was no discussion.

   All proposals were approved by voice vote.

2. Existing Course changes with program changes
   a. PSYC 321 name change (PDF)
   b. WGST Change of Major and Minor – adding existing courses (PDF)
   c. EDCL Change of Major (PDF)
   d. HTMT 444 course change and change an existing minor (PDF)
   e. BIOL 343/343L and changes to majors (PDF)

   There was no discussion.

   All proposals were approved by voice vote.

3. New Course Proposals with Program changes
   a. BIOL 423 and associated changes of major and minor (PDF)
   b. BIOL 359 and changes in associated majors and minors (PDF)
   c. AAST 280 and 350 with change of major and minor (PDF)
   d. MGMT 342 with change of major forms (PDF)
e. Hispanic Studies change of program proposal which includes new courses and major revisions (PDF 1 | PDF 2)

f. JWST220 and change of program forms (PDF)

g. MATH 460 and 461 and change of majors and minors (PDF)

There was no discussion.

**All proposals were approved by voice vote.**

6. Constituents’ Concerns:

   Jason Overby, Senator – SSM, strongly encouraged Senators to try out the beta version of Yammer. Having tried Yammer himself, he reported that it “puts email to shame” and should be a viable alternative to the current, abused listserv system.

7. Adjournment: 6:03 PM
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 20 January 2015

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 20 January 2015 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

Agenda

1. **Call to Order**: 5:05 PM
2. 2 December 2014 Regular Meeting Minutes were approved.
3. **Announcements and information**: none.
4. **Reports**

   A. **Speaker of the Faculty**

   The Speaker introduced Pearson Hoak, the new Faculty Secretariat. Applause followed.

   He reported that he attended a SACSCOC orientation meeting in Nashville in December with a party that included the President, Senior VP Steve Osbourne, Interim Provost Brian McGee, Presidential Assistant Debbie Hammond, and our then liaison to SACSCOC, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, Penny Brunner. Since that meeting, he reported, Penny Brunner has left the College to take up a position at Clemson University and that the President and Interim Provost are working on an plan to replace her as expeditiously as possible, given the large amount of work still to be done over the next 16-18 months in our reaffirmation, including determining and developing our new QEP, or Quality Enhancement Plan.

   The Speaker noted that the President sent out a couple email calls for faculty input into the QEP in the fall, and the Speaker expressed hope that faculty did provide their ideas. There will likely be conversation and debate about the plan, he said. Our last QEP, he pointed out, was the institution of the First Year Experience program.

   The Speaker reported that he attended the recent budget hearings, and he thanked the Budget Committee for their time-intensive and very valuable work in reviewing budget proposals, attending the lengthy meeting, and their ongoing involvement in the budget process. He thanked, as well, the President and Interim Provost for their involvement in the open process.

   The Speaker encouraged faculty to participate in Dean evaluations. Most faculty will have received requests via email for their participation in the process. However, he added that Dean Tillis of the School of Languages, Cultures and World Affairs, due to being in his first year at the College, will not be evaluated, as well as the Deans of non-line schools: the Honors College; the University of Charleston, South Carolina; and the School of Professional Studies. He observed that the Faculty Welfare Committee over the past few
years has been instrumental in ensuring the opportunity for faculty to evaluate their Deans and added that the Faculty By-Laws Committee will be looking at some Welfare Committee-proposed FAM language on these evaluations in order to address some of the present language’s shortcomings.

The Speaker announced that the College will again be participating this year in the “Great Colleges to Work For” survey, another initiative for which the Faculty Welfare Committee advocated, with the hope that we would regularize participation in order to gather a benchmark set of data to give us perspective on our campus climate and work environment. He urged Senators to participate and asked that Senators go back to their departments and encourage faculty colleagues there to participate, as well.

He also reported that the Welfare Committee has taken up the idea of reinstating the “Distinguished Professor” title, which was discontinued by the Board of Trustees, he said, in 2001. He deferred to the Interim Provost to answer any specific questions about this, but noted that it is being considered by the Interim Provost and in other venues as well.

The Speaker noted that discussions between faculty and members of the Charleston Business community convened jointly by the College and the Charleston Chamber of Commerce continue. Initially, these meetings, he said, were to take up discussion about the position that more advanced degrees are needed from the College to address economic needs in the region. However, those meetings, with sometimes upwards of 20 people in the room, he observed, were at times unwieldy and not very productive. Future meetings, thus, will be in smaller groups and over more targeted issues and concerns surrounding what the College is providing for students and whether or not changes could be made to better prepare them for a post-college life. He will be contacting those who have participated in past meetings, but also opened the door to anyone else who might wish to participate. Any one interested, he said, should contact him.

At this point, the Speaker took a question from Jason Overby, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics (SSM): what effect, if any, will the recent announcement that Clemson is building a graduate school annex at the old Navy base in North Charleston have on these discussions?

The Speaker, first adding that Clemson’s plans for the new facility have been known for quite some time, replied that Clemson’s planned offerings will have to be part of the conversation and may even end the conversation, if Clemson is seen as filling the perceived gap. [The Interim Provost also addressed Overby’s question: see below.]

Finally, the Speaker reported that, following a practice established by Speaker Cherry, he recently called a meeting of faculty committee chairs, in order to check the status of the committees’ work, share information, and to cross-pollinate ideas across the committees. The meeting was productive, he said. Minutes will be posted on the Senate website soon.
B. **Interim Provost** (Topics – [PDF](#))

**Preliminary Remarks**

Before beginning his report, the Interim Provost addressed the question raised by Senator Jason Overby (SSM) above, regarding Clemson’s presence in North Charleston. There has been no secrecy about their plans to develop a graduate center in North Charleston: they will bring a handful of faculty permanently from their College of Engineering and Science to North Charleston along with up to 200 graduate students to first develop programs in power system engineering and then add programs having to do with aeronautical engineering. They have a blanket permission, the Interim Provost said, from the CHE to bring any program in engineering to the Lowcountry they care to, provided that they have a market for it. Likely, they will maintain a relatively small presence and rely on the Citadel and the College to provide some of the core math and science education needed by their graduate students in applied disciplines. Means of collaboration between the College, the Citadel, and Clemson is being discussed right now, led by Dean Amy McCandless, and will ultimately involve and require the support of our faculty. There is no need to worry at present about Clemson’s graduate efforts in the Lowcountry duplicating our own, he asserted.

The Interim Provost wished Penny Brunner the best in her new post at Clemson and noted that a great team remains in place here in the office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning, and he thanked them for their continued good work on behalf of the College.

In addition, he reinforced what the Speaker said about the Great Colleges to Work For survey, thanking the Faculty Welfare Committee for their leadership on this.

**Budget Hearings for Academic Affairs**

The budget hearings lasted around four hours. Presentations were made by the Deans, Associate Vice Presidents, and the Faculty Compensation Committee. The Interim Provost thanked the Faculty Budget Committee and its chair, Julia Eichelberger, for their many hours spent reviewing the voluminous documents associated with the budget hearings, representing faculty concerns at the lengthy meeting, and following up on the hearing. He thanked the Deans and the AVPs for their hard work on their budget requests, as well.

He reported that for the the Deans and the AVPs he characterized the College as a “stable and financially successful institution,” but not “particularly wealthy.” With modest state support, only incremental tuition increases allowed by the state, we can expect no large across-the-board appropriations. We will have fairly flat appropriations, with perhaps a few small gains in specialty areas. Philanthropic support continues to grow, but will not likely have a pronounced effect until many years from now. We have stable enrollments, but no growth expected. In short, there are no new sources of money
in large supplies, so we will have about the same numbers of faculty lines and staff positions next year as we have this year. Hard choices are on the horizon: many very good proposals will not get funded.

He added that as part of the budget considerations, current program fees (or, more specifically, course fees) are on the table for discussion. Most program fees are likely to stay the same next year, but some fees may go up incrementally because they no longer cover the costs of the programs/courses they support. Also under consideration is the possibility of school fees for those schools that are relatively more expensive than others, something the Senate considered late in the year of 2007. The most expensive schools per credit hour and which are tough to support financially are the School of Business and the School of Science and Mathematics, both of which have had enrollment increases in recent years. School fees are under consideration to see if they might offset higher costs, address needs in the schools, and also help us achieve strategic plan goals related to such things as undergraduate research, workforce preparation, and study abroad initiatives, among others. Fees might also allow for cost recovery for investments already made in those schools, and under consideration, as well, is providing some of the money from fees to be directed by students in the schools. Nothing has been decided yet on school fees, he said, and the conversation over this idea will include the Budget and Academic Planning Committees this spring.

December Commencement

The Interim Provost thanked all who attended, participated in, planned, and helped support December commencement this year, expressing deep appreciation for the support this shows our students and their families. But he reported that December commencement’s attendance has been going down significantly. Over 300 students attended the December ceremony 10 years ago. This year the number was less than 190. Graduation numbers haven’t changed, but more students are opting to attend the spring ceremony in the Cistern, instead, even if they have to wait for it, or they are choosing not to attend commencement at all.

In the fall, making the December 2014 commencement the last one was being considered, but the President decided that eliminating the ceremony with only a year’s notice might not be fair to students who may already be planning to attend the 2015 December ceremony. He also, the Interim Provost reported, wants to see what will happen to December numbers if we relax the requirements for participating in the spring ceremony, which is the current plan. The Interim Provost said that faculty and students can expect to soon receive an email that says that we are now allowing any student applying to graduate in spring of summer of 2015 the opportunity to participate in the spring ceremony, a meaningful change from current policy. The recent move to three ceremonies in the spring should provide room for additional students to participate. We will inform students that there
will be a December 15th, 2015 ceremony, but that we make no promises for a December 16 ceremony. We will evaluate whether to continue December ceremonies after the 15 December 2015 commencement. For historical context, the Interim Provost noted that the December commencement has not been a consistent tradition of the College.

**Updates to the Faculty/Administration Manual**

The Interim Provost thanked the Faculty By-Laws Committee and its Chair, Rick Heldrich, and all the committees and staff involved in continuing to update and improve the F/AM, whose most recent iteration is out with notable improvements in language regarding accommodating students with disabilities and attendance policy.

**Tenure and Promotion Review Process**

The tenure and promotion review process, the Interim Provost reported, is half completed in terms of the four levels of recommendation involved: departmental and Dean’s reviews are completed and we are now moving into the work of the faculty advisory Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review Committee. The Interim Provost pointed out the great deal of work done by this committee and he thanked the current committee and its chair, Mark Landis, for the work they are doing in reviewing the 43 files on their docket this year.

While it has been a long-held custom that the Provost sits with the committee during their deliberations (this is not required in by-laws), the Interim Provost noted that he will not be doing so this year. He said that he feels uncomfortable sitting with the committee in their deliberations, he said, when he does not also have access to all the other deliberative processes prior (such as the departmental review committees’ or Dean’s deliberations). Instead, he will conduct his own, independent review in light of his own reading of the materials and the three previous levels of review. He is interested in seeing if this “grand experiment of the Interim Provost” changes in any way how the Provost and the advisory committee see things relevant to past years. Granting that it will be hard to judge that from just one year’s practice, this is his strong preference for how to proceed this year and, he said, he wanted to make sure the Senate is informed. He expressed confidence that we will still have “the same high quality review we have always had thanks to the hard work of the deans and the faculty.”

**Comments on Today’s Senate Agenda**

The Interim Provost singled out the Curriculum Committee for their ongoing work, adding that it is easy for us to underestimate the importance of the work they do, which we may seem to be rushing through in Senate meetings. But the committee’s work, he said, has real consequences over time for the life of the institution, as evidenced, in part, he said, in trends over time in students’ choices of majors. He shared a list of the top 14 undergraduate major declarations as of the end of fall 2014 (such data he noted is al-
ways available on the institutional research website, and he discussed how these declarations evince the evolution of the College since it entered the public education system 45 years ago (see below). The following majors accounted for about 62% of declared majors in December 2014. Thus the 14 majors represent an outsized number of our total declarants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Management</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality/Tourism Management</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the top four majors in the list, all longstanding CofC majors, have been in the top four for many years, sometimes in different positions, Exercise Science, coming in at number five, is a fairly recent major. Public Health (number six) is a very new major. Of the 14 majors listed, only five were in existence at the College when it entered the public education system 45 years ago. “I think we’re charting,” he said, “the evolution and change at the College of Charleston through the work of its faculty and through the work of the curriculum committee and the Senate.” Six of the 14 majors, he specified, fall comfortably into the Arts and Sciences (29% of total majors), while the other eight might fit comfortably in the professional side of things (33% of total majors). He asserted that this is a “moment-in-time snapshot of who we are as an institution, thanks to the work of the faculty.”

Discussion/Questions/Comments

**Phil Jos**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), asked if he would be correct in assuming that, given that overall enrollments have been flat for some time and that majors have proliferated at the same time, that the Provost’s office, in assessing the relative success of attracting majors, would not be comparing us to an era in which there were fewer majors competing.
The Interim Provost responded by saying it would be fair to say that Academic Affairs is trying to ensure that every major has robust roster faculty staffing, support for high-quality student advising, and that students can graduate in four years with a range of options for courses and are well-served at the beginning, middle, and end of their major. Some programs, he said, are having difficulty meeting these goals due to growth. Some majors have declined over time incrementally, perhaps, he said, because there are more major options or students are finding other majors more attractive. We may have to make some tough programatic choices, the Interim Provost said, because we cannot expect enrollment growth or added state money to solve our problems. This may mean faculty reallocation over time, as lines become available, or that scarce new lines will have to support growing programs. In short, he said, in Academic Affairs, the mission is to ensure that programs have the resources they need to succeed, and the Deans, in the budget process, were fairly clear about what those needs are.

George Pothering, Parliamentarian, asked if there has been a change in the number of double majors over the period that the Interim Provost has been discussing.

The Interim Provost noted that he has only looked at the past few years in terms of Pothering’s question. Right now, he said, around 250 students graduate in a typical spring with double majors, and so we need to think carefully about whether the growth in some majors is a function of double majoring. In some majors, there is a high incidence of double-majoring. Dance, for instance, had 33 out 50 majors double-majoring. Most of the large-size majors, he observed, do not show such a high percentage of double-majoring, but the trend toward double-majoring, if there is one, would certainly explain smaller declines in some majors, with simultaneously larger increases in others.

In fact, the Interim Provost pointed out, even the numbers he shared are a bit distorting for some majors. For instance, Computer Science would say it supports multiple majors, of which Computer Science is but one. The same goes for Biology.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked the Interim Provost to discuss what conversations he is having with the Tenure, Promotion, and Third Year Review Committee, given that he is not sitting with the committee. The practice of the Provost sitting with the committee was, Krasnoff noted, to encourage shared standards across the College. How, he asked the Interim Provost, are we going to keep such standards?

The Interim Provost replied that, with regard to shared standards, the committee and he are having ongoing conversations and the committee knows that they have access to his input on standards whenever it is needed. The standards are the center of many conversations in the written documents
produced in departmental and dean-level evaluations. Thus, there is a wide-ranging and ongoing conversation about standards and their meaning. If the committee needs his input on a standards question, he said, he will respond as rapidly as possible.

There were no more questions.

C. Faculty Educational Technology Committee – Chair, David Desplaces
Recommendation to Adopt Yammer (PDF)

The committee has taken up, among many agenda items, the need for an alternative to the listserv system, and in the process of working on this, Desplaces reported, discovered that IT had also been working on alternatives to the listserv system and evaluating options for a different project. The committee, coordinating with IT, conducted an independent evaluation of Yammer, a Facebook-like, cross-platform communication application that works on both computers and handheld devices. It allows individuals to create and join discussion groups, "follow" individuals and/or topics, search for relevant information shared by any group or any individual, etc. Yammer could be used for any number of communication functions: disseminating information, gathering information, encouraging discussion and participation, answering questions, and so forth.

In addition, Desplaces added, Yammer operates in a secure way and would come to the College at no additional cost, since it is included in the license for a software suite we already run.

After testing the system and considering it carefully, the Faculty Educational Technology Committee (FETC), on behalf of the faculty, recommend, he said, that the college adopt Yammer as a replacement for the listserv system, pending additional review that the College needs to undertake on a few issues, including FERPA compliance.

Finally, he added that members of the College will be able to opt out of discussions on Yammer if they so chose. There will still be a few listservs to be used by the College to disseminate emergency information, important HR information, and the like.

Desplaces opened the floor for questions and discussion, and invited Andrew Bergstrom, Director of Web Strategies, and Robert Cape, Senior Vice President and Chief Information Officer, also present at the meeting, to join in the discussion.

Discussion/Questions/Comments

Jason Overby, Senator - SSM, agreed that Yammer looks like a good system, but he asked how, within the new system, we can enforce using appropriate channels for communication of certain kinds of content. He noted that a good number of people regularly abuse the faculty and staff listserv for disseminating or requesting information on things outside the listserv’s designated purview: cats, roofing contractors, blackberries, ham, condos, apart-
ments, sofas, and so forth. How can we insure people will use Yammer in a way consistent with the designated purpose of each channel?

Bergstrom answered by way of some history: a previous FETC recommended that the College go from the listserv system to a web forum system, which was adopted, but which ended up not working out for a number of reasons. Meanwhile, the College consolidated some of the existing listservs into the current faculty and staff listserv and in the process terminated many of the existing listservs. This, added to the failure of the web forums, opened the faculty and staff listserv to an overload of messages that are not appropriate for the list. In short, he said, when there are not enough channels, information flows to those that are open, regardless of appropriateness.

Yammer, he said, is not subject to that kind of restriction problem. Users may post to and read from public and private groups, but Yammer also features metadata, which is not supported by listserv. In Yammer, metadata creates topics, and users can follow persons, groups, and sets of topics, allowing for cross-talk across different groups, another feature not available in listservs.

He also pointed out that when the listservs were originally put in place (around 2005), the College never articulated an acceptable use policy. Yammer allows for an acceptable use policy to be put in place that users, on their initial sign-in, have to agree to in order to participate. Such a policy would spell out responsibilities and consequences for abuse. Bergstrom hopes that this will help cut down on potential abuse.

Desplaces added that, as in Facebook, one has to opt in to groups in Yammer.

Roxanne De Laurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked three questions:

• If Yammer is like Facebook, can’t interested parties simply use Facebook, and if so, why do we need a new software program?
• Will yammer compile data on users?
• Will we have to look at ads?

Bergstrom explained that there will be no ads: Yammer is part of a closed network at the College. He further noted that Yammer is covered in the enterprise agreement that the College has with Microsoft, which also entitles us to a suite of services called Office 365, which the College is currently evaluating and which uses a redundant and secure cloud system. The cloud system would still allow users to have access to core software, in the event of the College having to go offline for any reason. That would be the case for Yammer, too, but also, eventually, perhaps, for Microsoft Exchange, the email system.
Bergstrom also stressed that there will be no tracking with Yammer. This is specified in the contract with Microsoft, just as it is with our contract with Google for Google Apps: there is no data mining or tracking.

As to the question about Facebook, Bergstrom said that Yammer will work in a closed system and our contract with Microsoft gives us control over Yammer. This would not be the case with Facebook.

DeLaurell observed that the closed system would mean that the college would have liability for what happens on Yammer.

Bergstrom agreed: The college is responsible for its content; individuals are responsible for the content they post.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism, asked if Yammer would be open to our alumni, specifying that in his program they use a listserv to contact alumni.

Bergstrom replied that the plan for Yammer is to maintain a closed network. It would not be open to alumni. He explained that Yammer is an enterprise social network whose members are here at the College. Listservs, on the other hand, come into play with colleagues and individuals outside the College who do not have an authenticated account to work with us (listservs may still have a role in these cases). Additionally, we have what are called “distribution lists,” which are collections of email addresses created inside Microsoft Exchange (such as all enrolled students, all faculty, all staff, etc.) from which one cannot opt out.

All three modes of communication described above will be in place and their use will depend on the application

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked, given that all three modes of communication would remain in place when Yammer is adopted, if it would be permissible to use a distribution list to announce an event, and to be sure, thereby, that the announcement reaches everyone, even if everyone may not want to get such a message.

Bergstrom noted that distribution lists are regulated by individuals who have control over what can and cannot be posted on them.

Some of the listservs, on the other hand, were initially set up so that everyone was automatically enrolled and individuals would have to opt out if they wished to no longer receive messages. However, this automatic opt-in policy was discontinued when it created storage problems in the cases where messages piled up in untended email folders. Thus, a voluntary opt-in policy was adopted instead.

Currently, the listservs, Bergstrom pointed out, do not reach all the people one might think they do. The faculty/staff listserv does not reach everyone on the faculty and staff.
Krasnoff asserted that he didn’t think many faculty would opt out. Interim Provost McGee replied that there are a thousand fewer individuals reached by the faculty/staff listserv than there are by the administrative information distribution list.

Krasnoff asked if, in his reply, Bergstrom was essentially saying that the listservs to be used in the way he (Krasnoff) was describing are going away, which Bergstrom confirmed.

Bergstrom said that Yammer works through mobile applications, web interface, and through email. All Yammer interactions can be handled through an email client if the user so chooses. One can email to a group or to an individual, which will create a post in Yammer.

Krasnoff asked for a clarification: will the possibility for an individual to contact everyone be built into the Yammer system?

Bergstrom responded that the listserv groups we had in the past will be built into Yammer: classified ads, events, and so forth.

Krasnoff asked if a faculty and staff group—the ones everyone posts to—will be built.

Bergstrom confirmed that those groups can be built in Yammer but that there’s no guarantee that everyone will join them.

Krasnoff, granting that some may find messages currently going out on the faculty and staff listserv annoying or of no interest to them, the ability for an individual to reach a very large group is desirable. In some cases, using the faculty and staff listserv, people have opened conversations of what might be called a political nature, which, he granted, could be toned down a bit, but as they relate to the educational enterprise at the College, he argued, are a very good thing.

The changes to the communication systems by IT and administration, he asserted, have the effect of indicating that the administration does not want us to have such discussions and wants to actually shut down such conversations. He said that he would prefer that such conversations be allowed to continue, despite the fact that they sometimes get out of control or off topic and the user may have to delete many unwanted messages. It’s part of our community we need to maintain, he said. While there are many advantages to the Yammer system, the discussion so far has not revealed how the possibility for the kinds of discussions he has been talking about will be maintained. Collective conversation doesn’t seem to be a priority: what is being done to maintain that?, he asked.

Desplaces responded to Krasnoff by pointing out that the committee felt it important that the individual opt in or out of discussions. This is a responsibility we have as individuals and members of the community, he added, and
one which has already been exercised by around a thousand people, as the Interim Provost has noted, he said.

He also said, to add perspective, that IT did not bring Yammer to the committee. The committee was working on a solution to the problem of the listservs and, in contacting IT for help thinking about tools, discovered that they had been reviewing Yammer for another initiative.

The Interim Provost offered a summary of Krasnoff’s position, with which Krasnoff agreed: opt everyone into the Yammer equivalent of the faculty/staff listserv and let them opt out, rather than the reverse, which would demonstrate the presumption that everyone is a participant in the community and can make their own decision about whether they wish to participate or to opt out.

He also noted that last spring a very explicit and critical faculty and staff listserv conversation about politicians and trustees elicited no public statements from administrators that the conversation should stop. If there were any desire by administration to silence conversation, he added, that would probably have been seen last spring.

The Interim Provost expressed hope that Yammer be accepted or rejected on its merits, but that its adoption has nothing to do with quashing speech. Rather, its adoption would create convenience for the community, to allow for something like we had with listservs in the past (open discussion, classified ads, faculty, faculty and staff, etc.) but with powerful, Facebook-like tools.

**Roxanne DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, returned to the thread of acceptable use policy. We will gain with Yammer an acceptable use policy that users will have to agree to, but how will the policy be enforced? Who will monitor the Yammer conversation and decide when there has been an infraction, “cats don’t belong here: cats gotta go…”?

An unidentified Senator or guest responded with a faint “meow.”

Bergstrom replied that an acceptable use policy has not been established yet.

DeLaurell said that, presumably, there will be some mechanism to hold users accountable to the policy they accept when they sign on to Yammer.

Senior VP and CIO Robert Cape asked “is that what is wanted?,” to which De-Laurell replied that is not wanted by her, since she would prefer to allow anyone to talk about anything.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, said that ultimately Yammer will have to work on an honor system in which people use the groups as intended. We will probably have to put up with some posts going to the wrong groups, but hopefully not as much as we do now.
DeLaurell asked Cormack if she thinks Yammer will stop group-inappropriate posts. Cormack reiterated that it should be an improvement over the situation we have now with the faculty-staff listserv.

Jason Overby, Senator - SSM, agreed: right now, he said, “it’s one size fits all.” When all the different kinds of messages—condos for rent, political discussion, and so forth—come across the same list, it produces noise.

DeLaurell replied that Yammer might not reduce noise but actually might increase it. But, she said, her question is not about the noise, but about who is going to enforce the acceptable use policy and enact penalties, such as taking away privileges.

Speaker McNerney asked if Robert Cape or Andrew Bergstrom wished to answer DeLaurell’s question.

Bergstrom replied that IT will not be the enforcers of the policy.

Cape agreed. IT will not, he said, be reading and interpreting posts and coming to conclusions about them and applying penalties: “never have, never will.”

**DeLaurell** replied, “so what will we gain with Yammer?”

The Interim Provost replied that we will gain a technology superior to the existing listserv technology and that has a full suite of functions. Adopting Yammer would also allow us, he said, “to push reset” in order to allow for a community that is talking about the things they want to talk about, while not getting posts on what they do not wish to talk about. He noted that there are universities with no listservs at all because, he said, of conversations like the present one. He also added that there are people on campus who would like to shut down the listservs altogether, but he is opposed to that, as, he said, he thinks most of the Senate is.

He agreed with Cormack that most of us will gladly self-police, with rare instances of abuse of the policy, which we will tolerate unless it becomes a serious problem. Abuse that makes the community feel threatened or presents an endless annoyance might ultimately result in some privileges being taking away, but this is something the Interim Provost said he could do right now. But we are not doing that right now, instead preferring to let things go along as they are, while we work toward a better solution, in which IT will not be “the content police,” we all have better tools to manage our communication, and an understanding of what counts as acceptable use. He said that DeLaurell’s point is well taken: it’s critical to get clarity on the acceptable use policy. He recommended that the FETC take that up next.

Jon Hakkila, Chair - Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs, suggested that if it’s the policy we are concerned about, then we ought to put a policy in place before we make the move to replace the technology. If, instead, it’s a technology concern, then we might want to think about whether or not Yammer will become obsolete in the
On the issue of opting in and opting out, he added, it is important that users understand what is available to opt into in the first place, a list of some sort. There are many things that come across the faculty and staff listserv, he said, that he wouldn’t go looking for, but when he sees them, he is interested. Knowing what is available would be helpful.

Bergstrom noted that there is a search function in Yammer, as well as the ability to look at streams or feeds, and there is a feed for everything that goes on in Yammer that is publicly available. You can search, for instance, for a particular topic in the “all feed.”

Hakkila asked “how many feeds are there?,” to which Bergstrom replied “as many as there are topics.”

Ken Kelly Shaver, Senator – Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if there is a way on Yammer, as there is on smart phones, to block particular senders.

Bergstrom replied that in Yammer, you can chose whom you wish to follow, but he said he will have to check on whether or not you can choose to block a user.

Elaine Worzala, representing the Dean of the School of Business’s office, asked if Yammer will require a sign-in every time you open it.

Bergstrom explained that if if you are accessing Yammer via an Outlook client, you would not have to sign in to Yammer, but that if you are accessing it through a web client, you would. If you are using the mobile app, you sign in the first time you use it.

If you are accessing Yammer via Outlook, you will get messages that indicate they are from Yammer and from a specific group. A reply to the message will go to Yammer and add a post to the wall in the thread of that conversation.

In broader way, Bergstrom said, IT is working on identity and access management, particularly on cutting down on the number of systems to which we have to sign in. Currently we do not have a true single sign-in system.

Desplaces encouraged Senators to test Yammer out on their own, though he did caution that, at present we only have access to a demo version that will be reset, which means that any groups set up in the demo will eventually disappear.

Yammer can function as a tool, he stressed. For example, suppose you have forgotten the deadline for graduation is. You may have received an email from Academic Affairs with that information but deleted it in your own email, but you can search Yammer for the information. Or, he said, you could use Yammer to pose questions to certain committees or to the Senate,
or groups could use it to more efficiently address questions that may come in to them. He gave an example from the University of Rhode Island in which a question sent to the Registrar’s Office, with a system similar to Yammer, can be answered efficiently by whomever is staffing the desk at the time of the question.

Daniel Delgado, Senator - Hispanic Studies, noted that he finds the listservs somewhat intrusive and that he finds the web forums more appealing. He asked what the problem is with the web forums.

The Interim Provost explained that no one wanted to sign in and use the web forums, so they had very low usage. There were other problems as well.

Delgado asked how this will be different with Yammer.

The Interim Provost replied that with Yammer, you can subscribe to the groups you wish to and direct the messages to flow to your email. This will work for the user, essentially, as things do with the listserv system. Users who want more functionality and a community forum experience can use the Yammer interface.

Amy McCandless, Dean - University of Charleston, South Carolina, asked if Yammer, a Microsoft product, will be compatible with Apple products.

Bergstrom replied that Yammer works well with iOS and has a rapid update process to accommodate new versions of iOS, Android, etc.

The Speaker asked Desplaces for a clarification at this point in the conversation: is the FETC presenting a report or offering a resolution? Desplaces explained that the committee is offering a report and a recommendation, but not a resolution, so there’s no vote by the Senate required.

The Speaker suggested that Senators test Yammer for themselves, and observed that the concerns raised by the Senate have been heard by both IT and by the Interim Provost.

Krasnoff asked the Speaker if he could add one last statement, and the Speaker agreed.

Krasnoff said that when we shifted to the web forums, people did not sign in to them, and, as a result, people posting did not find enough of an audience for what they wanted to talk about or to announce. People responsibly posted to the forums, he said, without much effect, and so people began using the faculty and faculty and staff listserv, instead. This could happen again with Yammer, Krasnoff said: if not enough people join the classified ads group, we may begin to see classified posts in the faculty-as-a-whole group. Yammer may not solve this problem.

Krasnoff also responded to the Interim Provost’s representation of Yammer as a new and better technology. Krasnoff asserted that email is a good technology itself, capable of a wide range of uses across numerous platforms.
While there may be problems in the way people use it, it is not clear, he argued, what is wrong with the technology itself.

Bergstrom replied that if the College goes offline because of a hurricane, for example, listservs no longer function. We also pay for the listserv license, which is money we can recoup if we discontinue its use. Listserv cannot be augmented with integrations via APIs. There is more opportunity to build on Yammer than there is with listserv.

There were no further comments.

5. Old Business

None

6. New Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee (webpage)
   Corrected Course Proposals: Geology (PDF)

Steven Jaume', representing the Faculty Curriculum Committee, introduced Geology curriculum documents to replace incorrect documents presented at the December meeting.

There was no discussion.

The Speaker asked for a motion and second from the floor, a vote was taken, and the motion passed.

B. Resolution: Nous sommes Charlie (PDF)
Kelly Shaver, Senator – Management and Entrepreneurship

A Resolution: Symbolic Support for Freedom of Expression

WHEREAS tragic events in France have once again illustrated that religious beliefs can be used to justify attacks – both literally and figuratively – on freedom of expression, and

WHEREAS freedom of expression and inquiry have all too recently been threatened at the College of Charleston,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON ASSERTS

“Nous sommes Charlie.”
Shaver explained that the pictures at the bottom of the resolution were taken on a day in Washington, DC on which 3,000 people marched carrying signs reading “Je suis Charlie.” He urged consideration of the resolution for the reasons given therein.

Shaver’s resolution was seconded.

**Discussion/Questions/Comments**

Joe Carson, Senator – SSM, noted a typo in the document that was corrected.

Wayne Smith, Senator – Hospitality and Tourism, asked if the French grammar was correct, and Shaver assured him it is.

**Decision**

The resolution was adopted on a voice vote with nine abstentions and no “nays.”

6. **Constituents’ Concerns:** none.

7. **Adjournment:** 7:19 PM

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 2 December 2014

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 2 December 2014 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order: 5:05PM
2. 11 November Regular Meeting Minutes were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and information: none
4. Reports
   A. Speaker of the Faculty
      The Speaker reported that we have hired a new Faculty Secretariat, who will start in January.

      He also reminded the Senate and asked Senators to remind their colleagues that the December commencement ceremony is coming up, and regalia will be available for faculty to borrow, if needed, through the Office for the Academic Experience on the Thursday prior.

      He reported that, in preparation for reaffirmation in 2016, a large contingent from CofC will be traveling to Nashville this weekend for the SACSCOC annual meeting.

      Noting that he is an ex officio member of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, the Speaker also prefaced the first item in Old Business (F/AM disability academic accommodation-related language) by stating that the committee, over the course of two lengthy meetings, very carefully considered Senate discussion on the proposed language in November (see minutes 22-26) and in the revision before the Senate at the present meeting, attempted to address the concerns raised. Furthermore, he said, all of the processes surrounding reasonable accommodation are up for further review, particularly the audio recording agreement and processes for resolving disagreements.

   B. Interim Provost
      Update on Course and Instructor Evaluations

      The Interim Provost reported that the course and instructor evaluations response rate was 44.5% at the time of the Senate meeting, a significant improvement over prior semesters, likely owing in part to faculty taking up Academic Affairs’s suggestion that they set aside time in class this semester for students to complete evaluations (a practice required of all courses beginning in the spring semester). He noted that the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs was at the top of the list of schools with a 49.6% return rate. He also singled out numerous departments and units for their above-50% return rates: Arts Management (54%), Art History (55%), Eng-
lish (56%), Jewish Studies (58%), Physics and Astronomy (59%), Classics (59%), Religious Studies (62%), Library (65%), German and Slavic Studies (69%), and Hospitality and Tourism (74%). These figures, the Interim Provost asserted, are clear evidence of a department and faculty commitment to the evaluation process.

Use of the FAST System

The Interim Provost also, noting that the end of the semester is a time at which faculty may notice students showing signs of distress, asked faculty to consider using the FAST system (Faculty/Staff Assisting Students in Trouble). The system, under the aegis of Undergraduate Academic Services (UAS), is now nearly ten years old. In that time, in the neighborhood of 30-39% of students contacted via FAST referrals have taken up the offer to have a conversation about how they might be helped. Over half of the students flagged through the FAST system, he observed, are flagged for reasons of not turning in assignments or disappearing from class, but for a significant number of referred students, there are a variety of other reasons: they seem to be grieving, have some kind of distress or behavioral issues. The Interim Provost thanked faculty and staff for using the system, which not only helps support students but helps us retain them as well.

Budget Hearings for Academic Affairs

The Interim Provost announced the dates for public hearings on the budget, 1/12/15 and 1/26/15, both in the afternoon, specific times and location forthcoming.

Distance Education and Course Scheduling

The Interim Provost encouraged departments and programs to consider offering distance education classes not just in summer but strategically during fall and spring semesters as well, which could both help students get the classes they need and make primetime classroom scheduling just a bit easier, particularly as building renovations continue to take classrooms offline.

Comments on the Senate Meeting Agenda

The Interim Provost congratulated members of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual and members of the Office of Academic Affairs staff for their time- and effort-intensive work in redeveloping F/AM language on disability issues, and for hearing faculty concerns raised in the November meeting and making adjustments in the policy. In this policy, the College, he observed, is trying to balance the College’s considerable legal duties with our academic mission, which is front and center in all our decisions on this policy. He will continue, he said, to take feedback as the policy is redeveloped.

The redevelopment of the attendance policy language (on the agenda as well) has also, he pointed out, involved the work of an enormous number of faculty and staff colleagues, over the course of 14 months. The current poli-
cy has not changed in substance since 1973, he noted, and has, predictably, fallen out of step with current conditions. We now have many, many more students and many more students by percentage of the population involved in activities outside the classroom formally sponsored by the College. Those who have worked on the policy’s redevelopment, he said, have kept in mind the faculty’s central role in determining appropriate attendance policies for their classes.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

None.

C. **Faculty Budget Committee** ([Slides - PDF](#))

Julia Eichelberger, Chair of the Faculty Budget Committee, reported that the committee (herself, Tom Carroll, Rohn England, Steve Johnson, Rhonda Mack, Courtney Murren, Tom Ross) has been working with the Interim Provost for help the committee become more conversant with this year’s budget realities and to give him feedback on redeveloping the budget process this year. She described the budget outlook as, in keeping with things since 2008, a “little depressing.” Most of our income comes from tuition and fees, and most of the budget increases we will get are for “non-discretionary” items (annually increasing utilities costs, mandated state salary increases, increases to benefits, and other increases over which we have no control). This leaves little for merit increases, new faculty lines, renovating buildings, and so on. There is not a lot to work with, therefore, but she noted that we are on relatively sound footing compared to other institutions.

She then outlined the causes for “movement” we are likely to see from last year’s to this year’s budget. We have had a slight decrease in out-of-state student enrollment, which hurts us. Added to this, any increases in tuition we might see are likely to be small, since the state over the past few years has limited any tuition raises. Reallocation of resources for changing needs or strategic priorities is also possible in this year’s budget. Finally, we may see some increases in fees in certain departments and programs.

Under the heading of “some good news,” Eichelberger discussed the new transparency in the budgeting process, something many in the Senate have been asking for for years. Faculty can witness the process and hear the discussion over budget priorities from the beginning, as they unfold, rather than, as in years past, learning of the decisions *ex post facto*. At the hearings (1/16/15 and 1/24/15) that all may attend, the Faculty Budget Committee will represent faculty’s broader interest.

She specified that the conversation at the hearings will largely revolve around “new money,” given that with our budget model, from year-to-year units are given the same budget, unless they request more or, unlikely though it seems, ask that they receive less.
She also provided, for further context, a list of those involved in the hearings and budgeting process who report to the Provost (slide 8) and an Academic Affairs organizational chart (slide 9).

She asked for any committees that have particular concerns to convey those to the budget committee.

**Questions / Discussion / Comments**

None.

5. **Old Business**

   **A. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual** ([webpage](#))

   1. **NOTICE OF INTENT: To Change Faculty Administrative Manual to More Clearly Define Faculty Responsibilities with Regard to Students with Disabilities Policy** ([PDF - “clean” copy of revised statement](#) | PDF - “comparison” copy, showing changes to the current F/AM language)

   Rick Heldrich, Chair of the Committee, explained that these documents are different from those considered by the Senate in November, having been revised to address concerns raised in November. These documents, he stipulated, have not been fully vetted yet by Academic Affairs, however, and, therefore, there could be more changes made even after the Senate discussion.

   **Questions / Discussion / Comments**


   Lynne Ford, Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience, noted that, like all other students on campus, REACH students are subject to accommodation, but REACH students are not degree-seeking students.

   Deborah Mihal, Director for the Center for Disability Services (CDS), also said that REACH students are qualified students with disabilities and, thus, are entitled to reasonable accommodations. However, the program is unique, in that the course, materials, assessments, and so forth, are often customized by arrangements between the instructor, the student, and the program. Any accommodations CDS might recommend in these situations will still be within the scope of not lowering academic standards, but given the individualized nature of the program, the REACH program and the instructor will coordinate on accommodations.

   Smith wondered, for inclusivity, if a section might be added to the language to address REACH.

   Heldrich replied that the committee did not consider any particular types of disability or classes of students with disabilities in revising the policy but did build into the language a way of addressing concerns that aca-
ademic programs had the necessary support to offer any required accommodations and weren’t left hanging to provide support on their own.

Mihal followed up by saying that the language as presented would apply equally to REACH students as to any other student registered with CDS.

**Julia Eichelberger,** Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), suggested that the section on student responsibility might indicate a timeline within which students should notify faculty of a need for accommodation. Item number three under that section specifies “providing appropriate notification to the instructor,” but doesn’t mention timeliness, per se. Perhaps, “appropriate notification” includes the sense of timeliness, she said, but we might want to indicate “the sooner the better,” in order to get accommodations in place as soon as possible and with fairness and minimal disruption to all parties.

Heldrich replied that the committee tried to address timeliness by specifying in item number two in the same list “in advance” and also in the responsibility of the College section, where there is a time frame so that the process of deciding on accommodation does not get dragged too far into the semester.

**Iana Anguelova,** Senator – Mathematics, cited item number three under instructor responsibilities, “provide and administer reasonable accommodations,” and suggested the addition of “with the help of CDS.” As an example, she noted that the double-time accommodation on exams in Math cannot be administered by the instructor. Only CDS can do that.

Heldrich replied that the committee tried to avoid making the language too procedural. Language that is too procedural might work for one situation but not for others.

**Phil Jos,** Senator – SHHS, observed that while the section of the policy providing lists of responsibilities is directive, the paragraph leading into it, is less direct than it could be, particularly given the concerns raised in the November meeting:

> The following responsibilities foster a collaborative approach in arriving at reasonable accommodations in the context of academic programs. As stated above, accommodations may not be unduly burdensome or fundamentally alter the nature of the academic program.

He had three suggestions:

1. indicate that the collaboration involves faculty specifically and CDS
2. mention “the class” itself, rather than just “in the context of academic” programs (since accommodations take place at the level of the course)
3. indicate, in the context of "burdensome," that we have in mind burdens on faculty as well as other kinds of burdens.

Any of these, Jos suggested, might be a little more pointed, and thus match what follows, which is also very pointed.

The Speaker at this point asked for further comments or questions, and there were none.

He said that while the language under consideration is in a section of the F/AM not directly under the control of the Senate, he believed it the will of Academic Affairs to get not just the Senate's thoughts on the policy in its current state, but also a vote that expresses the Senate's attitude toward it.

The Interim Provost clarified that this is entirely up to the Senate. Heldrich argued that any vote could only be on the general philosophy of the policy since the language is still subject to change.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, agreed with Heldrich and suggested that the Senate not take a vote. A vote might seem like an endorsement of whatever the language ends up being.

Heldrich suggested that any further comments or concerns be sent to the by-laws committee and/or the Interim Provost.

Krasnoff also pointed out that a vote on the spirit of the policy would be somewhat odd, amounting as it would, to our saying that we agree with the spirit of complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

No vote was taken.

The Speaker asked Heldrich to introduce the next item in old business.

2. NOTICE OF INTENT: To Change Faculty Administrative Manual to More Clearly Define Faculty Obligations with Regard to Class Attendance Policy (PDF)

Heldrich noted that, to his understanding, the policy as offered was vetted last year by the Council of Chairs; thus all chairs weighed in on it.

Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker added that the policy, in an earlier form, came to the Faculty Senate, and there was, essentially, no discussion and a sense that there were no objections to it. The policy was created by the Committee on Student Affairs and Athletics, went to the Council of Chairs last year, and the Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, and Financial Aid Committee had no problem with it, either. This year's Academic Standards committee, however, had some feedback and objections: the current version of the policy is meant to address those concerns.

Questions / Discussion / Comments
**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator – Philosophy, suggested that, if the Academic Standards committee has a strong objection to a rule that absences be excused for activities in which students represent the College, the Senate should discuss that objection. He argued that interpreting such a rule as an abridgment of academic freedom doesn’t make sense, since much of how classes are structured faculty don’t get to decide upon, such as when classes meet and so forth.

There was no further discussion.

The **Speaker** asked for a motion from the floor to vote on the proposed attendance language.

Phil Jos moved that there be a vote, and the motion was seconded.

The Speaker noted that the vote would be a vote “in support” of the proposed language and not a vote for including the language in the F/AM, since the language would go in a section outside of faculty control.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker said that, given that the language has already been thoroughly vetted and approved by Academic Affairs, we should expect no further changes. It should go in the F/AM as is.

The Senate voted to support the language as presented.

**B. Resolutions Concerning Course-Instructor Evaluations**

Iana Anguelova, Senator – School of Science and Mathematics

1. Resolution to Set the Deadline for Collecting Course-Instructor Evaluations at the End of Reading Day for Each Semester ([Word](#) | [PDF](#))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution to Set the Deadline for Collecting Course-Instructor Evaluations at the End of Reading Day for Each Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHEREAS, student evaluations of teaching are seriously considered in all promotion and tenure decisions and thus affect all the Faculty at the College of Charleston, and, therefore, a consistent deadline for collecting student evaluations each semester should be set in consultation with the Faculty Senate;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEREAS, online student evaluations as a self-selecting sample are a non-probability sample (i.e., no credible conclusions can be made with any confidence/probability from such samples), and bias towards lower extremes is known to exist in such samples, in order to reduce this bias the student evaluations deadline should be set BEFORE the start of final exams each semester;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEREAS, students with final exams early in the final exam week may be able to see their final grade on OAKS in some classes even before the end of final exam week (and thus before they potentially write their student evaluations), and this potentially adds further to the lower-extremes bias and also...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
potentially affects unfairly the faculty trying to follow best practices in submitting their grade-work on OAKS as early as possible; 

THEREFORE, 

be it RESOLVED that we, the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston, request that the deadline for collecting student evaluations of teaching be set no later than the end of Reading Day for each semester.

2. Resolution that a Policy be Delineated in the Faculty/Administration Manual Concerning the Administering and Collecting of Course-Instructor Evaluations (Student Evaluations) (Word | PDF)

Resolution that a Policy be Delineated in the Faculty/Administration Manual Concerning the Administering and Collecting of Course-Instructor Evaluations (Student Evaluations)

WHEREAS, student evaluations of teaching are seriously considered in all promotion and tenure decisions and thus affect all faculty at the College of Charleston;

WHEREAS, specifically, as part of the policy for evaluation of faculty members, student evaluations are mentioned in several instances in the Faculty/Administration Manual, such as,

− “Student evaluations of teaching shall be collected from students in classes taught by any faculty member of special status” (46) (Faculty members of special status are all the non-tenured and non-tenure track faculty including the Instructors, the Senior Instructors, the adjunct faculty, etc.), and, concerning tenure and promotion,

− “The Summary Rating for all courses in the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder with the summary student evaluations” (94-95)

− “Student course evaluations will be completed for every section of every course, every semester, with the exception of a course that has only one student enrolled” (94);

WHEREAS, the FAM also includes language about the relevance of student evaluations in the tenure and promotion process (“Student evaluations should be consistently good” [82] and “numerical items from student evaluations…are important” [82]);

WHEREAS, student evaluations (a.k.a. Course-Instructor Evaluations) are thus of sufficient importance to affect the tenure and promotion process and the considerations of tenure and promotion committees across the College of Charleston, and, therefore, a consistent policy for collecting and administering student evaluations should be set and delineated in the Faculty/Administration Manual in consultation with the Faculty Senate;

THEREFORE,
be it RESOLVED that we, the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston, request that the policy for administering and collecting Course-Instructor evaluations (student evaluations) of teaching be delineated in the Faculty/Administration Manual. In particular we request that a deadline for collecting student evaluations be set no later than the end of Reading Day each semester.

Anguelova presented the motions together and offered the following justifications. Academic Affairs takes very seriously student evaluation data. In her own department's Tenure and Promotion Committee, she noted, an inordinate amount of time is spent discussing course and instructor evaluations. Given their importance in tenure and promotion procedures, she argued, they are important enough to be included in the F/AM.

There have been many discussions of these evaluations in the Senate but there has never been a vote. This topic deserves a vote, she asserted.

Specifically referring to the first resolution (collecting evaluations before final exams) she argued that we cannot attached significance to the results when the students decide for themselves whether or not they will complete the evaluation: they are a self-selected sample.

This sample is also, she said, biased, and furthermore, in this sample, one cannot determine with any significance the direction of the bias. At this point, she mentioned a study sent to her by Joe Carson, Senator - School of Science and Math (SSM), which, she noted, attempts to argue motives in the case of student evaluations after exams. She denied that motives could be concluded in a self-selected sample.

She said that she appreciates the Interim Provost's plan to conduct evaluations in class, since it produces not a sample, but a population of students in class on that particular day.

It is common sense, she said, that a student doing well on a final exam is not going to complete a course and instructor evaluation. It is more likely that a student who did not do well will fill out an evaluation. In this case, evaluations tend to be worse.

Currently, many students can fill out evaluations after they have already seen their final grades on OAKS. (She noted that she posts the grades so that if there is a mistake, students will have time to call it to her attention and discuss it.) Those students with exams late in the examination period, on the other hand, may not see the final grade before submitting evaluations, if they choose to do so. Thus, there is an inconsistency: some students get to complete evaluations with full knowledge of their final grade and some do not. We should either allow all students the former case, she argued, or eliminate it altogether.

Either way, she asserted, the F/AM should have a written policy regarding when evaluations are to become available because if the administration wishes to make a change to it, they will have to notify the faculty first.
Questions / Discussion / Comments

Joe Carson, Senator- SSM, reported having not only sent Anguelova the study she mentioned, but also having, himself, looked through other published peer-reviewed literature on the effects of examinations or situational timing on evaluations. All the papers he found, he said, indicated that the effects of these conditions on evaluations is negligible. While these studies were not conducted at the College and do not represent “the last word,” he said, we should take into consideration that several peer-reviewed papers contradict both the course of action suggested in the first resolution and, also very directly, Carson said, several of the statements in the “whereas” section of the resolution. Carson said that, as academics, we should have a problem with “whereas” statements that are contradicted by peer-reviewed literature. Even if we see flaws in this particular literature, it is, nonetheless, peer-reviewed and contradictory to the statements in the resolution.

Anguelova asked for an example.

Carson replied said that one statement in question had to do with the inability to attach statistical significance to a sample.

Anguelova replied, “no statistical significance can be attached to such [a] self-selected sample?”

Carson agreed that this was the statement he had in mind.

Anguelova replied, “I am sorry, but that is true.”

Carson declined to argue about this particular point, but stated that it is a fact that there are at least two to four published, peer-reviewed studies that reach conclusions that directly contradict the statement. At the very least, there is controversy in the professional community over this, he said.

Anguelova replied that the conclusion of the paper Carson sent her was that the scores were lower, but not significantly lower. Either way, she asserted, “you cannot attach a probability on a non-probability sample.”

Phil Jos, Senator- SHHS, asked for clarification on why the sample of students in a class is not sufficient. Are we not trying to generalize about the class from the sample?

Anguelova replied that we are trying to generalize about the population of students in a class based on the sample of those who complete the evaluations, and this is not a random sample, and because of this, we cannot derive a significance from the results of the survey.

Jos replied that the only cure for that is higher response rates.

Anguelova agreed, stating that the possibility of representing the population via the sample is better with higher responses. The “real cure,” however, is, she said to change the population. As an example, she pointed to the paper in-class evaluations we used to conduct. The results derived were for the
population of students in class on the day of the evaluation, as opposed to a sample that chose or didn't choose to fill out evaluations.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, noting that he had several comments to make but would parse them out over the course of the discussion, commented on the population issue by saying that some students will miss classes, but if you really want as close to a complete class population as possible, you could administer the evaluations on the final exam day, in the exam itself.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator - SHHS, observed that we may be approaching a more workable solution to our problems with evaluations now that when Anguelova first proposed her resolutions, when we did not have evaluations being done in class. She also argued that, in addition to in-class administration, there is a value to also having the opportunity open for students to use the online evaluation system beyond the set aside class time. This would potentially capture more responses, or allow students the opportunity to add to their responses.

This leaves open the question, she noted, of when the evaluation period should end, and she argued that it should end when the semester does to afford students as much opportunity as possible to respond. As to the concern about students seeing their final grade on OAKS prior to completing an evaluation, Eichelberger suggested using OAKS’s functionality to suppress the grade during the evaluation period.

Anguelova replied that after final exams have been graded, students should be able to see their grades.

Shaver replied “yes, but that's your choice,” with which Aguelova agreed. She asserted that this is also best practice.

**Shaver** asserted that the first resolution would seem to deny the choice of other instructors to administer evaluations after students have completed the course.

Anguelova stated that she doesn't find compelling the idea that students would wait to fill out evaluations after a final exam because they didn't have time prior to exams. She said that the period for evaluation needs to closed before examinations because post-examination course evaluation results tend to be lower.

She added that whatever the Faculty Senate decides, it should be in the form of a vote.

**Shaver**, citing prior experiences in teaching at the College and elsewhere, argued that students in project-based courses in which all the course's work and learning comes down to a group project that is due in the exam period cannot “look back over the course of the semester to compare what they knew on day one and what they knew after the project is finished until the project is finished.” They aren't finished by Reading Day, and thus they are not in a po-
sition to fully evaluate what they have learned from an instructor at that time. We should give them until the end.

An instructor may choose, he also added, not to post final grades before the College does, and he asserted that a requirement that students complete evaluations by Reading Day is, essentially, a disenfranchisement of instructors who teach the kind of project-based courses he described above.

Adam Ali, Senator – Geology, agreed that an in-class administration of the evaluation would essentially randomize the sample, which would resolve the problem of a self-selecting sample. Allowing additional time into the exam period for the few, though self-selecting, students who are not in class should not affect the random in-class sample adversely.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, said that she supports the proposal, but offered a caveat. She reported administering the evaluations on the last day of class, when the students had high motivation to show up, since there was a review for the final on that day. She said, however, that it took about an hour to do so, noting that she informed her students in advance that she wasn't concerned with the numbers, but she would read everything they wrote.

In reply to Shaver, she said that a Reading Day deadline would still provide students with three-months worth of experience on which to base their evaluations.

She advocated for the Reading Day deadline, allied with in-class administration and an announcement on the syllabus of when evaluations will be administered. The students motivated in a positive or negative way and who may, as a result create, a self-selecting sample problem, she further stipulated are students an instructor already knows about: it's the other students, the majority in the middle, from whom we wish to hear. Those are the students we will hear from in the in-class administration of evaluations.

Jason Coy, Senator – SHHS, called the question and it was seconded. Lary Krasnoff queried a point of order: was the question being called on the first resolution or the two resolutions as a package?

The Speaker replied that they are two separate items, so the first is the one on which the question was called, which passed with the required 2/3 vote by voice.

The first resolution, “Resolution to Set the Deadline for Collecting Course-Instructor Evaluations at the End of Reading Day for Each Semester,” was then voted on. A voice vote was inconclusive. On a show of hands, the resolution failed, 17 to 15.

Discussion now turned to the second resolution, “Resolution to Set the Deadline for Collecting Course-Instructor Evaluations at the End of Reading Day for Each Semester.”
The Speaker observed that the final sentence of the resolution – “In particular we request that a deadline for collecting student evaluations be set no later than the end of Reading Day each semester.” – would need to be stricken, given the prior vote.

Lary Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, pointed out that in the discussion of the first resolution, many seemed to feel that the in-class administration of the evaluations essentially obviated the need for a Reading Day deadline. He suggested that if Senators wish to enshrine this policy, they may wish to vote for the resolution at hand so that we stick with the policy of in-class administration. On the other hand, he sounded a skeptical note on whether or not such a policy should go in the F/AM. One argument in favor is that evaluations are referred to in a number of other places in the document, and, therefore, a policy should be there, as well. But, he observed, those references have to do with what is done with evaluation data, and the resolution at hand does not say what the policy should go in the F/AM but only that a policy should be there.

Jason Coy, Senator – SHHS, agreed that there might be an argument against putting a policy in the F/AM. Evaluation procedures have changed, and they may well change again. Additionally, we've had different Presidents and different Provosts over the past few years. We may come up with a new processes, creating a need to change F/AM language each time.

Krasnoff replied that a counter-argument to Coy's would be that, as mentioned earlier in the debate on the first resolution, with a policy resident in the F/AM, each time the policy is changed, the faculty would have to be notified in advance. Therefore, having a policy in the F/AM would ensure faculty input in the case of a proposed change.

Kelly Shaver moved that the final sentence of the resolution be deleted, and the motion was seconded, rendering the resolved section as follows.

be it RESOLVED that we, the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston, request that the policy for administering and collecting Course-Instructor evaluations (student evaluations) of teaching be delineated in the Faculty/Administration Manual. In particular we request that a deadline for collecting student evaluations be set no later than the end of Reading Day each semester.

Discussion of the motion strike the final sentence of the resolution.

Phil Jos, Senator – SHHS, offered several comments on the motion. To the extent that he did not feel that the Reading Day deadline would reduce extreme responses or necessarily secure better information via a higher response rate, he said he could support the motion to strike the last sentence.

However, as a counterpoint to Shaver's arguments, having evaluations to go past Reading Day is problematic, he said, not because students may punish professors for bad grades but because it is just generally a bad time to get responses of any sort from students. It's just an incredibly busy time for them.
In addition, he said he could actually support the sentence that is being deleted through the motion if the length of the evaluation period remained unchanged, possibly by starting the evaluations earlier. Assessments of effective teaching that could show us a picture of the teacher in the classroom, he asserted, don't change within the last 3 to 4 weeks of class. Students would be able to say a good deal about a teacher at this point: whether expectations were clear, whether the instructor answered questions, was accessible, whether the syllabus was clear, and so forth. Therefore, an earlier starting date for the evaluations would not necessarily be a problem.

Furthermore, Jos said, he does not think that the moment of completing a final project puts students in any better position to make such judgments, and in fact, as far as what they have learned, the instructor may be in a better position to assess this than they, themselves, are.

**Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker** said, in reply to Jos, that some of the most frequent feedback from students prior to when we began to run the evaluation period into the final examination period was that they wanted a longer time period to complete the evaluations at the end of the semester. Prior to the extension into the exam period, the students were, in fact, given the same amount of time: the period just began sooner. Students, however, were not doing the evaluations early in the administration period; they didn't want to or feel ready to do them earlier. We asked for student feedback on these matters, and, she said, it is important that we respect their perspective on when they feel they can best give us feedback.

**Tom Kunkle**, Senator – SSM, asked for a clarification as to the nature of the resolution. Is it not solely about whether or not there should be a policy in the F/AM (and not about when evaluations are administered)?

The Speaker said, yes, that is correct, but that at present the Senate is discussing the motion to amend the resolution by striking the last sentence.

Kunkle then called the question on the motion to amend, which was seconded, and passed on a voice vote with the required 2/3 majority.

**The Speaker called for a vote on the motion to amend the resolution, which passed on voice vote.**

The “resolved” section now read as follows.

```
be it RESOLVED that we, the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston, request that the policy for administering and collecting Course-Instructor evaluations (student evaluations) of teaching be delineated in the Faculty/Administration Manual.
```

**Discussion on the resolution, now amended, continued.**

Kunkle asked if anyone knew of a better place to put evaluation policy than in the F/AM.
Scott Peeples, Senator – SHHS, expressed reticence to vote in favor the resolution without knowing what language might actually make it into the F/AM as a result of the resolution. He said that so long as the faculty has a chance to review and weigh in on changes to the evaluation process, there is no need for policy to be specifically articulated in the F/AM.

Rick Heldrich, Senator – SSM, said that he doesn't particularly want the language in the F/AM, but if the Senate wants the language in the F/AM, then it needs to see what the language is before voting on it.

Anguelova replied that the resolution is to include language, but the actual language would need to be determined. What would be included in the F/AM, for instance, she said, is the in-class administration policy that requires all instructors to set aside class time to administer the evaluations.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, said that including in the F/AM, the policy for administering and collecting student evaluations of teaching is a way of ensuring fairness, a way of stating the rules clearly so that all faculty can be held to the same standard. This is especially important for merit raises, where faculty are being compared, but is also significant in tenure and promotion processes, where faculty teaching evaluations are compared to departmental means and school means. There needs to be general policies written into the F/AM, and it is up to the Senate to ask for them.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, said that the policy is fairly clear right now: in-class administration with an opportunity for students not in class at the time to complete evaluations throughout the exam period. If the policy where to be written into the F/AM that evaluations must be conducted in class, he argued, that is just a “back door” way of saying that they have to be completed before Reading Day.

Rick Heldrich, Senator – SSM and Chair of the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual, suggested that the discussion might be tabled, allowing the committee to work up some language to bring back to the Senate for consideration and, if it is the will of the Senate, a vote.

Anguelova responded by saying that a vote on the resolution would be a “philosophical” one. But if we can't have a successful vote on that first, then it doesn't make sense for the by-laws and F/AM to come back to the Senate with specific language for a vote.

Hollis France, Senator – Political Science, asked what should be done if a student does not have a laptop to bring to class for an in-class administration of the evaluation.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker replied that students can also complete the evaluation on other devices, such as smart phones. Also, the in-class administration instructions produced by Academic Affairs suggest notifying the students in advance of the date. A student who does not have a laptop, with this advance notification, might arrange, instead, to do the evaluation in ad-
vance of the class and to simply notify the instructor on the day that she has already done it. We recognize, she said, that not all students will have equipment to complete the evaluations in class, but that there are also ways that are not awkward for the student of addressing this problem.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator – SHHS, expressed support for the resolution on the grounds that we have had different policies in recent years and that not everyone follows the rules every year. A consistent policy would be good for tenure and promotion, since such decisions involve comparisons.

**Phil Jos**, Senator – SHHS, stipulated that, as it relates to the F/AM there is a distinction between policy and procedure, and that mostly what the Senate has been discussing falls into the territory of procedure. However, a real policy issue question is “what do you do in a T&P situation where you have somebody who has 20% response rates on most of their evaluations? What do you make of that when you know they’re also being compared ... to somebody who consistently has 80%? What do you do with those results if there’s any kind of comparison to be made?” These are policy concerns that are important and that the F/AM should address, but, Jos asserted, the procedure of how to get higher response rates and so forth is better left in Academic Affairs in consultation with the Senate.

**Andrew Shedlock**, Senator – Biology, expressed a concern that we attend to “signal vs. noise ratio” in whatever procedures we develop for administering evaluations and in the interpretation for T&P purposes of student evaluation data. He stressed that increasing the number of responses may not also ensure a good signal to noise ratio, and that if our procedure for getting a higher response rate is not also significantly improving our signal to noise ratio, then “we are trying to fix something that is not broken.”

**Janette Finch**, Senator – Library, observed that the discussion is turning away from the resolution and toward matters of how evaluations are used in the tenure and promotion process. Some classes, she observed, may never get positive evaluations due to the difficulty of the material. Faculty who teach these classes may be at a disadvantage in the T&P process if the department highly values evaluations. Therefore, she said, we need to have some consistency in how we weigh student evaluations in each department.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator – SHHS, replied to Shedlock’s comments on the signal to noise ratio in evaluations, saying that in the College T&P committee last year there were candidates whose evaluation return rates were not very high, so the focus turned from those measures to the graduate surveys. For low return rates on evaluation, signal does, indeed, tend to disappear.

**Iana Anguelova**, Senator – Mathematics, said that in her department, they do not take student evaluations at face value, but the problem is, she said, at
the level of the College T&P committee, where apples may be compared to oranges. A F/AM-resident and consistent policy could speak to how much weight should be assigned to student evaluations.

The Interim Provost weighed in at this point. There has been much research on student evaluations for many, many years, and there is a great deal of experience in higher education in how to use student evaluations. There is also ample evidence that they are an imperfect indicator (one of many) of effective instruction, and he said it is his belief that faculty colleagues at the department level and in the college-wide T&P committee, as well as the deans and even the Provost, all understand the need to take student evaluations with a “substantial grain of salt.” He said, “I know that faculty fear that others will make unsophisticated use of these indicators. That is not my personal experience in my academic career. I hope it is not the experience of most of you who have been in the role of evaluating faculty in one fashion or another, and I guess I just have to ask you to take my word for it that we are not naïve consumers of these data.”

Jon Hakkila, Chair - Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs Committee, expressed concern about the actual questions being asked of students in the evaluations. The questions, he asserted, are more important than the sample size.

Tom Kunkle, Senator – SSM, noted that the discussion has not really been addressing the motion but ranging widely on the general issue of student course and instructor evaluations. He said that he would be hesitant to ask language be added to the F/AM when we, ourselves, cannot even decide what we would like it to say.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, requested that the Provost’s office, well in advance of the each coming semester, inform the faculty of the procedure for administering evaluations so that faculty can work it into their syllabuses.

“Agreed,” replied the Interim Provost.

The Speaker asked for any further discussion.

The question was called and seconded, and passed on a voice vote.

A vote was taken on the resolution.

The second resolution, “Resolution to Set the Deadline for Collecting Course-Instructor Evaluations at the End of Reading Day for Each Semester,” as amended, failed on a voice vote.

6. New Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee (webpage)

The proposals below were opened for discussion by Bonnie Springer, Chair-Faculty Curriculum Committee, by department/ program (1-6 below), with
the stipulation that if any Senator wished to do so, specific proposals could be isolated for separate discussion and vote.

None of the proposals were separated and all were approved on voice votes.

1. **Psychology** ([PDF](#): all PSYC proposals. Overview, PDF p. 1)
   a. Change of major (BS) (PDF p. 5)
   b. Change of major (BA) (PDF p. 14)
   c. New Course Proposals
      (1) PSYC 359 - Study Abroad in Neuroscience (PDF p. 23)
      (2) PSYC 413 - Conditioning and Learning: Advanced Topics (PDF p. 44)
      (3) PSYC 422 - Personality Psychology: Advanced Topics (PDF p. 55)
      (4) PSYC 423 - Social Psychology: Advanced Topics (PDF p. 67)

2. **Japanese** ([PDF](#))
   Change of minor – adding a clarifying clause to course listings

3. **Chemistry** ([PDF](#))
   Course change proposals: HONS 191/191L; 192/192L; 293/293L; 294/294L (Proposed Honors sequence)

4. **Finance** ([PDF](#): all FINC proposals. Overview, PDF p. 1)
   a. Change of major (BS) (PDF p. 4)
   b. Change of minor (PDF p. 11)
   c. Course change: FINC 418 - Advanced Valuation and Corporate Financial Analysis (PDF p. 40)
   d. New Courses
      (1) FINC 450 - Applied Portfolio Management I (PDF p. 16)
      (2) FINC 451 - Applied Portfolio Management II (PDF p. 27)

5. **Geology** ([PDF](#): all GEOL proposals. Overview, PDF p. 1)
   a. Change of Major (BA) (PDF p. 87)
   b. Change of Major (BS) (PDF p. 93)
   c. Course Changes
      (1) GEOL 103 - Environmental Geology (PDF p. 13)
      (2) GEOL 250 - Introduction to Geochemistry (PDF p. 29)
      (3) GEOL 257 - Marine Geology (PDF p. 33)
      (4) GEOL 320 - Earth Resources (PDF p. 79)
      (5) GEOL 441 - Pollution in the Environment (PDF p. 83)
   d. Course Deactivations
      (1) GEOL101/101L - Dynamic Earth & Dynamic Earth Laboratory (PDF p. 9)
      (2) GEOL 238 - Water Resources (PDF p. 25)
      (3) GEOL 252/252L - Mineralogy & Mineralogy Laboratory (PDF p. 51)
B. Academic Planning Committee

Proposal to change the Coursework Elsewhere during Senior Year Petition policy (PDF)

Note: there were two proposals under consideration, a proposal to change the “Courses Taken Elsewhere during Senior Year Petition” policy and a request to change the “Coursework Elsewhere during Senior Year Petition” policy for students who hold a baccalaureate degree from another institution.

George Pothering stepped down from his role as Parliamentarian, handing those duties temporarily over to Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, in order to present the proposal in his role as Chair of the Academic Planning Committee.

In order to put the first proposal into perspective, he said that currently, a student can transfer in with 92 hours of credit, complete 30 hours in the senior year, and graduate with a degree from the College of Charleston. On the other hand, once more typical students approach the senior year and they
are interested in taking coursework elsewhere, a rule that students complete 60 hours at the College becomes important, as in the following language: “candidates who have earned more than 60 credit hours at the College of Charleston may petition to complete up to 7 of their final 37 credit hours at another institution.” So, Pothering, observed, we will let a student graduate from the College with 30 hours of credit taken at the College, but once students approach 60 hours at the College, we look at things differently. The proposed language tries to address the disparity by changing that “more than 60” requirement to “a minimum of 30.”

We have had some issues with the current policy, he said, such as cases in which students wish to take a prerequisite course elsewhere in the summer before they come into their senior year. It also affects students who want to study abroad, since that means taking courses elsewhere. Here he noted further examples provided in the rationale section on the first page of the document provided.

Questions / Discussion / Comments on the first proposal

Scott Peeples, Senator – SHHS, said that he supports the change, but asked if the committee uncovered any rationale for the 60-credit hour rule.

Pothering explained that the issue was brought to the committee by the office of Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience Lynne Ford via the Registrar’s office.

Dawn Bare, Associate Registrar for Transfer Evaluation, said that they looked at the policy in the catalog, and that she has no idea what the original rationale for the policy was.

The Interim Provost added that, as discussed in the Academic Planning Committee, minutes from faculty meetings in the 1970s almost never explain the rationale for rules, only providing the proposal and the vote. Research, thus, often yields no insight into rationale. As an example, he pointed out that in 1972 the College took the required hours for graduation from 126 hours down to the current number of 122 as the result of a special faculty committee recommendation, and “we have no idea why.”

Irina Gigova, Senator – SHHS, noting that she had no idea that a College of Charleston degree could be granted with 92 hours of credit transferred in from elsewhere, asked what the rationale for that might be.

The Interim Provost speculated that this particular rule encapsulates an institutional history at the College characterized by two somewhat opposed impulses. On the one hand, in the 1970s the College sought to be an open and welcome place for transfer students, particularly students from other public institutions. At other times, we have shown a more protective attitude toward courses taught at the College. There’s “a back-and-forth in our rules which suggests different faculty attitudes toward rule-making over the decades,” he said.
Rick Heldrich, Senator – SSM, asked, given the Interim Provost’s comments about our inability to ascertain rationales for some rules instituted in the past, how we will make sure that the rationale for our rule-making will be preserved for future reference.

Several Senators in reply pointed to the stated rationale in the document itself. Pothering added that the rationale for this particular proposal is born out in the examples.

Lynne Ford added that the rationale is also that the residency requirement for a degree is 30 hours, and it is inconsistent to prevent students who are going to meet this requirement from doing what we allow all other students to do.

Dawn Bare, adding that the proposal on the floor results from a proposal sent by the Registrar’s office to the committee, emphasized that there is no request to change residency requirements in the proposal: students still need to meet all those requirements. It is really a matter of affording all students who meet the requirements the same opportunities.

The Speaker asked for further discussion, and seeing none, asked for a vote on the proposal.

The proposal to change the “Coursework Elsewhere during Senior Year Petition” policy was approved by voice vote.

Pothering now introduced the request to change the “Coursework Elsewhere during Senior Year Petition” policy for students who hold a baccalaureate degree from another institution.

He cited this particular language from the current policy:

The maximum number of transfer credits acceptable toward a College of Charleston degree is ninety-two (92) credit hours total from all institutions. Sixty (60) credit hours total are the maximum from two-year institutions. Students may decline transfer credit, prior to enrolling at the College of Charleston, in order to add another transfer course(s) without going over the maximum hours of transfer credit allowed. Students may not decline transfer credit after enrolling at the College of Charleston in order to take a course at another institution as a transient or cross-registered student.

This requires, Pothering pointed out, that these students know well in advance of transferring to the College that they may be taking a transfer course down the line at some point while at the College and, thus, make a decision to transfer fewer hours from the institution from which they are transferring. They would need remarkable foresight to pull this off.
The proposal, then, allows these students to petition to complete up to 7 of their final 37 credit hours elsewhere after they get to the College. They can decline up to seven transfer hours in order to do so.

Dawn Bare specified that the difference between this proposal and the one voted on prior is that this one applies to students who hold a baccalaureate degree from another institution. When they come here, they will bring in 92 hours, and for those students, working on their second bachelors degree, we would allow them after a semester or two at the College to decline up to seven hours of transfer credit in order to petition to complete up to seven hours elsewhere. They would not be limited to doing this only in their first semester.

Pothering cited the example in the rationale in the document of an active Air Force Reservist that he argued speaks clearly to the problem with the current policy and argues for the solution proposed.

**Questions / Discussion / Comments**

None.

The request to change the “Coursework Elsewhere during Senior Year Petition” policy for students who hold a baccalaureate degree from another institution was approved by voice vote.

C. Resolution from the Interim Provost to Award Degrees (PDF)

The Speaker noted that is our practice in December and April in the Senate to accept from the Provost a resolution to the Board of Trustees to recommend that certified candidates be awarded degrees.

The Interim Provost asked for a motion from the floor and received one and a second for the following resolution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution to Award Degrees - December 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved: the Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Trustees that candidates certified by the Registrar’s Office as having completed all requirements be awarded degrees at graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resolution was approved by voice vote.

6. **Constituent’s Concerns**

None.

7. **Adjournment:** 7:19 PM
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 11 November 2014

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 11 November 2014 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. **Call to Order:** 5:06 PM

2. [7 October 2014 regular meeting minutes](#) were approved as posted.

3. **Announcements and information**
   None.

4. **Reports**

   A. **The Speaker**

   Faculty Secretariat

   The hiring committee (Speaker McNerney, Secretary Duvall, Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker, and Ana Gilpatrick) reviewed approximately 80 applications, conducted phone interviews, selected four applicants to interview in person, and interviewed three (one having dropped out). The committee has made a hiring recommendation and hopes to have a new Secretariat in place very soon.

   **October Board of Trustees (BOT) Meeting Highlights**

   In facilities news, the speaker reported that field stations at Dixie Plantation are on schedule to be completed in January and will be available for use in the spring; renovations to the Hollings Science Center are on schedule; Physician’s Memorial Audition is slated to be demolished over the Thanksgiving break, with completion of the new building in August 2016; the Jewish Studies expansion is on track for a fall 2015 completion; the Sottile Theater retail space at King and George is now open; the Rutledge Rivers Residence Hall construction will begin in June and is scheduled for completion in August 2016; and the Simons Center project is in a design and program completion phase.

   Another point of discussion in the BOT meeting, the Speaker said, was the public launch of the Boundless campaign.

   The Speaker also dispelled a rumor that faculty have been discouraged from attending BOT meetings. He stressed that this is not the case, and strongly encouraged faculty to attend BOT meetings and meetings of BOT committees if they so desire.

   Also announced in the BOT meeting, President McConnell and SGA President Spraker met with the Mayor and city officials about converting Coming and St. Philip streets back to two-way traffic and provided them with evidence that suggested that the plan needs further consideration. As a result, the College will be allowed to conduct a traffic study, the results of which will be reviewed by the city before any changes are made to the current traffic pattern.
A search committee is in place and working, the Speaker added, to locate a new Vice President of Student Affairs.

Faculty Charleston Chamber of Congress Meeting

The Speaker reported that on October 30, there was another meeting members of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce and faculty, this time adding most of the Deans. The meeting, he said, did not produce any “grand” actions, but it did make evident that more conversation is needed as the business community may still not be fully aware of what we do on campus. The Speaker said that he hopes the meetings will continue, along with other opportunities for us to educate the public about what faculty do at the College, and that if the Charleston business community observes weaknesses in what we do, he hopes they will share them.

Other Items

SACSCOC will be meeting in December, and the Speaker said that he will be in attendance.

This spring, we will move, he noted, to having three commencement ceremonies in the Cistern Yard (one on Friday night and two on Saturday). This will allow graduate students to be included in a Cistern ceremony and will also provide more tickets for graduates and their families.

Finally, the Speaker noted that anonymous dean and department chair evaluations will be administered soon, and he strongly encouraged Senators to participate and to, in turn, encourage other faculty across campus to do so as well. The Speaker also noted that regularization of these evaluations and the survey instrument for the dean evaluation are in large part the product of many years of work by the Faculty Welfare Committee.

B. The Interim Provost (Topics – PDF | Presentation Slides)

Before beginning his report, the Interim Provost also addressed the question of whether or not faculty are welcome at BOT meetings, verifying the Speaker's take on the matter. They are public meetings, he said, and, thus, open to faculty and students. The BOT, however, the Interim Provost reported, did ask that the number of 12-month staff members who staff those meetings be reduced, allowing them to continue doing the work of the College. The vast majority of faculty are not in the 12-month staff category.

Comprehensive Fundraising Campaign

The largest comprehensive fundraising campaign at the College prior to Boundless, the Interim Provost specified, was in the 1990s and raised what by today’s standards is a modest figure: in the 30 million dollar range. The Boundless campaign goes beyond just raising funds, however. It is a "long play," the Provost said: an opportunity to instill pride in alumni, current students, faculty, and staff for all that the college does (the big picture); an opportunity to engage alumni, of whom only about
10% currently contribute to the College, as advocates for the college in ways that go beyond contributing funds; and a means to get the College and its supporters excited about the College’s future.

So far, the campaign has raised $110 million toward a goal of raising $125 million. The successful completion of the campaign will mean not only support for faculty and students in the near and far term, but will also set the conditions for future, bigger campaigns. This is important especially in the context of diminishing state funding.

Course and Instructor Evaluations

The evaluation response rate is very low. The Interim Provost outlined two large steps that could be taken to ensure a higher response rate, but pointed out significant technical, human resources, legal, and/or financial challenges for each solution: going back to paper forms or withholding grades until students complete or opt out of evaluations and/or giving out grades early to those students who do the evaluations.

The plan for Spring 2015, he said, is to set aside class time (15-20 minutes) during which students can complete evaluations on their personal devices or computers. The day for conducting evaluations could be announced in advance by the instructor. The instructor could also survey the class to see if there is a need to provide computers or devices and, if needed, schedule class in a computer classroom, check out iPads from the library, or pursue similar solutions. The goal is to raise the response rate and in-class administration, he said, is the simplest solution to attempt at present. He said he would encourage all faculty to begin this practice this semester, but that in-class administration will be as required this spring. If this doesn’t work, we may be going for “more desperate options,” all of which have some serious drawbacks. The Interim Provost emphasized that he takes the issue of course and instructor evaluations “very seriously.”

School of Professional Studies

On November 10, the Interim Provost sent a memo to the President recommending that the college go ahead with the name change from North Campus to School of Professional Studies. The case originally laid out by Dean Godfrey Gibbison, the Interim Provost said, was still a strong one in terms of answering questions of identity, properly labeling an academic program as such, and consistency with how the College operates more generally. Those ideas, he pointed out, did not come in for criticism. The main concerns, rather, centered on other issues beyond naming. A concern for these other criticisms is built in, he said, to the President's decision.

The new school name is effective January 1, 2015. Based on faculty feedback, and here the interim provost singled out comments by Senators Krasnoff and Cory, the decision includes a guarantee that the school will remain a non-line school until 2017, at the very earliest. The original decision by prior-President Benson included a lead time for any decisions about line status of six months: the new decision includes an 18-month minimum lead time. Additionally, there is a guaranteed discussion in the
Faculty Welfare Committee and the Faculty Senate before any decisions can be made about line status. As it now stands, he reiterated, the School of Professional Studies has no faculty lines, a status not unlike that of the Honors College and the Graduate School.

Another concern raised in discussions leading up to the recent decision regarded the financial strength of the school. Financial viability is a concern that, in fairness, we can raise about all programs and all schools, and the Interim Provost said that he has recommended budget transparency and revenue transparency for all schools.

These concerns are outlined in the memo that he sent to the President and also in the President’s response, which the Interim Provost said he would be happy to share with Faculty Senate.

Budget Proposals for Academic Affairs

A memo will soon be released, the Interim Provost reported, outlining the budget process in Academic Affairs for this year. Budget proposals will be developed in November and December, with the first hearing of those proposals in Academic Affairs in December. A second hearing, in which the Interim Provost said he will present budget priorities to the Faculty Budget Committee and to anyone else who wishes to attend, will come in January, and at the end of that, recommendations will go to the Office of the President.

Faculty and Administrator Evaluations

The Interim Provost stressed the importance of roster faculty using the Faculty Activity System (FAS) to record professional activities. The FAS was purchased in 2005 and has been used steadily by some schools since then, with some departments, such as the Department of Communication, adopting its for use in faculty evaluation procedures. He pointed out that the College pays the same amount for the system annually, regardless of how much it is used.

When the President, the Board of Trustees, Deans, and so forth want to ask questions about research and service activities within or across schools and departments, within or across years, because the FAS is not used uniformly, these questions are only answerable by time-intensive and wasteful processes of manually compiling and tabulating data from individual faculty members CVs. Systems like the FAS are common at many universities, where their use long proceeds ours. The Interim Provost conceded that the earlier versions of the FAS featured a "clunky" interface and were not easy to use. However, we need to use the FAS for the kinds of data on research and service (teaching data, for the most part, is captured automatically) we need to access for various purposes.

Therefore, he said, by May 2016, every roster faculty member at the College will be required to have a FAS record of activity for that year (2015-16). Not to do so will result in "real consequences." That timeline provides 17 months for faculty to get used to the system. He recommended that department chairs and program directors
start asking their faculty to use FAS for faculty evaluation processes, so they won't have to do things twice.

Concerning adjunct faculty evaluation, the Interim Provost pointed out that our regional accreditors require evaluation of faculty without regard to rank; thus, we have to include adjunct faculty. Many deans and department chairs already evaluate adjunct faculty regularly and rigorously for the purposes of employment decisions. But we do not document that evaluation and systematically give formative feedback to adjunct faculty. For departments with high adjunct faculty dependency, he said, this will, unfortunately, be a significant additional burden added on top of roster faculty evaluation. Academic Affairs is working on processes to help chairs manage this kind of evaluation. A number of schools in the Southeast have been doing this for some time, and we might look to them for models.

On the topic of chair evaluations, the Interim Provost observed that the F/AM requires that such evaluations occur annually, a requirement that Academic Affairs is committed to fulfilling.

For Deans, evaluations are required "periodically" in the F/AM, and there has been some debate over what is meant by that term. Our regional accreditor, he said, provides some guidance on this, stipulating that senior administrators should be at least minimally evaluated once every three years. The Faculty Welfare committee has suggested a biennial calendar. We will do written Dean evaluations this spring, he said, as we did last spring, early in the semester and anonymously, with a push to get as many faculty to complete the evaluations as we can so that we have a sufficient sample.

The Interim Provost closed by stressing how seriously he and the administration take all the processes of evaluation he discussed, not just as a means of fulfilling accreditation obligations, but also because “we are trying to be a good and professional institution that documents, evaluates, and provides feedback for improvement.”

**Questions / Discussion / Comments**

**Margaret Cormack**, Senator - Religious Studies, asked if adjuncts are also using FAS.

The Interim Provost replied that our adjunct colleagues have not previously been part of FAS due to the different expectations we have of them. He said that if Cormack was suggesting that adjuncts use FAS, he would take that under advisement.

**Wayne Smith**, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, said that a problem he is having with course and instructor evaluations is that, while he used to get substantial and useful qualitative written feedback from students, he is now getting "Twitter-length" feedback. Is there a means by which, he asked,
we can gather qualitative feedback as well, even if it is not electronic? Perhaps, the student moderator could gather such feedback in a sealed envelope.

Yes, the Interim Provost replied, there are a couple ways more qualitative data could be gathered. The window for filling out the forms electronically is open for a couple weeks, and students might be encouraged to complete the online evaluation before the class period set aside for it. Also, students who decide after the fact that they wish to provide more written feedback may take advantage of the option during the evaluation period, though few do, to "kill" their previous evaluation of the class and do a new one, adding more in the way of qualitative feedback.

A third option is to provide a paper form for your own use in formative evaluation so long as you are out of the room.

The reality, the Interim Provost added, is that the majority of students, even in the days of paper forms, left "Twitter-length" feedback; however, a small set of students will leave fairly substantial feedback on the electronic evaluation because, in part, such feedback does not identify them by their handwriting.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if in the first 12 months of the 17-month lead time before the required use of FAS by faculty the FAS could be programmed to import lists of faculty publications from EndNote and other applications so that faculty do not have to enter all their information one publication at a time.

The Interim Provost replied that he certainly understands the concern and he would be happy to consult with Shaver and the programming staff to see if there's anything that he can be done. He also reiterated that all that will be asked of faculty by May of 2016 is that they have entered that academic year’s worth of data.

Shaver responded that if we are serious about having this data, there ought to be a way of entering an entire CV’s worth. He added that his data is now entered, but only through the efforts of a departmental administrative worker.

The Interim Provost observed that departments and programs might discuss means of entering backlogs of data, but even a faculty member’s entering a year’s worth of data by the end of every year would make a big difference.

Michael Gomez, Hispanic Studies, at the meeting to represent the Faculty Welfare Committee, asked for a clarification on whether or not the course and instructor evaluation period would go into the final exam period.

The Interim Provost replied that he was waiting to hear the faculty’s discussion and decision on a resolution to be discussed later in the present meeting [New Business, D. 1.] on ending the evaluation period before final exams. He said that he is sympathetic to the position holding that the course experience for a student can change markedly in the final examination period, but he wants to hear from faculty colleagues on this, and he also noted that students themselves
asked to have more time to complete evaluations. His main concern, however, is that we get more evaluation data from our students, he said.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - SSM, confirmed that two motions on course and instructor evaluations were to be considered later in the meeting, and added that we might consider extending the evaluation period by beginning it sooner, closer to the midterm.

She also agreed that the FAS is clunky, citing specific problems she has had in entering information pertaining to journals. She asked to whom faculty might address feedback for improvement of the system.

The Interim Provost said that he “would be delighted” to sit down with Anguelova to talk with Academic Affairs staff and Digital Measures.

Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker added that she and Sandy Hall in the Provost’s office are happy to take requests to modify the FAS.

Irina Gigova, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, asked about the $110 million already raised in the Boundless campaign: is it money promised or money already donated?

The Interim Provost explained that the College is following a rigorous methodology from the fundraising world for counting money raised in the Boundless campaign. At the risk of oversimplifying, he said, there are two kinds of gifts: 1. those for which the money is now in the bank and earning interest or, in the case of some endowed funds, is in the bank but may not earn interest for a number of years, and 2. the larger sum, in the form of irrevocable gifts. We already have from the campaign millions in the first category. We have some commitments from donors, he also noted, that we are not counting in the campaign because they have not been made in a way that the funds cannot be pulled back. To sum up, he said, some of the money raised in the campaign will do us good right now, some later, and still more not for many years.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, suggested that, in addition to communicating with the faculty, Academic Affairs also communicate to students the plan to administer online evaluations in class, in part, so that they know they have a right to the in-class administration of evaluations. Krasnoff also added that such a communication might also afford an opportunity to inform students about the exam schedule and their right to take final exams in the periods specified in the exam calendar.

The Interim Provost agreed that we need to clearly communicate with students that it’s an expectation of faculty to provide time for in-class administration of the evaluations, and that if such time is not provided, students need to talk to the faculty’s supervisor (program director, department chair).

Tom Kunkle, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics, asked if we actually know that setting aside time in class for online evaluations will lead to higher response rates, considering the number of other things the students might do on their devices instead.
The Interim Provost replied that there are a number of faculty in the room who have raised response rates with in-class administration of evaluations and that he would defer to them.

Emily Rosko, Department of English, suggested that faculty might ask students to take a screenshot that shows that they completed the evaluation without showing what they said.

Kunkle raised a concern that this would require students give up some of their anonymity.

Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker agreed that not all students will complete online evaluations in an in-class administration, even when they appear to be doing so, but she emphasized, based on evidence from a survey conducted last year and response rates in classes that did in-class administration faculty engagement has a dramatic positive effect on response rates.

The Interim Provost expressed appreciation for the efforts of Associate Provosts Caveny-Noecker and Diamond for all their work over the years on the online evaluation system.

There were no more questions.

5. Old Business

**RESOLUTION** to support Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 and call upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and appeal for the SC Legislature to create a position within the Board of Trustees to be held by the President of the Student Government Association.

Discussion resumed from the October Senate meeting on the following resolution, with Joe Carson, Senator – School of Science and Mathematics, who introduced the resolution, recapping prior discussion and answering questions.

**Resolution to Support Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 and Call upon the Board of Trustees to Publicly Support and Appeal for the SC Legislature to Create a Position within the Board of Trustees to be held by the President of the Student Government Association**

WHEREAS, on April 8, 2014, the Student Government Association unanimously passed SR-10-2014, calling for a position to be created within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the President of the Student Government Association;

WHEREAS, according to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, “more than 70 percent of public institution boards include one or more students”;

WHEREAS, the inclusion of a representative of the student body as a part of the final authority and governance of the College of Charleston is a logically tenable way to better
satisfy the goals set forth by the respective governing documents of the Student Government Association and the Board of Trustees;

WHEREAS, the inclusion of the Student Government Association President as an official member of the Board would help ensure mutual respect between Undergraduate students and the Board of Trustees;

THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the student body president.

Carson explained that the resolution offers support for a Student Government Association (SGA) resolution, penned by SGA Senator Zachery Sturman and passed unanimously, for a position to be created on the Board of Trustees (BOT) to be held by the President of the SGA. The Faculty Senate (FS) resolution also calls for the BOT to support the student resolution. The resolution, he said, makes a reasonable request for student representation and provides the FS with an opportunity to support student involvement in school governance. Both the BOT and SGA have expressed a desire for better communication between the two groups. This resolution, Carson asserted, can be supported by the BOT, students, and faculty to ensure dialogue between the BOT and students and to avoid any appearance of a lack of transparency.

The majority of institutions in the US, he noted, have a student on their governing boards. There are, he said, no compelling arguments for the College to go against the grain in this respect.

To address concerns raised in the prior FS meeting about whether or not the student representative would be a voting or nonvoting member of the BOT, Carson said the FS resolution does not broach that issue: the main purpose is to support the student effort. He also observed that there may be significant legal bars to cross to make the position voting, as opposed to a non-voting. A concern was also raised in the last FS meeting, Carson noted, that a non-voting membership on the BOT might be nothing more than a privilege already afforded students to attend open meetings. He pointed out, however, that the BOT frequently has closed meetings, executive sessions that are not open to the public. A student representative would be present in these sessions as well.

To ensure this, Carson asked and received unanimous consent to add to the "Resolved" section of the document the following sentence: "The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all board of
trustee members.” [See below for the entire resolved clause with the added language represented in underlined text.]

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the student body president. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

Discussion now continued on the resolution as amended.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, asked if the Speaker of the Faculty has the privilege of attending closed sessions of the BOT.

On the Speaker’s reply of “no,” Shaver followed up by questioning why we would support a student privilege that our own Faculty Speaker does not have.

Carson replied that if this is a concern, he would recommend that a separate resolution be submitted to add a faculty member to the BOT.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - School of Science and Mathematics, reminded the Senate that in the October discussion, a student raised some concerns about the SGA President being the student representative on the BOT. There is support for a student representative, she observed, but not necessarily for the SGA President as that representative.

Zachary Sturman, SGA Senator and author of SR 10-2014, expressed appreciation for the concern and said that support for the position to be held by the SGA President might be attributable to the statement in the SC Code of Laws that specifies that “presidents of student bodies may be ex officio members of boards of trustees.” He asserted that, legally, this is the only option for representation, as arbitrary as it is. The SGA President also already has channels that connect the position to the BOT, and so that adds another reason why the SGA President might be a good fit for the position.

Anguelova replied that since the law specifies ex officio status, then “ex officio” should be added to the resolution, which, she added, means “non-voting member.”

Sturman replied that “ex officio” means “by your position,” and it can be voting or non-voting.

Adrian Barry, a representative of Fight for CofC, said that they take issue with both the SGA resolution and the FS resolution. They do, however, support their own version of a bill to change the SC Code of Law proposed by SC State Representative by Bakari Sellers. Sellers’s bill, Barry pointed out, was introduced at the end of the last legislative session and did not come up for consideration. A new legislative session opens in January, at which time the bill can be considered. Fight for CofC, Barry said, spent the last couple months researching and reaching out to students
and on the basis of their research, has written their own legislation, based on Sellers's bill and called the “Student Agency in College Governance Act.” They had hoped that the FC could change its resolution to support their proposed legislation, rather than SGA SR 10-2014.

The Sellers bill would have provided for two voting student seats on the BOT, one to be held by the SGA President, the other to be elected by the student body in the same manner as the SGA President. Fight for CofC proposes a similar plan, except the SGA President would not automatically become a Trustee, but would have to run for the position of Trustee in a general student body election. The other seat would be filled by a student elected by the FS. This addresses, he said, some flaws in the SGA election system (such as 10% voter turnout and self-promotion within the ranks of student body representatives). Faculty, he asserted, also know the students best and would be inclined to select on merits rather than popularity in selecting the student for the second seat. He closed by saying that Fight for CofC has come before the FS with a fully written piece of legislation for which they would like FS support.

Anguelova replied that the Senate has not seen this bill.

Barry replied by saying that “we actually emailed it” via Hollis France, Political Science, “with a three-page statement,” but it didn’t go out to the Senate.

Anguelova responded by pointing out that the resolution on the floor is not the resolution Barry seemed to be asking for.

Barry suggested that the resolution on the floor could be easily amended by substituting “Student Government Resolution SR 10-2014” with “the Student Agency in College Governance Act.” “But because you haven't actually read it,” he conceded, “that’s kind of a reach.”

Anguelova said, in that light, that we should either vote on the resolution on the floor or table discussion until the “other resolution is available.”

The Speaker noted that the materials sent via Hollis France were not presented as a resolution by a faculty member, and that’s why it was not an agenda item.

Barry confirmed that they did not send a resolution, just their legislation and an explanation.

The Speaker noted that it is possible the Fight for CofC initiative might generate a resolution at some point, but it is not one at this point.

**Andrew Shedlock**, Senator - Department of Biology, asked if the College is also a statistical outlier among public institutions with regard to faculty speakers' representation on governing boards.

The Speaker noted that there could be ethical conflicts with faculty serving on BOTs, along the lines, for instance, of an employee of an institution making decisions about how money is spent.
Bob Mignone, Department of Mathematics, said that there are many precedents for faculty representatives (speakers of faculty, for instance) serving on governing boards. He believes that we are behind the curve.

The Interim Provost pointed out that Title 59, Chapter 101 of the SC Code of Laws quoted earlier in the discussion was quoted accurately in reference to the President of the student body. However, a CofC complication to be aware of in this connection is that we have two student body organizations with Presidents, the SGA, representing undergraduate students and the Graduate Student Association (GSA), representing graduate students. Thus, there may be no student at the College who can claim to be the President of the student body from a legal point of view. The Interim Provost invited comment from Zachary Sturman.

Sturman reported that he spoke two weeks prior to Vice Chair of the BOT Lee Michael, who informed him that in 2010-11 there was a similar initiative spearheaded by SGA President Isaiah Nelson, which was supported by the BOT 9-6, but this did not reach the 2/3 majority needed for a by-laws change. The BOT was not concerned about the issue just raised by the Interim Provost, Sturman said, considering representation by the CofC President of the SGA to still be in line with the law’s ethos.

Joe Carson pointed out that the text of the FS resolution renders “student body president,” leaving the resolution of that issue, if needed, for later.

Tom Kunkle said that the resolution would have a better chance of passing if it left more up the BOT to decide as to the role the student would play. He suggested replacing “supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014” with “supports student representation on the Board of Trustees.” Also, he suggested replacing “the student body president” with “a student body representative.” Finally, he stated that the final line (added earlier by Carson with unanimous consent) should be stricken, leaving it to the BOT to decide what sort of attendance and voting rights the student representative would have.

He also reported that the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges website reports some interesting results of a 2010 survey: more than 70% of universities, private and public, have some form of student representation on the boards, around 50% of whom are non-voting members. If we had a non-voting student member of the BOT, then, we would not necessarily be behind the curve.

The Speaker asked if Kunkle was proposing an amendment to the resolution.

Kunkle said, yes, and proposed the changes he outlined above as an amendment.

Shaver asked if the changes should be taken separately, as separate amendments, since people seemed to be comfortable with the first two suggestions but not the last. Krasnoff agreed that there do seem to be some separable issues. The Speaker noted that the amendment could be moved “as one” and that it might be divided during debate.

The amendment was seconded by Krasnoff, who also pointed out that “whereas” statements above the “resolved” clause would need to be altered as well, in parallel.
The Speaker advised that the Senate attend first to the “resolved” clause and change the “whereas” statements as needed later.

[See below for an edited text and a clean copy, both showing Kunkle’s amendments. In the first, deleted language is represented by strike-through font, added language by underlined font.]

[reflecting edits]

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 student representation on the Board of Trustees, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the student body president a student body representative.

The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

—

[clean copy]

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports student representation on the Board of Trustees, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by a student body representative.

Questions / Discussion / Comments on the Amendment by Kunkle

Adrian Barry asserted that initiative of SGA President Nelson was weaker than SR 10-2014: it only accorded a right to speak “when recognized.” Though this initiative had support, it was still voted down, a sign, he said, of the BOT’s unwillingness to cede power. Whatever is done, he asserted, it will be a reach, and, therefore, he urged the Senate to “reach for something significant.” Fight for CofC would like to see a more “hard line” resolution, with more specificity, rather than “low-balling ourselves” in the way we ask for a student representative on the BOT, he said.

Iana Anguelova called the question on the amendment, which was seconded, and was agreed to by voice vote with no opposition.

The Speaker then called for a vote on the amendment, reading the amended language.

Scott Peeples, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, asked if the Senate had not divided the amendment. The Speaker replied in the negative. Shaver asked for advice: should those wishing to have the language divided strike down the amendment and re-propose it in a different form? Parliamentarian George Pothering agreed that this would work.

A inconclusive voice vote was taken, followed by a vote by show of hands.
The amendment failed, returning the Senate to discussion of the resolution with the “resolved” clause as follows.

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the student body president. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

Questions / Discussion / Comments on the resolution

Larry Krasnoff moved the same amendment as Kunkle’s, but with the sentence at the end of the resolution stricken by Kunkle now remaining. The motion was seconded.

[See below for an edited text and a clean copy, both showing Krasnoff’s amendments. In the first, deleted language is represented by strike-through font, added language by underlined font.]

[reflecting edits]

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 student representation on the Board of Trustees, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the student body president a student body representative. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

—

[clean copy]

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports student representation on the Board of Trustees, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by a student body representative. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

Questions / Discussion / Comments on the Amendment by Krasnoff

Sturman said that he was fine with the amendment, the main goal being to support the idea of having a student on the BOT.

There was no more discussion.
The Speaker, first reading the amended language, called for a vote.
The amendment passed on a voice vote, the language now reading:

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports student representation on the Board of Trustees, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by a student body representative. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

Discussion continued on the resolution, with the Speaker calling for any more changes to or discussion of the “resolved” statement.

Seeing none, the Speaker opened the floor for discussion of and/or amendments to the “whereas” statements.

Iana Anguelova asked if she could call the question on the resolution.

Pothering suggested that before doing so, it would be best to make sure the “whereas” statements support the “resolved” statement.

Anguelova moved to strike the first “whereas” statement, which reads “WHEREAS, on April 8, 2014, the Student Government Association unanimously passed SR-10-2014, calling for a position to be created within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the President of the Student Government Association.” There was, however, no second.

Krasnoff said that there is no reason to strike the first “whereas” statement as it presents a matter of fact. Nor, he said, are there other entire “whereas” statements that should be stricken. In the fourth “whereas,” however, “the Student Government Association President” should be replaced with “a student representative.” He asked for and received unanimous consent for the change.

The title was changed as well to reflect the other changes.

The Speaker called for further discussion, this time of the resolution as a whole.

Jason Coy, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, cautioning that he doesn’t wish to come across as against student participation in school governance, advised Senators to vote against the resolution. It would create a problematic situation, should the BOT agree to adding a student representative, that would allow a student to be present to discuss and, perhaps, vote on matters of great import, while the Speaker of the Faculty is asked to leave the room. The faculty would have no say, while the students would.

He noted that one might object to his position by saying the faculty could agitate separately for a position on the BOT, but he said, for whatever reason, the BOT might find it more to their goals or liking to admit a student representative alone.
Carson replied that voting down the resolution would not in any way make it more likely that a faculty position on the BOT could be created. Conversely, he argued, having a student on the BOT, might make it more likely that there would be reasonable arguments to put a faculty member on the board, as well.

**Jon Hakkila**, Department of Physics and Astronomy, asked if it would be possible to table or postpone action on this resolution until a resolution supporting faculty membership on the BOT could be written, the two resolutions to be considered and voted on in the same meeting.

Krasnoff said that he agreed with Carson. The students “got out in front” of the faculty on this one: the Senate should pass the resolution now.

**Barry** said anything is a big step forward, so if the resolution passes, it is a good thing. But, he specified, as written now, the resolution is actually weaker than the SGA resolution, only asking for the bare minimum.

Irina Gigova, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, stated that the resolution supports the efforts of the SGA and Fight for CofC and should not be seen as a weaker version of those.

Sturman thanked Faculty Senate for the discussion, and noted that the SGA continues to work in their own committees and through conversation with the BOT, which has five new members in this term. He said he is less concerned about the language than the process.

**Andrew Shedlock**, Department of Biology, stated that it might be informative to look at patterns of other institutions. Do those who have student representatives on governing boards also have faculty representation? Is it common to have the first and not the second? And so forth.

Bob Mignone, Department of Mathematics, noted that there is a great deal of variability in governing boards in relation to these questions.

Phil Jos, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, reported, based on a google search, that a 2010 study found that 15% of private and 14% of public higher education institutions have voting faculty members on their governing boards.

Discussion ended here, and a vote was taken on the complete resolution as represented below.

**The resolution passed on a voice vote.**

---

**Resolution to Support Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 and Call upon the Board of Trustees to Publicly Support and Appeal for the SC Legislature to Create a Position within the Board of Trustees**

WHEREAS, on April 8, 2014, the Student Government Association unanimously passed SR-10-2014, calling for a position to be created within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the President of the Student Government Association;
WHEREAS, according to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, “more than 70 percent of public institution boards include one or more students”;

WHEREAS, the inclusion of a representative of the student body as a part of the final authority and governance of the College of Charleston is a logically tenable way to better satisfy the goals set forth by the respective governing documents of the Student Government Association and the Board of Trustees;

WHEREAS, the inclusion of a student representative as an official member of the Board would help ensure mutual respect between students and the Board of Trustees;

THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports student representation on the Board of Trustees, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by a student body representative. The position should include the same meeting attendance privileges that are afforded to all Board of Trustee members.

New Business

A. Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education and Special Programs

(website)

Jon Hakkila, Chair of the committee, noted that last year the committee developed a batch-voting procedure to speed the work of the committee in Senate meetings, where there are no concerns about specific course proposals. Program proposals, on the other hand, get a separate vote. At this meeting, however, since there is a separate concern about the MBA program proposal, voting will be separate on the course proposals.

1. CSIS 631 – Privacy and Security Issues: Change course title (PDF)

Questions / Discussion / Comments: none.

The proposal passed on a voice vote.

2. Master of Business Administration: Add new course(s) to requirements or electives (PDF)

Questions / Discussion / Comments

Hakkila asked James Kindley, MBA Program Director, to speak to the proposal, given that some concerns have been expressed about it.
Kindley explained that there is a special topics course (560) listed in the catalog, but inadvertently, he said, it was not specified in the various electives, three elective tracks, as an option for whoever is teaching the elective courses. So now that they are listed as three elective courses, the program wants to add the 560 course and let the department or group that is in charge of the elective decide whether or not to use 560 - Special Topics as appropriate but still require the three courses for students. The students would not get a choice in this, but the 560 course could be used for a variety of things, as it is intended to do. That’s the only change the program is asking for.

Hakkila noted that Kelly Shaver had concerns about the course.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, noted that one concern he had was removed by Kindley’s discussion above: if there had been choice for the students among courses they could take, then, of necessity, all four of the courses would need to be offered, which would eliminate three courses from the undergraduate program. He no longer, he said, has this particular objection.

However, he did express concern about the method of the evaluation of the success of the course. He asked that item 2 under “Assessment Method and Performance Expected” on page three of the course form be stricken. It reads, “Course(s) will be judged by employer reaction to student capabilities. This should result in increased hiring. Employers will be surveyed for their feedback regarding the students’ skills.”

Shaver asserted that it will be “exceedingly difficult” to differentiate whether increased hiring derives from the course or courses or from the growing reputation of the program itself.

Kindley replied that he has no problem striking that item, but in response to it, he noted that there is a close relationship between the program and the speakers it brings in to work with the students, and there is continuous feedback about the relevance of such interactions. The language was intended to tap into that.

Shaver said that in addition to the problem of teasing out the cause of increased hiring, the language would also obligate the program to do annual surveys.

Roxane DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, added that the factual statement in the language opens the program to a later challenge by a student on a claim that the course did not live up to its stated goals. This could create a vulnerability, in other words.

Shaver replied by asking if DeLaurell was seconding his motion to strike the language, to which she agreed.

The Speaker recognized it as a motion.
Phil Jos, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, asked if the objectionable part is only the first two sentences and not the final one. Employers, he said, are certainly competent to make a judgment about students’ skills. Also, it’s not an onerous task and doesn’t open the program to any particular vulnerabilities.

Shaver replied that his concern is all of it. The last sentence obligates employers to do a survey.

Discussion of Shaver’s amendment concluded here.

The amendment passed on a voice vote.

Hakkila noted at this point that his committee has not fully figured out how to handle the section of the form dealing with assessment.

Krasnoff added that the assessment section of the form, required not simply for course proposals, but in many other situations as well, is a burden.

The Speaker asked for any additional comments or concerns about the MBA course proposal.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, added that the proposal represents a fairly typical change.

The proposal passed as amended on a voice vote.

3. Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing: New degree proposal (PDF)

Hakkila noted that, from the perspective of the committee, the program is interesting and innovative. It is a program that offers something new to the curriculum and takes advantage of being in the Lowcountry. He pointed out that Academic Affairs helped a great deal in working out the financial support. He suggested that the proposal might be seen as a model for new curriculum proposals in the future. He turned the floor over to Bret Lott.

Bret Lott, Department of English, pointed out that a great deal of work went into developing the proposal, with a good number of people involved. He singled out Emily Rosko, Department of English, in this connection.

He said that the MFA in Creative Writing has been a long time coming. There are 25 programs in the Southeast, he said, but there is only one program in South Carolina, at the University of South Carolina. He pointed to the College’s assets: our faculty, support of the Department of English, the highly-respected Crazyhorse literary journal.

The program has two tracks: a studio track and an Arts Management track. It will finally bring to South Carolina a second program, he said, that has been long needed.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, asked if there are other MFAs, besides Creative Writing, and if so asked Lott to talk about those a bit.
Lott replied that, yes, there are: Painting, Arts, Drama, Music. The MFA is a terminal degree, but it is two years of studying with writers, two years of studying writing/literature, two years, in this case, of studying publication and working with an internationally-known journal. “The only reason you get an MFA is because you love the subject that you study,” he said. “That’s the truth of Humanities: there’s no [utilitarian way to] defend this thing.” The Arts Management track, he said, however, does train people to work in the multi-billion dollar arts economy. This track will help ready them for jobs in editing, publishing, working for different arts councils, and so on. We don’t want to “spit out adjunct professors to teach English 110,” he asserted.

Krasnoff followed up by saying that he was looking in the proposal for some synergy between the two tracks, but noted that “really, there isn’t.” There is no real crossover course to make the case that the two fields, writing and arts management, go together. His concern is that with the track, students might be getting a little less of each side.

Lott asked if Krasnoff was saying that students in the track would not actually be earning the certificate in Arts Management.

Krasnoff clarified: his concern, he stated, is that they might get “half of a each degree.”

Emily Rosko noted that the internship class was supposed to offer the synergy, allowing students to connect practical business skills or editorial training with community connections in the arts world. It has been left open in the Arts Management track, she noted, signified by an asterisk signaling that additional courses may count. The next step, she said, is to sit down with people in Arts Management and the Masters of Public Administration to develop classes geared toward MFA students in Creative Writing.

Phil Jos, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences, agreed that the proposal is strong, but raised a concern about Arts Management courses, which will now have students from Arts Management, Public Administration, and the MFA in Creative Writing. He said that this may require some very particular and special course development and, maybe, down the road additional staffing. This should be part of the plan, he said.

He also said that he was looking for, as an interim strategy, a capstone or some experience that brings together all the courses in Arts Management and Creative Writing. That could happen, he agreed, in an internship.

In addition, he asked about the admission standards, particularly the GPA, which Jos observed, is very low “for any program.”

Lott asserted that grades don’t necessarily reflect skill in writing.

Rosko, though she said she could not verify online at present due to a connection problem, said that the proposal pulls much of its admission standards from our
MA in English, which would put the MFA, in this respect, in line with current graduate level practice at the College in English.

Lott also pointed out that the portfolio of original work will make the case for admission.

There was no further discussion.

The proposal was approved on a voice vote.

B. Faculty Curriculum Committee (webpage)

Artium Bacchalaureatus (AB): Revise catalog statement on requirement for AB degree (PDF)

Bonnie Springer, Chair of the committee, introduced the motion by saying that there is no form for use with a motion like this. It is a clarification of catalog language.

The Speaker invited Tim Johnson, Chair of the Department of Classics, to contextualize the proposal.

Johnson pointed out that the current catalog language is based on an hours requirement, and with language placement this can result in a number of exceptions. The new language is intended to line up with the languages in general in terms of proficiency at an advanced level. There is no change here in practice: the language is just adding specificity.

Krasnoff asked for a clarification: does this mean that if a student gets placed into the high level, they get to exempt some of the 18 hours now?

Johnson replied that there are two answers: hardly anybody does place into the 300-level and if a student did, there are still multiple 300-level hours required. Most of of the placements that cause problems come in at the 102 or 201-level, he specified.

Krasnoff asked if a current student does place at 300-level, do they still have to take six courses or do they get credit for any of the things they placed out of?

Johnson said, under the new language, they would then qualify by taking two courses at the 300 level if they come in with that skill level. The current practice in a case like this, he said, is to apply for an exception.

There was no further discussion.

The proposal passed on a voice vote.

C. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual (webpage)

1. Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Manual to Remove Requirement of Distribution of Meeting Agenda in Printed Form (Word | PDF)

Rick Heldrich, Chair of the committee, explained that this motion would only remove reference to “print.”

There was no discussion.
The proposal passed on a voice vote.

2. NOTICE OF INTENT: To Change Faculty Administrative Manual to More Clearly Define Faculty Responsibilities with Regard to Students with Disabilities Policy (PDF)

Heldrich explained that these language changes are in response, in part, to a request from Deborah Mihal, Director - Center for Disability Services (CDS), for a clarified F/AM statement on the responsibilities of the College, faculty, and students regarding instructional accommodations for students with disabilities. The language, he also pointed out, has been vetted also by a number of other parties.

Discussion/Comments

**Roxane DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, noting that she has spent two years dealing with CDS on what constitutes reasonable accommodations, asked “why we are completely gutting faculty from the process?”

**Heldrich** replied that the College has a federal legal obligation to provide reasonable accommodations for students, and the proposed language accounts for that.

**DeLaurell** said she is not denying that obligation. She specified that the rule is that it is the faculty member has to provide the accommodation. What she sees in the proposed changes, she said, is that faculty are removed from dialogue with the student and that faculty are only dialoguing with CDS staff.

She also reported personal experiences with CDS that also inform her response to the proposed language changes. She said that she has “found the staff to be uninformed about what constitutes a reasonable accommodation” and “fairly hostile, in that they are not communicative.”

She said that she thinks the proposed language will create problems due to the vagueness of terms such as “reasonable” and “properly raised.” The staff at CDS, she asserted, should not be put in a position where they are making legal determinations, of which they are not capable. She added that the CDS staff have “some basic misunderstandings of how things work and don’t even follow their own process.” She closed by saying that the proposed change is “really dangerous” and that faculty in the classroom should not be preempted by a staff characterized as they are above.

**Associate Provost Deanna Caveny-Noecker** stated that the intent of the language change is not to give CDS sole authority or any authority they do not already have; rather, it is to clarify specific groups’ responsibilities, including faculty’s responsibilities. Faculty do not, she said, have the authority as individuals to define what the accommodation is. They have the responsibility to work with CDS and the academic authority—their department chair, the Dean, the Provost—to determine a reasonable accommodation. Another section specifies the College’s responsibility, not
CDS’s, which was an intentional decision by the by-laws committee. The language’s goal is to clarify the student’s responsibilities and the faculty’s responsibilities, and what our institutional obligation is.

**Judith Steele**, Assistant Director - CDS, noting that Deborah Mihal could not be in attendance, pointed out that the laws themselves are vague. Decisions about accommodations come down, she said, to the individual student, the student’s disability, and what is most likely to give the student equal access.

**Kelly Shaver**, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, pointed out that the section of the new language beginning with “it is the responsibility of the instructor to” makes no references to the department chair, academic affairs, or any academic officers, or even the instructor’s having a discussion with the student. A student, he asserted, is probably in a better position to determine what accommodation might be most effective in a particular course whose content the student understands than would be CDS, who have no real understanding of the course and should not be expected to have such an understanding.

**Caveny-Noecker** replied that when she was talking about the chain of command or authority, she wasn’t being specific about what the proposed language says. The intent of the language is to clarify responsibilities in the F/AM, and with respect to faculty responsibilities in the proposed language, those who worked on it wanted the faculty to be aware that they are to be the ones to administer accommodations, but also that they should raise concerns if they think the accommodations aren’t reasonable or appropriate to the nature of the class. They are also responsible for working with the CDS to resolve the issues.

A larger issue has been raised in the discussion, she observed, that neither the current language nor the proposed language addresses: what happens when there is a disagreement between faculty and CDS as to what is a reasonable accommodation? It is, she stressed, inappropriate for such a dispute to be carried out in a dialogue between the faculty member and the student.

CDS evaluates students for disability, makes initial recommendations for accommodations, and provides some accommodations themselves, such as space for testing, but CDS does not have the sole authority to say what is or is not reasonable, and neither does the faculty member. Academic affairs deems these accommodation decisions academic ones as they are ultimately decisions about credit for academic coursework. The Provost and Academic Affairs will accept responsibility for a role in those decisions, but the proposed language does not address that because it is a larger-scale issue that needs more work.

What the proposed language does do, however, is clean up the current language and clarify things, and those who worked on it—CDS, Academic Affairs, the faculty Committee on By-laws and the F/AM—believe it is better
than the current language. However, with the Senate’s serious consideration and with the concerns raised, she said, we can keep working on the larger issues.

DeLaurell reiterated her earlier observation that the proposed language creates confusion, adding “reasonable time” and “properly raise” as examples of vague phrases. She also asserted that in the instructor responsibilities section, the proposed language "remove[s] everything except answering to CDS and providing the accommodation." As evidence from her own experience, she said that, in order to protect other students whose privacy might have otherwise been violated by a recommended accommodation of audio recording, she spent hours retyping class notes in order to give them to a student who needed an accommodation. She said that while she’s willing to do this kind of work, she gets the impression that CDS is not. If the proposed language included the element of academic officers’ oversight (the Chair, the Dean, the Provost), she argued, she might be able to support it.

Furthermore, she asserted that CDS is "actually the problem," as evidenced, she asserted, by their telling students that they need not seek an instructor’s permission to audio record classes, whereas, in direct conflict with this, SNAP letters specify "with permission of instructor." She thus cautioned against giving CDS broad decision-making power. Furthermore, she noted that the lack of language about appeals makes matters worse.

She concluded by saying that the proposed language represented a "hastily done job" that will cause more problems than "working through" the issues in a "methodical manner" would cause, urging those working on the language to keep foremost in their minds that faculty will be the ones who administer accommodations and that the faculty want to accommodate students in a reasonable way.

Iana Anguelova, Senator - SSM, said that she agrees that the proposed language represents a clarification. For example, one sentence stricken in the new language in the “responsibility of the instructor” section is “justify the proposed accommodation [(or the denial of an accommodation) if appealed by the student].” Anguelova asserted that she, as faculty member, does not feel qualified to make a justification of that sort, but this is what the SNAP office is for: there should be a separate body for such decisions. We are, she noted, raising bigger issues, but as far as the proposed language goes, it is better than what is currently in the F/AM.

Anguelova at this point asked for a quorum call, which revealed that, with 26 senators in the room, there was a quorum. Discussion continued.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, agreed with Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker that the proposed language does not make CDS the final authority. He also agreed that the faculty have to determine what a reasonable accommodation is in relation to the particular class and its learning
objectives and the student’s particular disability (in part, Shaver’s point). He suggested a small change to the proposed language. In item 4 under “it is the responsibility of the student to,” which reads “request an accommodation within a reasonable time in advance of situations for which it is necessary,” Krasnoff suggested adding “from the instructor” after “accommodation.” This would clarify the faculty role: the student is supposed to work with the faculty member, they would try to work things out together, and in the case of a problem, CDS would assist.

As for vagueness in the proposed language, Kranoff pointed out, much of that is already “baked into the law.” Standards of reasonability are common in the law, and “we are stuck with them” and, thus, “we have to work together” to come to a sense of “reasonable.”

**Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker** reiterated that the intent of the proposed language was clarification. There was no intent and there is no action in the proposed language, she asserted, that takes away rights of the faculty member or gives rights or authority to CDS beyond the authority they already have.

**Shaver** noted that the clarification has raised problems that we need to deal with, and he thanked those who worked on the proposed language for the clarification that has made the problems obvious.

At this point, **Larry Krasnoff** asked for clarification as to whether or not the Senate was voting on the language, which would seem out of place given that it would reside in a portion of the F/AM over which the Senate has no control. Speaker McNerney replied that the Senate will take a vote, but mainly in order to indicate the position of the Senate in regard to the language.

**Rick Heldrich** explained that the reason the Senate is considering language that it does not have direct control over is that for many years the administration promulgated policy that affected faculty, yet faculty were not necessarily informed of policy changes and had little role, if any, in shaping them in the first place. A discussion between faculty and Brian McGee, who was then working as Chief of Staff in the President’s office, resulted in the faculty consultation process now on display in the current discussion. Faculty are presented with policy and given a chance to debate and help to develop it before it goes into the F/AM. The by-laws committee in this case tried to clarify the language currently in the F/AM and brought it to the Senate for discussion and further input as needed. Having the current debate is a good thing, he said, and validates McGee’s original position that this is the way that policy changes should be enacted at the College.

**DeLaurell** took issue with Krasnoff’s suggestion that his proposed revision (see above) would address concerns about the faculty being cut out of the process of deciding on accommodations. She pointed out stricken item 3 under instructor responsibilities, which reads “suggest alternative or
negotiate accommodations with the student and/or SNAP coordinator if the recommended accommodations are unacceptable." This is a removal of faculty input, she said.

Many in the room replied that the revised item 3 (just below stricken item 3) answers those objections: the instructor should "promptly raise concerns and recommend alternative accommodations to a CDS administrator if the accommodations recommended by CDS are incompatible with the format or nature of the course."

DeLaurell countered that the proposed language "does not allow you to talk to the student." Why can’t you talk to the student?, she asked.

Interim Provost McGee thanked Heldrich for recapping the issues and conversations around past development and promulgation of policy, which did not substantively involve faculty input. He thanked the Committee on By-laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual for their work to insure thoughtful faculty discussion of policy. There has, he said, been a significant amount of work done on this particular policy redevelopment and improvement. The Senate’s helpful discussion "will cause us to go back and look again" at the disability language. He assured the Senate that there is still time left for considering the issues raised, and he thanked the Senate and all those who worked on the policy, across the board. He expressed his office’s intent to work through the language line by line to incorporate, where possible, the concerns raised in the debate.

Shaver asked "how many of us does it take to leave before we no longer have a quorum?" On the Speaker’s reply, "one," Shaver quickly riposted, "I am leaving."

At this point the Speaker asked for a motion to adjourn, which was offered instantaneously, seconded, and voted on in the affirmative.

7. Adjournment: 7:29

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 7 October 2014

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 7 October 2014 at 5:00 PM in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order: 5:04 PM
2. 9 September 2014 regular meeting minutes were approved as posted.
3. Announcements and information
   See the Speaker’s report below.
4. Reports
   A. The Speaker

   The Speaker explained that some items on his report at this meeting he intended to cover at the previous Senate meeting but did not for the sake of time.

   The speaker noted that this fall we are welcoming over 50 new faculty colleagues to our campus (36 on the tenure track or tenured and 15 in visiting lines). He specified that "new" in this context means "new to the institution," not new lines.

   The Speaker announced that the College has now received permission from the CHE to purchase a building and property on Lockwood Boulevard and has received some funding from the legislature to go toward its purchase. The College intends to move some administrative and operational offices there, creating more academic space at the main campus. The process may be lengthy, as there are still some environmental studies of the building that need to be done before we can purchase it.

   The Faculty Senate offices, the speaker noted, will be relocating very soon to the Education Center, occupying two spaces there: ECTR 227 and 228. These rooms will adjoin. One is a larger conference space than we had in Randolph Hall and will include a large monitor that can be used for projecting from laptops or electronic devices. Committees will be able to use this room for their meetings. The other room will be the office of the Faculty Secretariat and is roughly the same size as the space the Secretariat had in Randolph Hall. In it we will store the Senate’s paper records for the use of Senators or whoever may need to consult the written record. This space should be ready within the next two weeks.

   The speaker reported that the ad for the Faculty Secretariat has now closed and he, the Faculty Secretary, and Ana Gilpatrick will soon begin screening the approximately 80 applications.

   The Speaker announced that on Wednesday, October 8, he will be hosting a forum for our adjunct faculty colleagues. Following a precedent set by former Speaker Lynn Cherry, this meeting and one or two more this year will bring together our adjunct faculty colleagues to discuss issues related directly to them. The 90-minute meeting on October 8 will be primarily dedicated to discussing the College’s implementation of the
Affordable Care Act. Guests at the meeting will include Brian McGee, Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Sandy Butler, and Katie Walker.

The Speaker also offered a follow-up on the Board of Trustees/Faculty shadowing program begun by former Speaker Cherry. This fall, six members of the Board of Trustees have volunteered to spend time, roughly 1/2 to 2/3 of a day, shadowing six volunteer faculty members.

The Speaker reminded the Senate of the upcoming October Board of Trustees meeting, October 16 and 17. Committee meetings on the 16th, the speaker added, are open to anyone who has an interest.

Plans are now being made for a second meeting between faculty and the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, the Speaker reported. The intent is to broaden the conversation that was begun at the first meeting. This meeting will include school deans, who did not attend the first meeting. Among the dozen faculty who attended the first meeting, there were three senators (Larry Krasnoff, Pam Riggs-Gelasco, Kelly Shaver), five department chairs (George Pothering, Pam Riggs-Gelasco, Calvin Blackwell, Mark Del Mastro, Marian Mazzone), and chairs and previous chairs of faculty committees (Jon Hakkila, Bob Podolsky, Simon Lewis, Margaret Hagood, Amanda Ruth-Mcswain). All of these faculty have been invited to attend the next meeting. But as the goal is to broaden the conversation, the Speaker invited any other senators who may be interested in attending the next or future meetings to contact him.

The speaker noted that our SACSCOC (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges) reaffirmation is coming in two years. Work towards this has already, of course, been underway, but much work remains. One particularly important item will be the development of our Quality Enhancement Plan or QEP, and faculty had a significant role in that process for the last reaffirmation.

The speaker noted that November 1 will see the public launch of our comprehensive fund-raising campaign, and he asked faculty to consider how we all might champion that campaign. The Foundation might take a bit of time at the next meeting to explain how we might do that.

The speaker remarked that he owes the faculty a newsletter, and this will be coming, most likely, early in November.

Finally, the Speaker noted that in order to become a bit more sustainable, he and the Faculty Secretary made a decision prior to the first Senate meeting to no longer mail the hard copies of the agenda to the campus community. We hope, he said, that the electronic publication we have been using via email and the website will be sufficient. But he did also mention that we may need to make a change to the bylaws to accommodate this new practice.

There were no questions.

B. The Interim Provost
Campus Diversity Climate Survey
The Interim Provost explained that a report scheduled later on the agenda will cover the survey and provide detailed information.

School of Professional Studies (SPS)
The Interim Provost deferred to Dean Godfrey Gibbison, whose report scheduled next in the agenda will address the proposed SPS.

He did add, however, that President McConnell has not made a decision on the SPS. The President wanted, first, the Interim Provost said, to provide an opportunity for Dean Gibbison to speak to the Senate, and, in addition to that, complete his consultation with all the relevant faculty committees.

Top Ten Percent Admissions
The Interim Provost reported that a great deal of work has been done to review how a pilot of the Top Ten Percent program might work. Following the review and after lengthy discussion of the results of the review, President McConnell concluded that there is not enough time for a fall 2015 rollout. 12 to 15 months will be required in order to ramp up for a proper pilot. Throughout this year, the administration will continue to work through the details of a pilot, with an eye toward implementation for admissions for the fall 2016 semester. The additional time will allow us to get the program right, addressing all concerns.

Later in his report, the Interim Provost addressed a concern about the proposed Top Ten admissions program raised in the September Senate meeting by Richard Nunan, Department of Philosophy [September minutes, p. 7]: Nunan argued that the program might be susceptible to equal protection lawsuits. The Interim Provost replied with assurances that "our legal basis for pursuing the pilot program is strong."

“Furthermore and more generally,” he added,

the Senate has my confirmation of the College's commitment to and respect for the law... even as federal and state laws are revised by the legislative branch or interpreted by the judicial branch. For example, at the federal level, we recently learned from the 4th Circuit's Bostic decision that the denial of choice in certain intensely personal decisions can alter the course of an individual life and, hence, is a type of segregation not countenanced by the 14th amendment. I am no attorney, but my own assessment is that state agencies in South Carolina, including our own, may soon be compelled under the rule of law to accept a new understanding of Title 20 of the state's Code of Laws. We'll await additional guidance from state and federal courts on this topic.

Decentralization and Academic Affairs
President McConnell has placed an emphasis on decentralizing decision-making, including decision-making on budgets, as much as is possible. The Interim Provost specified four topics of consequence for decentralization.
• Decentralization of adjunct budgets to the academic schools
• Provisions for carry-foreword of budget surpluses – there are units that do have year-end budget surpluses, and those units, smart use of carry-forward, with multi-year spending plans has management advantages
• Finding ways to get certain units more realistic budgets – some units are so under-budgeted relative to actual need that they are always in the red
• Decentralizing lapsed salaries – this is the hardest of these four areas because our budget model is not built to do that at all. It will take the most work, but it will make a big difference in how efficiently the Deans can manage their schools.

Budget Update
The Interim Provost reminded the Senate of the more transparent budget process outlined in the September Senate meeting [September minutes, p. 12]: building budgets in programs, departments, and schools and then having multiple hearings in Academic Affairs before a budget goes the President for signing in the Spring. He said he will perfect and distribute a memo with guidelines by the end of October to begin the budget process, which will give more time for the process than we have had in the past.

On the current budget, the Interim Provost addressed the requirement put on the College to spend $52,000 in teaching the US Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and Federalist Papers. The texts in this requirement are not accidental: there is a law on the books (59-29-120) specifying that each state university or college must provide instruction in these particular documents and, additionally that students must pass a test on the same in order to graduate. The law has long gone unenforced, but some legislators “have discovered it and are quite enthusiastic about it,” suggesting that we may be seeing more action on this in the future.

Nevertheless, we are, in fact, complying with the budget proviso (11.22), given that the coursework in many departments already deals with these documents. By Associate Vice President for the Academic Experience Lynne Ford’s count, the Interim Provost said, we spend about $577,000 in the fall semester alone on such instruction. Thus, we quite easily discharge the requirement.

Other Action Items in Academic Affairs
The Interim Provost noted that the definition of “graduate faculty” in the Faculty/Administration Manual has not changed in a very long time, and he has asked Dean of the Graduate School Amy McCandless and the other Deans, and will ask other faculty, to be involved in a review of this definition. The fact that a faculty member need not be a member of the graduate faculty to teach a graduate class or that we have many faculty listed as graduate faculty who have never taught a graduate class argues for the necessity of revisiting the definition for, among other things, SACS accreditation.
Additionally, the Academic Standards and Academic Planning Committees will be asked by Academic Affairs to review the requirements for the College's Dean's List, which has not been reviewed in a long time. The Interim Provost reported having some discussion on this with Student Government Association President Ryan Spraker.

Finally, the Interim Provost reported that a proposal for a Faculty Development Center developed by several administrators and faculty is being circulated and carefully considered.

**Questions / Discussion / Comments**

There were no questions.

C. The North Campus and the Bachelor of Professional Studies Program (PDF)

Godfrey Gibbison, Dean – North Campus

Dean Gibbison observed that much of his report from the floor is already contained in the document that was circulated with the agenda (see the link above).

He emphasized that the North Campus and the proposed School of Professional Studies (SPS) can augment revenue for the College while it also serves the community in ways that the college has not been doing already.

The Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) program has encountered a number of challenges.

The BPS is organized into concentrations and not majors, but employers, more familiar with the idea of a major, may not understand concentrations, per se.

Additionally there is market saturation. The North Campus is in a market already saturated by other, "loud" options, who can draw on significantly more funding for marketing then can the North Campus. "Loudness" has given these other options great prominence in an adult education market that the College had not been serving very well before the BPS.

There are also some perception problems. Dean Gibbison adduced a telling example: he spoke of meeting people who think that Charleston Southern University is a local four-year public institution and that the College of Charleston is a private four-year college.

He then turned to challenges coming from the way the BPS program is set up. While the BPS is a transfer student program, the standard GPA requirement for transfer students at the College of 2.6 may be somewhat high given the nature of the students being served by the BPS, who are not just transfer students, but returning students. Returning students, Dean Gibbison pointed out, are enthusiastic and motivated learners. He asserted that we should at least conduct research to see if the GPA requirement is detrimental to adult returning students' degree completion. The Academic Standards Committee, he suggested, might weigh in here.

Another challenge is transfer credits. The more transfer credit students are granted,
the shorter their time to degree and the lower the cost for them. Dean Gibbison also suggested that we look into our transfer credit policies.

However, what Dean Gibbison described as the biggest impediment to the North Campus is having too few programs. He said that the College needs to make a decision: are we “in or out?” Our North Campus (NC) students and others in the community who might be swayed to become students at the NC want to study a range of subjects, and not just those currently offered in the BPS. The NC would be a compelling choice if the offerings were more robust and if students were able to make multi-year plans to complete their degrees, which can only happen, he said, with a commitment to more programs and courses at the NC.

We might also have a serious conversation, Dean Gibbison asserted, about upgrading from concentrations to majors. The Curriculum Committee and the Senate could “take ownership” over developing the BPS and programs at the NC. It might also be time, he argued, to talk directly with departments who have relatively popular degrees that might be offered at the NC in evening, night, and weekend classes to a broader segment of students.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

Phil Jos, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), asked what "brand" the Dean wants the North Campus to project that might bring us success, given the kind of investments we would need to make. Also, would this brand involve distance education, in addition to traditional classroom education?

Dean Gibbison replied that that brand would have to turn on "quality." We would seek to deliver the academic rigor that may be lacking in our competitor’s offerings. Distance education has to be part of the package, too, however, in order for us to reach populations of students who may not always be able to participate in a traditional classroom-based education. Students who work for big manufacturers in the area, for instance, may work on shifts that can change from month-to-month. Or they may work in businesses that periodically require mandatory overtime. The mix of face-to-face and online modes of instruction, some research suggests, is what works well for adult returning students.

Wayne Smith, Senator - Hospitality and Tourism Management, asked Dean Gibbison to discuss the BPS in the context of the current 2+2 program that has students completing two years at Trident Tech and then coming to the College. These students face certain challenges. How do the challenges faced by BPS students compare?

Dean Gibbison responded by relating an experience he had recently at Northeastern University, where he learned that they attribute a good part of their success in the professional studies program to building strong connections with two-year colleges. Students completing an associate degree feel a sense of accomplishment, and the Professional Studies program can articulate itself directly with these two-year programs.
The situation with students at Trident Tech for two years, he argued, is not quite the same. Entering into a major like Hospitality and Tourism at the College, he said, students from Trident will often not have courses accepted for credit, and because of this their time to a four-year degree is more like five years. These students, instead, may take their credits to USC-Beaufort or the main campus in Columbia and complete their work in four years.

Dean Gibison said there's an opportunity to build a link between the BPS and two-year schools. Such a link would benefit students, and with the relationship established with Trident Tech, we could work in tandem on making sure that the curricula from the two schools line up.

**Roxanne DeLaurell**, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, pointed out that Dean Gibbison left a misimpression about the Hospitality and Tourism program at the College, which is a business degree, quite unlike the degrees at Beaufort and Columbia. Dean Gibbison affirmed the distinction between the programs that DeLaurell pointed out.

**Idee Winfield**, Senator - SHHS, noted that from the Dean's report, it sounds, she said, as if there might be a BPS with a concentration in History that would have a different curriculum than the BA in the History offered at the downtown campus.

Dean Gibbison responded by saying that what he was trying to suggest is that we might be able to deliver a BA in History at the North campus in the evenings. It would have the same requirements, but meet the needs of a different population of students.

Winfield followed up by asking about the School of Professional Studies. If a BA in History would be within the School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS), where does the SPS come in?

The Dean replied that the SPS would provide a structure and faculty resources to support the BPS. The SPS would create a "cohesive academic unit" with some faculty that can build the BPS and build majors within the BPS to meet the needs of a particular kind of student.

Winfield responded by asking how those BPS majors would be different from majors in SHHS.

Dean Gibbison replied that students entering into the BPS, since it is a degree completion program, have to meet certain stringent requirements as to age and number of credits, etc.

The SPS, Dean Gibbison added, would allow for more development of the BPS programs.

**Brian Lanahan**, Senator - School of Education, Health, and Human Performance (SEHHP), asked for clarification: "are we talking about adding concentrations to the BPS or are we talking about adding majors to the North Campus?"

Dean Gibbison replied that he would like to see two separate things occur:
1. More concentrations added to the BPS to appeal to a broader set of students

2. The offering of popular majors, such as History and Psychology, at night. These would still be HSS degrees with the same requirements as are in place now.

Jason Coy, Senator - SHHS, observed the emphasis on "faculty resources" or "personal resources" in the Dean's characterization of the SPS. This could be potentially problematic. Coy asked a series of questions: does the Dean want a budget to hire adjuncts?, a budget to employ adjuncts already working on the main campus?, money to incentivize current faculty to teach for a different audience at the North Campus?, or, he asked, was the Dean talking about faculty lines devoted to the SPS? In the case of the latter, Coy expressed grave concern: who would do the hiring and evaluating (such as in tenure and promotion processes) of such personnel and what might their relationship be to faculty not in the SPS?

Dean Gibbison responded that he is, in fact, talking about having faculty lines devoted to the SPS. He already, he said, has a budget to hire adjuncts, and some professors at the downtown campus have taught on the North Campus. We might want to add devoted faculty to the SPS. An example, he said, might be if we wanted to add a program in healthcare management. We have few people at the College right now who are credentialed to teach in such a program.

Coy replied that the scenario described would run into the problems he was talking about. Added to this, Coy expressed concern about the limited number of roster lines available on the whole. We are already in a situation, he pointed out, where roster faculty are stretched thin. Furthermore, how would tenure and promotion be handled?

Dean Gibbison replied that the Provost is not likely to support lines being allocated to the SPS unless the need and the tuition dollars to support lines have been amply demonstrated. He went on to say that the SPS would start off as a non-line school. Should it shift to a line school, the discussions around that shift during an extended transition period, he suggested, would help resolve the issues Coy raised.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, expressed interest in what Dean Gibbison said about a potential program in healthcare management and asked what the Dean envisioned being in the program.

Dean Gibbison described a few potential courses, but having not actually proposed a program at this time, suggested that he and Shaver continue their conversation online.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, expressing agreement with Coy’s position, said that the transition from a non-line to a line school raises issues as to how faculty will be evaluated and whether or not they will be held to the same standards that are now in the FAM. Those published standards represent what we judge as "quality," Krasnoff said, expressing concern with how the Dean used the word "quality" in his earlier reply to Jos. Since our "quality" is represented, Krasnoff argued, by students being taught by faculty that can meet the tenure and promotion standards, departing from
these standards in anyway as a cause for worry.

He also expressed concern that in the Dean's discussion, "quality" at times seems like it means what would bring in the most students and the most revenue. From another angle, Krasnoff said, the Dean suggested that we need to lower admission standards. Krasnoff also referred to written texts by the Dean that assert that "faculty on this campus, the main campus, use the term of 'quality' to exclude a certain population" and argue thereby "that we need to lower that standard of quality to the extent that more students would come in." Quality, Krasnoff stated, cannot be determined along the lines of what brings in the most students and the most revenue. He concluded by saying, "once we give you lines, and once we let you go outside the standards of the regular tenure and promotion process, I think we are going in a scary direction. That's the deep-down concern you are hearing in this room."

Dean Gibison replied, returning to the entrance requirements for the BPS, by asserting that it makes sense to study whether or not it is good practice to have different entry requirements for adult returning students and traditional students. The former group often includes students who might have completed their degrees when they were younger, but for the impediments of major life events that intervened and had a negative effect on their GPAs. Thus, it is worth taking the time to study different GPA requirements.

The Dean further explained that, to some extent, he feels it necessary to speak of revenue. In the September meeting of the Senate, he noted, the Interim Provost was asked directly whether or not the North campus was making money [September minutes, p. 14], leading to the impression that there is some concern about the financial viability of the unit. "When we are asked those questions, we become very conscious that we can't do anything that does not succeed financially because if we do, it will come back to haunt us." The BPS does not get the same leeway in this regard as other programs: Physics and Philosophy, he said, do not make us any money, but we teach them nonetheless for other reasons. In the end, he argued, his unit, by contrast, has to launch programs that, for better or worse, are viable in the marketplace.

The Interim Provost entered the discussion at this point to add that, with regard to the SPS, the issue at hand is limited to moving from calling the North Campus “the North Campus” (where the BPS and certain other classes are taught) to a School of Professional Studies with the BPS located at the North Campus.

The President and the administration, the Interim Provost assured, are not at this time considering launching the SPS as line school. Any such move would take some time and would be thoroughly vetted by the faculty. Furthermore, any changes to curricular programs at the North Campus will have to come through the committee structure and the Faculty Senate and, thereby, be thoroughly vetted by the faculty.

Roxanne DeLaurell, Senator - Accounting and Legal Studies, asked if the Senate is being asked to sanction an SPS as a non-line school and whether or not there was to be a vote at the meeting to that effect.
Dean Gibbon asked the Interim Provost to take the question.

The Interim Provost replied that all that is before the Senate is a transition from saying the North Campus houses the Bachelor of Professional Studies to saying the BPS is a program, like all others, housed in a school and supervised by a dean. This is, he pointed out, a far narrower territory than the range of issues Dean Gibbons has raised. The Dean, he stressed, was giving an informational report for the purposes of discussion. There is no vote.

There were no further questions.

D. Campus Climate Survey Update  (PPT)

Hollis France, Political Science, presented information on the survey on behalf of the Diversity Climate Study Committee (DCSC), of which she is a member. She noted that some information on the survey has already gone out in emails from the Interim Provost and from Associate Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning Jim Posey, who sent the executive summary of the results.

[France presented slides (linked to above) and discussed them: information below is in addition to that which is already provided in the slides or which represents significant elaboration on the content of the slides.

In the slides, Rankin = Sue Rankin of Rankin & Associates Consulting; DCSC = Diversity Climate Study Committee; Executive Team = the President and his staff]

France added a date to those presented in the first slide. Town Hall meetings open to the campus are scheduled for Friday, October 10, 10:00-11:30 and 1:00-2:30 in the Stern Student Center Ballroom. Sue Rankin will be there to present the results of the survey.

Open community forums to develop action initiatives will be run by DCSC committee members. The action items will aim to insure that our campus is an “welcoming, safe, and inclusive space.” France emphasized the need for participants to read and think about the survey results and come prepared with action items. The forums are designed with that end in mind. Locations are to be determined.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

Scott Peeples, Senator – HSS, asked for a clarification: do the community forums all have the same agenda?

France replied in the affirmative and noted that having the forums at many different times and dates is designed to maximize opportunities for input.

There were no further questions.

5. Old Business
None

6. New Business

A. Faculty Curriculum Committee (webpage)

[All proposals involving only courses (new/changed/deactivated) or changes to programs will be voted on as a single group, unless a Senator wishes to isolate a specific proposal for discussion and a separate vote. If they wish to do so, Senators should contact the Faculty Speaker or the Faculty Secretary in advance if possible, but this action can also be done on the floor of the Senate.]

Steve Jaumé, Department of Geology, represented the Faculty Curriculum Committee (FCC) and offered to take questions.

The Speaker explained, as the italicized passage above from the agenda indicates, that any of the proposals could be separated from the group for separate discussion and consideration and voting, and he asked if anyone would like to do so. There were no requests to do so.

The Speaker then asked for unanimous consent to approve the entire set of proposals, and without objection, all proposals below were approved.

1. African Studies Minor: Changes to the Minor (PDF)
2. Teacher Education
   a) Concentration Changes
      1. Early Childhood Education (PDF)
      2. Elementary Education (PDF)
   b) Course Changes (PDF for all courses)
      1. EDEE 327: Learner Development and the Context of Learning
      2. EDFS 303: Human Growth and Education Process
   c) New Courses (PDF for all courses)
      1. EDFS 200 – Special Topics in Education
      2. EDFS 300 – Special Topics in Education

B. General Education Committee (webpage)

Karen Smail, Chair of the General Education Committee (GEC), introduced the slate of courses proposed for general education status, noting that these particular courses were approved by the GEC last spring, but not in time to have them approved by the Faculty Senate last year.

Following the same arrangement as with the FCC proposals, the Speaker asked for unanimous consent to approve the entire set of proposals, and without objection, all proposals below were approved.

1. Motion to Approve for General Education Status (PDF)
a) Social Science ([PDF for all courses](#))

1. URST 320: Town and County Planning
2. URST 360: Land Use Law
3. URST 399: Special Topics

b) Humanities: URST 398 - Special Topics ([PDF](#))

C. Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual ([webpage](#))

1. Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Manual to add Adjunct Representation to the Faculty Welfare Committee, Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, and the Faculty Compensation Committee ([PDF](#) | [Word](#))
2. Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Bylaws to add Adjunct Representation to the Faculty Senate ([PDF](#) | [Word](#))

The Speaker explained that as proposed changes to the FAM, the motions require a 2/3 majority vote to pass. Parliamentarian George Pothering noted for the record that, while it was not the case prior to an by-laws amendment two years ago, motions from the Committee on By-Laws and Faculty/Administration Manual (BLFAM) can be voted on in the same meeting in which they are presented. The Speaker added one more note on the history of these motions. They were presented by the Faculty Welfare Committee last year [see December 2013 minutes, p. 12] and moved to BLFAM for further vetting and to work out the particular language.

Rick Heldrich, Chair of BLFAM and Senator - School of Science and Math (SSM), introduced the motions, explaining that the separation of committee and Senate representation made good sense to the committee, given that they seem to raise separate issues. He offered to answer questions about either of the motions and/or the committee's deliberations.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

**Daniel Delgado**, Senator - Hispanic Studies, asked if adjunct faculty representatives are not typically compensated for participation in faculty governance.

Heldrich replied that the committee discussed this, but discovered that adjuncts cannot be compensated for such service at the College because it raises health insurance issues related to salary.

**Irina Gigova**, Senator – SHHS, asked about how, pursuant to motion 2, adjunct Senators would be elected to the Senate.

Heldrich replied that the committee had much discussion about representation. The committee concluded that there was no way to guarantee representation of discipline and, similarly, thought it would be hard to account for representation along the lines of “service” (part-time vs. full-time). The committee also rejected the idea of having adjunct representatives for each school since that might increase the level of votes
dedicated to adjuncts to a level that some might feel is too high.

The committee went with the fixed number of Senators, with a proviso that they have to come from at least two different schools and at the least three different departments.

**Simon Lewis**, Department of English, placed the motions in the wider context of the “national scandal” of how contingent or adjunct faculty are treated around the country. While the problems at the College are not as acute as elsewhere, a third of our courses are taught by adjunct faculty, around half of introductory courses are taught by adjuncts, and “those faculty have no representation whatsoever.” While the motions appear complicated, he said, they are simple and begin to address the problem.

Adjunct Senators will represent adjunct concerns, not their departments or their schools. Likewise, on key committees (the Advisory Committee to the President, Faculty Welfare, and Compensation), they will represent adjunct concerns.

A survey conducted in 2011 (it has taken a long time to get these motions to the Senate) revealed how dedicated are the adjunct faculty to the College, and yet they also felt very undervalued by the College. These motions are a way to show that their voice matters. He urged the Senate to pass the motions.

**Jason Coy**, Senator – SHHS, thought splitting the motions was a good idea. While he supports the first motion (committee representation), as the committees named do work that concerns adjuncts, he said he does not support the second motion (Senate representation). If it is OK for adjuncts to be in the Senate and deal with all the issues before the Senate, including T&P, he argued, then why not have them on all committees? The first motion makes a sensible distinction that limits adjunct representation to a few select committees, and this is undermined by the second motion, as the Senate takes on all issues.

**Julia Eichelberger**, Senator – SHHS, urged voting in favor of both motions. She agreed with Coy that the committees in the first motion are committees particularly significant to adjuncts, but she said that it is realistic and practical to have a few adjuncts serving on those committees and a few serving in the Senate. At this time, if all committees were open to adjunct service, she speculated, it might be hard to find enough adjuncts willing to serve. The limited number of committee slots seems appropriate at this time, as we are just beginning to include adjunct representation at this time. We can also, she suggested, if it makes sense in a few years' time, add adjuncts to other committees. This is a “reasonable gesture” at this point, and there is no reason for concern about undue influence of a few adjunct votes. But it matters that we hear their voice on committees and in the Senate.

**Kathleen Janech**, Adjunct Instructor in Biology, noting that she has served as an adjunct for the past nine years, offered thanks for the efforts of those who have worked on the issue of adjunct representation over the past few years and for the Senate’s consideration of the motions. She urged Senators to vote for both motions.
Adjuncts are often thought of as temporary employees who teach their classes and then vanish, she said, but there are many adjuncts who work full time and are very deeply invested in the College. These adjuncts would very much appreciate having a voice in how things are run, as this bears directly on their lives.

The **Interim Provost** asked Senators, however they may vote, to take into careful consideration as they deliberate that adjunct faculty are now the only employee group on campus that does not have an “official mechanism of any sort for being reached out to or for engaging in outreach of their own.”

The **Speaker**, asked that, given that the motions are separate, that discussion at this point be confined if possible to the subject of the first motion: adjunct committee representation.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator – Philosophy, stated that he agrees with Coy’s point and supports the first motion, as it does provide a voice. A lot of what the Senate and committees do boils down to voice, he said, since we do not have, in many cases, any legislative power. The first motion provides voice on relevant committees for adjuncts.

*** The question was called, seconded, and passed.

The first motion, “Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Manual to add Adjunct Representation to the Faculty Welfare Committee, Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, and the Faculty Compensation Committee,” **passed on a unanimous voice vote**.

---

Discussion now turned to the second motion, “Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Bylaws to add Adjunct Representation to the Faculty Senate.”

---

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator – Philosophy, pointed out two functions of the Senate. It serves as an advisory body that deliberates and may send a message to the institution, which may or may not be taken up. But the Senate is also, to a small extent, a legislative body, with control over parts of the FAM, curriculum, and, presumably, tenure and promotion standards. But “are we committed to adjuncts deciding things?” The first motion “suggests not,” Krasnoff asserted, because we are not also asking adjuncts to sit on other committees. We might ask why adjuncts should decide on curriculum if they do not also serve on the curriculum committee, or general education, if they are not on that committee, and so forth.

Perhaps, he suggested, the impetus for the motion is to make a gesture showing that adjunct’s opinions are valued. But could this not be accomplished, Krasnoff asked, by having three adjuncts serve as non-voting members of the Senate. They would be present and their voice singled out. There needs to be an argument, he stated, for why the representation needs to include voting, since many salutary effects can be secured
simply through non-voting representation.

Scott Peeples, Senator – HSS, replied that adjuncts already have a kind of non-voting representation as guests of the Senate, just as anyone can come to the Senate and speak without voting. “Being a non-voting member of the Senate,” he said, “is pretty much the same as not being a member of the Senate at all.”

Not so, Krasnoff countered, as they would be elected. “Elected to basically be guests,” Peeples replied. Krasnoff replied that the position would entail a responsibility to attend all Senate meetings. Even, so, Peeples responded, the privileges of a non-voting member of the Senate are the same as that of a non-member of the Senate. The only meaningful Senate membership, he asserted, is a voting membership.

Peeples added that it is hard to distinguish precisely what business the Senate votes on that would not be of concern to adjunct faculty. They are involved in delivering the curriculum, so curriculum is of concern to them. From a different angle, Senators may not teach in departments on whose curriculum they vote. The distinctions between adjunct faculty and roster faculty, thus, begin to blur. Peeples argued that he thinks adjuncts have “as much right as anyone” to vote on issues in the Senate.

Iana Anguelova, Senator – SSM, seconded Krasnoff’s concern. She adduced the Senate’s lengthy consideration earlier in the meeting about line versus non-line schools as an example of something that would not concern adjuncts. She asserted that only a small part of curriculum development would be of concern to adjuncts. The same, she argued, is true for tenure and promotion. Most of what the Senate has power over, she said, is not of concern to adjuncts. She went further, saying that even a non-voting Senate seat doesn’t make sense because, as she put it, “why would an adjunct sit here for two hours?”

Scooter Barnette, Senior Instructor – Health and Human Performance, voiced her support for the motion, adding that adjunct instructors are some of the best instructors in the College. Granting them a voice and vote is the least we can do.

Jason Coy, Senator – SHHS, said that a very good list has emerged in the discussion of things adjuncts would not be concerned with or would not be qualified to vote on. Tenure and promotion is an example. In the Senate, he noted, we had a T & P issue a few years ago that ended up in a vote of no confidence in the President. This had nothing to do with adjuncts.

He further expressed concern that not supporting the motion might be misconstrued as disregard for the contributions adjuncts make to the College.

Coy argued that the committee assignments voted on in the first motion were chosen for a very specific reason: “to exclude adjuncts from decisions that they shouldn’t have a say in.” He asked if it was ever discussed if adjuncts should be on the Tenure and Promotion committee.
Simon Lewis, Department of English and former member of the Faculty Welfare Committee, said that in drafting the first motion, there was never an argument about exclusion. Rather, given that adjuncts are already overtaxed, the plan was to give them representation where it would matter most – in the Senate and in specifically targeted committees. It was never a question of excluding the other committees. In fact, Senate seats allow them to weigh in on the work of those committees on which they are not seated.

As to T & P discussion and the vote of no confidence mentioned earlier, Lewis stated that not very many members of the Senate had read the documents in the tenure and promotion case with which these were concerned, but we voted on the resolution of no confidence, nonetheless. Adjuncts would have been no less well-equipped, Lewis asserted, to render such a decision than most Senators.

Coy replied that we vet T & P language in the Senate, as well, and therein might lie a difference.

Nevertheless, Lewis replied, adjuncts are invested even in such issues as T & P language because these issues bear on the nature and values of the College, to which they are strongly committed.

Julia Eichelberger, Senator – SHHS, pointed out that the American Association of University Professors, among many other organizations, holds it as a best practice to have adjunct faculty participate in the full range of academic duties. A “healthy institution,” she said, does this. Exclusion of adjuncts from the Senate is not, on the other hand, a best practice.

Nor did she find compelling the argument that adjuncts shouldn’t be voting members of the Senate because there are matters with which they do not have direct experience. “They are part of this academic institution. They contribute to our common work.”

Evan Parry, Senator - Theatre and Dance, expressed full support for the motion and suggested that many of us, as roster faculty, might have lost track of concerns adjunct faculty have, particularly in approving General Education courses.

He also said that it is important not to devalue or trivialize the gesture in the motion.

Kathleen Janech, Adjunct Instructor in Biology, said that, while she understands the argument being made against the motion along the lines of certain areas of Senate concern being outside the interest of adjuncts, she distinctly disagrees. While adjuncts will not come up for tenure, matters of promotion policies are of significant interest to them.

Tom Kunkle, Senator – SSM, asserted that there is no reason to fear three adjunct Senators as a cabal. The relative power of their vote would be small.
Ryan Spraker, President of the Student Government Association, said he finds it interesting that the group that makes up 30%+ of faculty at the College are not represented. As to the idea that adjuncts would be voting on items that don’t concern them directly, it is the job of representatives, at times to do so. Spraker adduced an example here of Seniors voting in the SGA Senate on meal plans. Voting on issues that do not directly concern you is a matter of making sure our college works, he said.

Margaret Cormack, Senator - Religious Studies, replied to Kunkle's remark by noting that three votes could be very meaningful. Her recollection, she said, was that in the last General Education reform, a majority was secured with only one or two votes.

Tim Johnson, Senator - Classics, noted that a vote is a central characteristic of a democratic system. Adjuncts are excluded from voting, even though they account for 30% of our courses, they have a symbiotic relationship to the College, and their welfare is affected by everything we decide. The motion is not an empty gesture. Rather, it is important to include perspectives that matter in our decision-making. He used his own faculty as an example. Adjuncts in Classics are not only shouldering much of the teaching load, but they bring in perspectives from other schools at which they have taught and seen legislation conducted. There is no risk of competency here.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator – Philosophy, reiterated a prior point he made: to a large extent, the Senate only has voice. One could say that without a vote, there is no voice, but if that were true, he argued, then we would have to say that in about two-thirds of what we do in the Senate, we have no voice. There is a narrow slice of things the Senate has a vote on, such as matters of curriculum and new majors. “It may seem exclusionary,” he said, “but the idea of faculty control is that we want decisions made by the people who have passed through the various tests of quality that are defined by the tenure and promotion process.”

Krasnoff moved to amend the motion as follows. In the section labeled “MOTION 1c: To change Article IV, Section 2, A,”

“and 3 Adjunct Faculty Senators with voting privileges.”

would be changed to

“and 3 Adjunct Faculty Senators without voting privileges.”

Krasnoff’s motion was seconded.

---

Discussion now turned to Krasnoff’s motion to amend the “Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Bylaws to add Adjunct Representation to the Faculty Senate.”

---

Iana Anguelova, Senator – Mathematics, said that the amendment is a good one because it keeps the gesture intact. She also argued that, while she values the work of adjuncts, unlike full-time faculty, whose loyalty is to the College, adjuncts may be
working at more places than just the College. There may be a problem, therefore, with competing interests, in which case, it might be peculiar for them to have voting privileges.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, stated that the amendment allows us to have a vote that does not contaminate the vote on the motion itself and does not risk losing the two-thirds majority on the basis of peoples’ feelings on this particular issue.

He argued against the amendment, saying that he thinks there are things that we vote on that do, in fact, really matter to adjuncts in “a way that has not been considered yet.” As an example, he raised the possibility that adjunct budgets might be at stake in a future Senate vote over the SPS becoming a line school if funding the school means further stretching our existing budget. Adjuncts might want to vote on this, and there are many other cases one can imagine, he asserted, in which adjuncts would be directly vested in a Senate vote.

Scott Peeples, Senator – HSS, spoke against the amendment and in favor of the main motion. He asserted that, according to the FAM, instructors, which he took to also mean “visiting instructors,” are allowed to serve in the Senate. Why, he asked, would we enfranchise such instructors, but not adjuncts?

Beverly Diamond, Associate Provost, clarified that the term “instructor” has a very specific meaning in the FAM. It means a person hired into a position that can lead to promotion to senior instructor position, and who is subject to third-year review and comes up for promotion but cannot stay as an instructor if the promotion to senior instructor is not earned.

Daniel Delgado, Senator - Hispanic Studies, noted the wide array of positions and ranks of faculty in the Senate: Senior Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor. He asserted that adjunct faculty should also be included.

Rick Heldrich, speaking not as Chair of the Committee bringing the motion, but as Senator – SSM, said he favors the amendment to the motion. The nature of adjuncts varies from department to department. In his department, Chemistry, he pointed out that adjuncts are never invited to department meetings. While they are qualified to teach, they are not, he said, qualified to vote on curriculum matters. There may be something of a disconnection if a department does not allow adjuncts to vote on curriculum, but they can in the Senate.

Heldrich argued that, while he values adjuncts and their work, the motion is “an attempt to put a bandaid on a problem that makes us all feel bad, but it doesn't solve the problem: the bleeding doesn’t stop. The adjuncts are still not getting paid anything.”

Simon Lewis, Department of English, encouraged the Senate to vote against the
amendment because without the voting privilege the motion is pointless.

Evan Parry, Senator – Theatre and Dance, added that perhaps if adjuncts are members of the Senate we can begin to address some of the endemic problems they face.

---

There was no further discussion, and a vote on the amendment to the motion failed.

---

There was no further discussion on the main motion: “Motion to Change Faculty and Administration Bylaws to add Adjunct Representation to the Faculty Senate.”

A vote was taken and passed by a show of hands, 25 “yes” to 10 “no.”

D. RESOLUTION to support Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 and call upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and appeal for the SC Legislature to create a position within the Board of Trustees to be held by the President of the Student Government Association. (PDF | Word)

Joe Carson, Senator – School of Science and Mathematics, introduced the motion, noting that it is in support of a resolution passed unanimously last April by the SGA Senate and that was penned by Zachery Sturman, SGA Senator, a student in attendance at the Senate meeting.

The resolution does not specify the nature of the position, voting or non-voting, and so forth, but it does ask that students be given a place at the table and allowed to voice their opinions to the Board of Trustees (BOT). It helps ensure a dialog between the BOT and students and would foster transparency. The majority of schools in the US, he said, have students on their governing boards: the College is an “outlier.” No compelling arguments have been made against having a student on the BOT at the College, he asserted. While the Senate has no power to create such a position, it is important that the Senate support the students when they demonstrate that an issue is important to them, as they have through their unanimous vote on their resolution.

Carson, with unanimous consent of the body, amended the resolution. He explained that the last “whereas” statement turns out to be factually incorrect. It claims that the composition of the BOT can “only be modified by legislative action.” However, Carson said, a South Carolina statute exists that says in specific situations the BOT has the power to amend their own by-laws and may create a “non-voting” member, which seat will be filled by the president of the student body. Since the last “whereas” statement may be inaccurate, his amendment struck it entirely.

The amendment also included two modifications to the “resolved” section of the resolution to bring it in line with state statute described above.

1. Adding “if necessary” after “calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support and”
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2. Changing “President of the Student Government Association” to “student body president.”

The resolution, at this point, read as follows:

**Resolution to Support Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014 and Call upon the Board of Trustees to Publicly Support and Appeal for the SC Legislature to Create a Position within the Board of Trustees to be held by the President of the Student Government Association**

WHEREAS, on April 8, 2014, the Student Government Association unanimously passed SR-10-2014, calling for a position to be created within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the President of the Student Government Association;

WHEREAS, according to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, “more than 70 percent of public institution boards include one or more students”;

WHEREAS, the inclusion of a representative of the student body as a part of the final authority and governance of the College of Charleston is a logically tenable way to better satisfy the goals set forth by the respective governing documents of the Student Government Association and the Board of Trustees;

WHEREAS, the inclusion of the Student Government Association President as an official member of the Board would help ensure mutual respect between Undergraduate students and the Board of Trustees;

THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the College of Charleston supports the unanimously passed Student Government Resolution SR-10-2014, and calls upon the Board of Trustees to publicly support, and if necessary, appeal for the Legislature of the State of South Carolina to create a position within the Board of Trustees of the College of Charleston to be held by the student body president.

The Parliamentarian offered some guidance for the discussion and vote on the resolution. This should begin with the “resolved” clauses. If there are any amendments, then they should be made to these statements first. After that point changes could be made to the “whereas” statements. Then there should be a discussion of the whole document and a vote on it.

Phil Jos, Senator – SHHS, asked if the ambiguity implied by “a position” is intentional, with the details of the nature of the position to be worked out later, in another venue. Carson replied that the student resolution (SR-10-2014) does not refer to voting or non-voting membership. That decision would be separate from the Senate resolution at hand.
**Rick Heldrich**, Senator – SSM, asserted that the matter of voting or non-voting membership has to be decided for the Senate resolution, given the lengthy discussion the Senate just had on this distinction with regard to adjunct representation in the Senate. The faculty has no vote on BOT. Why would we have a student position with a vote, when there is no such position for the faculty?

**Lance Foxworth**, SGA Senator, stated that the intent of the resolution is to support the students' case for having a member on the BOT, voting or not. The Faculty Senate might make their own resolution for a voting membership on the BOT. The BOT is the governing body of the College and should have representation from all groups. He urged the Senate to adopt the resolution.

**Larry Krasnoff**, Senator – Philosophy, noted that the faculty does have representation on the BOT through the Speaker of the Faculty, though this is a non-voting representation. He said that the Senate should support the resolution. Finally, he added that he was surprised that those who in the prior matter were so insistent that representation without a vote is meaningless were now “very quiet.”

**Matt Rabon**, Senior in Philosophy and representing Fight for CofC, noted that he as an individual and Fight for CofC as a group are deeply conflicted about the resolution. While they fully support having students and faculty in a voting capacity in the BOT, they worry about the student representative being filled by the President of the SGA, which might politicize that position too much. Rabon also expressed concern that voting on the resolution might give the Senate the impression that it has “discharged responsibility with regard to what happened last year.” The resolution speaks of a loss of trust in the BOT, but Rabon suggested that the cause of the mistrust be named: the Presidential search last year. The symbolic action of having a student on the BOT will not alone, he asserted, remedy the trust problem. He urged the Senate to either strengthen the resolution through amendments or to vote it down.

**Ryan Spraker**, SGA President, also expressed reservations about the Senate resolution and the SGA resolution passed last year. There are requirements to be a Trustee that are perhaps not being acknowledged. Notably, Trustees are appointed by the state. While there may be some flexibility in the law, as pointed out in the amendments, state action of some sort would be required to add a student representative to the BOT.

Also, he observed, the resolution is only a statement: it has no force.

The Speaker of the Faculty and the SGA President attend BOT meetings but are not allowed in executive sessions, which is where far-reaching decisions are made.

He urged that the Senate pass the resolution, but coupled with more investigation into the issue and also pushing for a faculty vote on the BOT.

**Zachery Sturman**, SGA Senator and author of the SGA resolution, thanked Carson for bringing the resolution on the table to the Senate and thanked the Senate for
considering it. Sturman noted that when the BOT went into executive session last year and decided therein on the next President, the students had no seat at the table. A full membership in the BOT would mean a membership that would include attending and voting in executive sessions.

More than 70% of schools, he asserted, now have students on trustee boards. Having the SGA President serve as the representative on the board is standard practice. Furthermore, the South Carolina Code of Laws specifies that such a position would be held by the student body’s president.

He disagreed, he said, with the argument that the resolution doesn’t get at the heart of the problem. The SGA resolution, on the contrary, he argued, is the only thing substantive that deals with what happened last year. We would have a little more comfort, he said, with a student there representing students’ interest.

Iana Anguelova, Senator – SSM, moved that discussion be postponed until the November meeting. The motion was seconded.

The Parliamentarian noted that the motion to postpone is debatable and requires a 2/3 majority vote.

Jason Coy, Senator – SHHS, pointed out that the remaining Senators may not comprise a quorum.

---

There was no discussion of the motion to postpone. A voice vote was taken and it passed.

The resolution will be on the November meeting agenda under “Old Business.”

6. Constituents’ Concerns
   None expressed.

7. Adjournment: 7:21 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Michael Duvall
Faculty Secretary
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on 9 September 2014

The Faculty Senate met for a regular meeting Tuesday 9 September 2014 at 5 P.M. in Wells Fargo Auditorium (Beatty Center 115).

1. Call to Order: 5:04 PM

2. Announcements

   Speaker Todd McNerney introduced himself, and reminded the body of the standing rules for the Senate: all are welcome to attend, and all are welcome to speak, and those who speak should identify themselves and their affiliations before doing so. The speaker also introduced George Pothering (Computer Science), who will continue to serve as Parliamentarian; Mike Duvall (English), who will continue to serve as Faculty Secretary; and Ana Gilpatrick (Academic Affairs), who is serving as a temporary Faculty Secretariat until we hire a replacement for former Secretariat Heather Alexander, who has left the post for graduate school.

   The Speaker asked the body for unanimous consent to alter the order of the agenda in order to allow President Glenn McConnell more time to speak before departing to attend an important foundation event. With no objections raised, the Speaker moved the President's and Provost's reports ahead of the Speaker's report.

3. 1 April 2014 regular meeting minutes were approved as posted.

4. Reports

   A. The President (Outline PDF | Evolution of College Mission Statement - Documents PDF)

   The President thanked the Senate for the courtesy of changing the order of reports and welcomed the faculty back from the summer break.

   **Academic Freedom**

   The President reported on meeting with a group of faculty that included some in the audience, current Speaker McNerney, and former Speaker Lynn Cherry to discuss academic freedom. He said the he wants to “reaffirm” his “commit[ment] to the principle of academic freedom.” Faculty will continue to select their own texts and decide how to teach them. “Faculty at this college,” he added, “have been guaranteed academic freedom for as long as there has been a Faculty/Administration Manual. As the President and as a new member of this faculty, I share your beliefs about academic freedom, and I am committed to preserving this freedom.”

   **Men's Basketball Program**

   The President noted that Earl Grant has been hired as the new head coach for the men's basketball program. Grant, whose credentials include five years as an assistant coach at Clemson University, the President said, will usher in a new era of excellence, teamwork, and success. Moreover, the President said, that academics and character are very important to Coach Grant, who will, the President stressed, “make the school
proud, bring excitement, and, eventually, a full house to the TD Arena.”

The President also expressed pride in the basketball players, who “showed tremendous resilience, and strength under very challenging circumstances” during the last two and a half months. “They composed themselves like gentlemen and represented the College with class.”

Finally, the President thanked the search committee for their dedication and sacrifice in selecting the right person for the job.

**Interim Provost**

Soon after the announcement of former Provost George Hynd’s departure to take the position of President of Oakland University, President McConnell began meeting with faculty to identify characteristics they would be looking for in an interim or permanent Provost. These faculty also identified action items to be immediately adopted by a new Provost. As a result of these discussions, the President identified whom he thought was the “best person for the job” and who could carry the action items out. On August 13th, he named Brian McGee Interim Provost and Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs. The President thanked Interim Provost McGee for taking the job.

The Interim Provost, the President said, by virtue of his prior positions, including Chair of the Department of Communication and Chief of Staff and Senior Vice President for Executive Administration, knows the College and its history very well, and having come up through the academic ranks, the Interim Provost is “one of you,” the President added, and is an asset to the administration, the campus, and the faculty.

The Interim Provost is at present, among other things, working with the administration to create a more transparent budget process.

The President said that McGee will serve as Interim Provost for the entire academic year, allowing continuity for faculty going through the tenure and promotion process. A search for a new Provost will begin after the conclusion of the search for the Executive Vice President of Student Affairs (EVPSA). The President expressed his appreciation for Jeri Cabot’s having served as Interim EVPSA over the last year.

The President will lay out a process for the hiring of a new Provost at the end of the fall semester. He invited comments, in the meantime, on the desirable qualities and characteristics for the next Provost.

**Vision for the College**

“My vision for the College,” the President said, “is that we will remain a premier liberal arts and sciences institution, marked by a deep commitment to serving undergraduate students. At the same time, the College houses a research university which will supply a growing number of graduate and research programs, including, eventually, targeted doctoral programs that will meet the needs of our community and state.”

This vision will be realized via

1. affordability, accessibility, and diversity
2. the University of Charleston
Affordability, Accessibility, and Diversity

These three items are intertwined. “You cannot have one without the other two: we must be more affordable before we can be more accessible, and vice versa, and we must be both affordable and accessible before we can be more diverse.” The President stressed that he wants “to make sure that we are providing opportunities for students from underrepresented populations or with low socioeconomic status to enter through our gates and have the chance to change the trajectory of their lives.”

We are going to have to offer more and bigger scholarships, which is why scholarships are a “top priority for our comprehensive campaign.” High-achieving students who want to come here often do not because they can get more generous scholarships elsewhere. Many students from disadvantaged backgrounds, he said, would also consider the College if we were more affordable. “There must be more scholarship opportunities for them, too.” Our comprehensive plan will address this.

We will also be looking for other ways to lower our cost to students, he added.

Regarding diversity, the President emphasized that “our administration will treat all people with dignity and respect and ensure that our campus is a safe and welcoming environment for all. That is who we have been at the College, and we don’t expect that to change. As a matter of fact, we are going to reinforce that.”

Steps we will take to increase diversity include recruiting more high school guidance counselors, particularly in areas where we have no representation, to recommend the College to their students, bringing counselors to the campus so that they can see it firsthand and meet our faculty and staff and bring that experience back to students who, he said, “would never have previously considered us as a viable option.”

We will follow this up, the President said, with the involvement of our African American alumni caucus, whom he praised for their “leadership and talent.” With “logistical support,” they can “engage with prospective students who come to this campus for tours.” We need to develop opportunities for members of the caucus to meet with and “develop a rapport” with prospective students in order to share with them their own experiences and why the College would be a good choice for them.

The President said that we will also “champion the SPECTRA program,” which serves to transition students into the College. “It is essential to our diversity efforts,” he stressed, by lessening the “culture shock” these students might feel and connecting the students, such that they “band together to encourage one another to succeed and to graduate.” They then become “ambassadors” for the College. The President praised “the camaraderie” among SPECTRA students and “how they cheer one another on.” “Everyone at the College can be proud about” the SPECTRA program, a “great success,” which he would like to see continue and grow.

The College will also collaborate with Francis Marion University (FMU). “I think the future of higher education is collaboration, not in competition and duplication.” Thus, if FMU comes to the Lowcountry, the President said he is “confident we will find many ways to help one another and better serve the people of the state.”

Finally, as concerns diversity, the President pointed to what “we are calling the ‘10%
pilot program,” which, he noted, was reported in the Post and Courier on August 26. The President hopes for faculty support in developing the program, which will include Charleston, Berkeley, Dorchester, and up to three or four other counties. The program will admit any applicants in top 10% of their high school graduating class. “We’re out for the high-achieving students,” who “may not perform well on the standardized tests but... have grades to prove they know how to apply themselves to achieve and to succeed.” The program will require the support of resources and tutoring in order to ensure that students succeed. The program will “open doors to schools from which we have rarely received a student.” A thorough assessment of the pilot program will reveal whether it is successful and whether we can expand it to other counties and, perhaps, to the whole state. The President reported “very positive feedback” on the program from both members of the campus and the Charleston community. The goal, he said, is “to remain an excellent liberal arts and sciences institution,” and, he pledged, “we can both be a premier liberal arts and sciences institution and, at the same time, meet the needs of this community and of the students” that this pilot program would bring to the College.

The President said he expects “there will be other ideas” to increase diversity, and “the best ideas may frequently come from right here in the Senate and from the faculty.”

**University of Charleston**

The President described the “main part of [his] vision” as “perserv[ing] our excellence in undergraduate teaching while offering advanced studies that meet the needs of our community. Our new ability to offer doctoral programs becomes the College’s insurance program that it will remain the College of Charleston with the University of Charleston, not the College at the university.” He added, “we are the only place I know of in America where the university is at the college; the college is not at the university.” This is a specific legal arrangement in the State of South Carolina, and it “allows us to thread the eye of the needle in this regard.”

The President reminded the Senate that the faculty received an email from him on July 23 and again on August 25 that announced the new and revised mission statement for the College approved by the Board of Trustees. Documents posted on the Senate website prior to the meeting, he also noted, show the evolution of the College’s mission statement since 1994. The new mission statement, he reported, “has been the vehicle by which we sought approval from South Carolina Commission on Higher Education [CHE] for the University of Charleston, South Carolina [UCSC] to offer targeted doctoral degrees.” The Academic Affairs Committee of CHE approved unanimously the new mission statement on August 26. The full CHE voted in favor of the mission statement on September 4.

UCSC can now offer doctoral degrees approved by our faculty, SACS, and CHE. “However,” he added, “I still plan to work with members of the General Assembly [GA] to pass legislation next year that will permit us to offer the targeted doctoral degrees,” which may, he noted, seem unnecessary, since the CHE has spoken, yet the President added that he has “some Constitutional concerns about the delegation of authority to CHE from the [GA], and under the Constitutional setup, the [GA] has plenary power, and as a result,” he said, “I don’t need a trial lawyer a few years up the road in a lawsuit
raising the issue of whether or not we are able to do what we’re doing.” Going down “both paths,” then, will assure there is “no confusion or roadblock” to the College’s “constructing its balanced future. I want to be very clear: the College solidifying its control of its own destiny to avoid consequences from those who may know little about us or who may not be as focused [on] our greatness, as we are. We still decide who we are, who we want to be, and how we’re going to get there. It’s as plain and simple as that.”

The President added that UCSC “will never be a Clemson or a Carolina or any other comprehensive university: it will be an enterprise of the College; it is a component of the College, and it will be very targeted and very focused.”

Currently the talk about UCSC doctoral degrees centers on Computer Science, Information Management, and Supply Chain Management and Logistics, but, the President emphasized, no programs will go forward without extensive discussion and proper vetting at all levels, and the discussion needs to start with the faculty. It must also “continue across our entire campus, our community, and our interested business stakeholders.”

The President reiterated that the College’s new, CHE-approved mission statement “does not change our undergraduate name, our academic courses, or our staffing,” nor does the new mission statement “mean that we will be offering the doctoral degrees in the near future.” He likened our “new status” to a “permission slip to explore new opportunities and to go where we collectively want to go and need to go.”

As a result of our new status, “merger is a moot question.”

The President reported on a meeting with MUSC in August that produced an agreement that the two schools set up a “collaboration council to identify ways that our two schools can work together to move our community forward.” Collaborating, we will be “better stewards of state money and show the [GA] we do not need them to legislate our future.”

The President also reported on a meeting between members of the College’s faculty and the Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce. He described it as an “uplifting experience with dialogue that was constructive and informative for all parties.” He expressed hope that the meetings would continue. He shared what he called “the best takeaway from the meeting”: a direct quotation from an employer who said, “when I’m hiring employees in Computer Science and they have a degree in English, it enriches my attraction to them.” Liberal arts degrees attract the attention of employers, who value applicants with those degrees more highly. This is “a message,” the President said, “we asked the business community to send back to their membership and to talk about why we are relevant to the business community and to Charleston and why our degrees are a great asset.” This, he said, was an “great affirmation that here at the College of Charleston we holistically educate people, and we prepare them for careers in a very complex and global environment.” It is a message he asks that the business community repeat often, and that we stay in a “continuing dialogue” with them in order for us to “stay connected” and that they “understand what a wonderful thing the College of Charleston is in this community.”
The President stressed that any new doctoral programs would require new funding, which will include “very significant private contributions from businesses and others.” “We will not,” he emphasized, “offer doctoral degrees without the requisite funding earmarked for those programs. I will not pull resources from our undergraduate mission. Remember, our goal is to secure the future of the College. It is not to weaken it.”

**Shared Governance and Transparency**

“This administration,” the President said, “will be one of collaboration, shared governance, and transparency. We will welcome constructive criticism and creative solutions. We are a stronger College of Charleston when all of us engage with one another, try to learn from one another, and support this institution and one another in moving this institution forward.” He asserted that he is “about building consensus with faculty, the Faculty Senate, and this community.”

He said that he hopes an example of this collaborative governance can be found in his treatment of the proposal for the School of Professional Studies, which he is putting through the proper vetting process, and which, he noted, the Provost will touch on in his remarks. The President is “not against it,” he added, “but before things go forward,” the faculty needs to be included in the process.

**Faculty Compensation**

The President announced a recommendation that there be increases in the raises awarded with tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor (from $5,000 to $5,500) and from Associate Professor to Professor (from $6,000 to $6,500). The Board of Trustees has yet to approve this, but the President said that he, the Interim Provost, and Executive Vice President of Business Affairs Steve Osborne will be working with the Board to make these changes, which, if they go through, will mark the fourth straight year of increases for these promotions. The President stressed that he hopes this is taken as evidence of “the seriousness with which we are taking faculty compensation and recognizing the work of those who have given years of service to the College as members of our faculty.”

---

The President closed by saying “it’s a privilege to serve with you. I’m excited to have an opportunity to work on the future that I described. Jointly, our dedication, our energy, and our ideas can take this college forward.” He added that, as he told the Board of Trustees, having gone to the College of Charleston himself, along with four of his siblings, the College is in his “DNA” and is “part of [his] family.” Each day on the job, he said, he has a “closer connection to this institution.” He said, that, looking around the room at the faculty Senators who have volunteered to serve, he “hope[s] that [the faculty] do get excited about the balanced future this institution has.” We have, he said, “the ability, with the tools we have, to transform our vision into reality in the years ahead and keep the College of Charleston, the College of Charleston.”

**Questions / Discussion / Comments**

**Phil Jos**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), specified that in the
past discussions we have had about moving towards a comprehensive university versus a liberal arts college, there was an idea of a trade-off: the move was considered necessary because the liberal arts model, particularly one that calls for a significant number of out-of-state students, might not earn much support from the General Assembly (GA). He asked the President for his read of that body’s attitude. Is it changing? How do you envision our “threading the needle”?

The GA, the President replied, sees the Lowcountry as an “economic unit in competition with other economic units,” and that we have many jobs we can’t fill, and so we people bring in from out of state to fill those jobs.

The people who come from out of state to the College, he said, we hope will stay in our community and fill the jobs. The President vowed to repeat to the GA what he heard from the employer he cited in his report above, how “a liberal arts education teaches you how to think. We are not a trade school. Never will be.” He added that he thinks the GA will support us if we are “good stewards” of state funding, which the President noted that he’s trying to do by keeping an eye on spending.

He emphasized that there is no initiative he is aware of to make the College a comprehensive state university. The GA, he said, is “satisfied” with the idea of targeted doctoral programs, but we should remain vigilant about where the support is coming from for any proposed programs, asking if the data is reliable and if what it is said that we need will need in the future is what, in fact, we will need in the future. “It would be wrong” to go out and raise money for programs that do not truly meet a need.

Furthermore, he reiterated that any new graduate programs would require a concomitant strengthening of our undergraduate program. He added that he “is going back to the [GA], for instance, on one program [to] ask them for additional money to enrich our undergraduate experience here with that program, allow[ing] us to hire more professors and to go forward.”

He also pledged to work with other Presidents of public schools in the state to advocate for public education. “One of the greatest dangers to public education [in the state] right now, K-12 and higher education,” he asserted, “is this debate that you can fix the roads of South Carolina without a gas tax. All of the other things come back to the general fund. The general fund was set up for education, and for law enforcement, and for health. It was never set up to fund roads....You could rob every new dollar out of that account for the next ten years and dump it into roads, and it will have as much effect on filling that 29 billion dollar deficit as a rain drop will out here in the harbor.” We need to make ourselves heard: the GA has to “re-engage” with public education.

Richard Nunan, Philosophy, asked about the 10% pilot program, expressing some concerns. While it might work in the short term in the local area, it might also fairly quickly engender lawsuits from parties elsewhere in the state who also graduated in the top 10% of their high schools’ senior classes and, on failing to be admitted to the College, could claim discrimination because the 10% program did not apply to them.
Such an equal protection lawsuit might arise from a white student, given the plan’s stated intention of increasing diversity. A loss in such a lawsuit, which is likely, Nunan asserted, would force us to go statewide with the program, whether we want to or not.

Raising another concern, Nunan noted that the President stated in his report that he would like to see the program go statewide, yet, Nunan argued, the numbers might be a problem. That is, with a statewide automatic acceptance of the top 10% of graduating seniors at all schools (granted that some will not come) and given that we enroll a relatively high percentage of out-of-state students whose much higher tuition dollars we use to essentially subsidize our in-state students, would this not create a serious financial problem as incoming in-state students might crowd out incoming out-of-state students?

The President, responding first to the implied 14th Amendment implications, stated that the courts have “consistently said that you can distinguish between different groups based upon objective criteria,” such as class-rank achievement. There are already other programs in South Carolina that rely on objective-criteria basis, such as guardian ad litem programs. On this basis, despite the chance that someone might file a racial- or socioeconomic-discrimination suit, the President said he has no fear of losing an equal protection suit in court for the 10% program.

Replying to the numbers concern, the President acknowledged Nunan’s observation that out-of-state students’ tuition dollars are important, but the President said that the program is not trying to drive the percentage of out-of-state students down, nor does he think it will have that effect. He emphasized that the result of the program will be a chance to enroll students from low-socioeconomic areas who are talented and who can be successful here, but who otherwise might not come.

The President reiterated that we need to run the program first as a pilot and then follow up with careful analysis of its outcomes. The only way to know if the pilot will be successful, he said, is to first run it. With its reach into counties and areas we do not typically draw from, particularly if we can provide scholarships, the program, he stated, has a chance of helping us “begin to reverse the regression that we’ve had.” It is not only important in its own right, but, he added, it may also garner us “high marks” in the GA and more support from them, as a result.

Nunan followed up. Assuming that lawsuits will not be a problem and the program is so wildly successful in the pilot that we go statewide with it, he said, what happens when you look at the numbers, and it seems that we will get flooded with applicants who are guaranteed acceptance? Would you, Nunan asked, then be prepared to lower the 10% figure to 5% or something else?

The President, first noting that success would also likely cause Clemson and USC to join in with the plan, said, yes, the percentage might need to be reduced in the scenario Nunan described. We need to be flexible, he said. The pilot will allow us to see how it works. The selection of the three other counties is critical: they need to be significantly different from the tri-county area in order to indicate how such a program might work statewide.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked if the administration could share some
data with the faculty that might help contextualize the pilot program, such as the current percentage breakdown of in-state versus out-of-state incoming first year students and the percentage of South Carolina students that we accept who are not already in the top 10% of their high school graduating classes. What the President seemed to be saying, Krasnoff observed, is that with the program, we would essentially trade the in-state population: it would be “demographically different but numerically similar.” The data requested could be revealing.

The President replied that he “would love” for the faculty to have this data, which he said, may suggest that in some schools we’re already getting some of the students that the program targets.

Krasnoff followed up, adding that he commends the program's commitment not just to accept students but also to actively recruit them and support them financially and academically.

The President concurred, saying that programs like SPECTRA, tutoring, and so forth will help such students succeed. As for the financial end, the President adduced the upcoming fund-raising campaign, with its emphasis on scholarships, as an example of how groundwork is being laid for the program. He added that the model in which tuition is continually raised is untenable, as raising tuition can reach a point where it backfires. We have to be careful, he cautioned, about out-of-state tuition on this score.

Scott Peeples, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), asked the President about faculty compensation beyond the needed step-ups on promotion that he talked about in his report. We lag behind our peer institutions in salaries, Peeples noted, especially at the Associate and full Professor ranks: are any efforts being made or is there a strategy to address salary compression via future merit increases and/or market adjustments?

The President replied that he is attending to how money is spent for compensation at the College, beginning with the compensation for administration, making sure that administration is not growing out of proportion to our student population. He noted that to look into faculty salary, for his first two months in office, he had all the faculty pay forms coming to his desk for his personal sign-off. By this means, he said, he has begun to educate himself on what people get paid in relation to what they do at the College. He said he “was stunned at some of the amounts,” how low they were. He is aware of the problem.

As for specifics, he said that such a large amount of his time upon arriving on campus was taken up with disentangling “the mess down at TD Arena,” that it crowded out the opportunity, among other things, to make a closer study of faculty compensation. Faculty compensation is, he said, on his agenda, and he welcomed any input faculty might have. “For the College to remain competitive, we have to attract good faculty and we’ve got to hold on to them,” he said. With a generally improving economy, he asserted, the GA needs to make some investments in public education.

The President reiterated that he is staying on top of financial matters and, in that vein, he brought attention to an example of repeated and senseless expense in the leaking roof in one of our buildings, which has apparently required 50 visits by contractors in
five years and major work, raising questions of accountability. The President said that he wanted to insure faculty in that building that the problem is being addressed.

He asked faculty to bring ideas to him on financial matters, including controlling costs. In fact, the President said, the step-up increases for promotions was an idea brought to him.

---

The President, at this point, had to depart, and so questions and discussion closed.

B. The Interim Provost (Outline PDF | Proposed School of Professional Studies - Memos PDF | Presentation Slides PDF)

The Interim Provost thanked the Senate for the opportunity to address the body in his new role. He expressed gratitude for the President’s leadership since taking his post in July, at a time, the Provost noted, “when some members of our community, frankly, wondered whether we were committed to treating out students with dignity and respect, and I think that question has been answered finally and fully by the events of these last seven weeks.”

The Provost also thanked the members of the Office of Academic Affairs and all the Deans for their kindness and courtesy as he moved into his new position. He also shared his appreciation for the kindness on his departure of the team in the President’s office and also for the many faculty and staff who contacted him individually with their encouragement and well wishes.

The Provost began by observing that the new mission statement, of which the President spoke, is “still quite consistent with the strategic plan that was carefully and fully framed back in 2009...with ample and full faculty input. The elements of that strategic plan are fundamentally not changed.” Constants are “respect for the College’s historic liberal arts and sciences tradition” and “respect for our public mission, with a belief that high quality and access are not incompatible and that an exceptional education is not reserved to the few but must be available to the many.”

*The Provost presented slides (linked to above) and discussed them: information below is in addition to that which is already provided in the slides or which represents significant elaboration on the content of the slides.*

The Provost noted that the enrollment figures he presented are tenth-day figures and are, thus, still subject to change while we are still in the drop/add period.

The “SC Origins” figures in slide 2 demonstrate, the Provost argued, that we are in no way turning our back on the local community. “Holistic Admissions” in the same slide refers to a shift at the College from number-based admissions practices (in which a high SAT score, despite a poor GPA, for instance, might earn an applicant a spot) to a balanced focus on multiple indicators. But, the Provost mentioned, if you wanted a single metric that *might* predict success, it would be high school GPA. The holistic
approach, the Provost noted, has had the effect of a slight decline in ACT and, particularly, in SAT scores for incoming students. The average SAT score is now in the 1100s, but this is not at all a matter for concern, so long as students are succeeding.

In the overall enrollment picture, we are down in undergraduate enrollment slightly from last year and are up slightly compared to 2010. Graduate enrollment is down a bit from last year. Out-of-state numbers are slightly down, while in-state numbers are slightly up. This “makes our legislature happy,” but, he noted, also “makes it a little bit harder to balance our books.”

The Provost praised the new facility for the North Campus and Lowcountry Graduate Center, a grand opening of which is scheduled for September 10.

The new facility at Harborwalk, which is also a very nice, he noted, will have a long occupancy by the College, since it will first provide swing space for the Rita Hollings Science Center renovations, which will be followed by Harborwalk’s service as swing space for the Simons Center renovations. The Provost thanked all who were involved in the development of the facility, singling out Steve Osborne and Alyson Goff in Business Affairs, Dean Michael Auerbach, and the department chairs and faculty most affected by the transition.

The Addlestone Library has now added flex space with multiple media screens and flexible configuration, which allows the hosting of large events and smaller events and meetings, as well. The Provost encouraged faculty to visit it and to think about how they might make use of this “21st century learning space” with their own classes.

The Provost also provided a calendar for the upcoming SACSCOC (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges) reaffirmation. The upcoming ten year reaffirmation visit will require, as he put it, “an enormous amount of work” by Assistant Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning Penny Brunner and her group, the administration, and the faculty.

The Provost asked Brunner if she had anything to add. First, she noted problems with the Provost’s slide’s information, which he promised to fix [the link to the slide deck above is to corrected slides]. She also noted that QEP will be coming up in the fall, and when the on-site review occurs in Spring of 2017, it will be scheduled somewhere between January and April.

This concluded the Provost’s discussion of items in his slides.

Collaboration

The President’s comments about collaboration and shared governance, the Provost said, “has brought home an old conversation about how to make sure that we have a true spirit of shared governance at the College.” The Provost referred to a 2005 faculty newsletter produced by then Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone, what the Provost
called a “somber reflection on the importance of faulty involvement in institutional decision making processes and an expression of concern that faculty were being marginalized by the events of that day.” While our situation may be different now, the Provost found the following words of Mignone still compelling:

“With improved communication, there may be a greater likelihood that broad faculty input will be sought before key institutional decisions are made, and there will be more opportunities to remind the administration why this is important.”

The Provost asked Mignone if the statement “still works for [him],” garnering the reply from Mignone, “Yeah, it does,” to which he further added, “that note, by the way, led to the biggest chewing out I ever had in the President’s office [President Higdon].”

The Provost noted that he is entirely in support of the statement quoted above, and that to his understanding, President McConnell is as well, and both he and the President, the Provost said, hold it as a goal to see that the tradition of faculty governance be “fully and properly restored.” Since it is likely that a new President and a new Provost will at one point or another, in the minds of faculty, “screw up, sooner or later.” “All I ask,” the Provost said, “is that you cut us a little slack along the way, but also, I would submit, that many mistakes are going to be avoided if we make a commitment to communication and input from our diverse constituencies.”

The Provost noted that for this reason, he has reinstated the Academic Forums, but not just for deans, but for department chairs and chairs of major faculty committees for an ongoing conversation with the Academic Council, which will convene in a few weeks. The Speaker of the Faculty, in connection with this, has been spending a good deal of time in the offices of the Provost and the President. The Provost is also looking for ways to consult with staff and students.

**Budget**

People are concerned about transparency in the budget process, especially in Academic Affairs. The process the President has asked for, the Provost specified, begins in requests from programs and departments to the schools and then from the schools to Academic Affairs. This is the same as prior processes, except there will be added to this “a first public hearing where all of those budgets at the school level and the administrative office level in Academic Affairs will be presented to [the Provost] as well as to the members of the [Faculty] Budget Committee, if they are willing.” This will provide an opportunity for anyone who wishes to hear budget priorities across units in summary form. This will be a “public hearing of what’s coming into the Provost’s office.” An initial, draft budget will be presented by the Provost to the Budget Committee in another public meeting. This will be a “transparent process, with budgets that have been keyed to strategic plans at the school and institution level and with the opportunity for input and expressions of concern about whether or not we got it right.” This will not assure, of course, that budgets submitted to the President will make everyone happy, but it does make for transparency and openness in the
School of Professional Studies

The Provost noted that the School of Professional Studies (SPS) was created in June, but, “unfortunately, it was created in a process that did not make a large number of people aware of its creation.” Memoranda circulated between President Benson and Provost Hynd laying out the rationale for the school were provided to the Senate in a document that also includes a later memo from President McConnell to Provost Hynd delaying the creation of SPS until late in September. The Interim Provost stated that the delay does not imply a criticism of those who developed the SPS, but recognizes the need for faculty input in a significant matter, and “that the process of creating the last few schools at the College was contentious...[and] the best way to make sure that there’s an opportunity to assess the wisdom of the creation of the school is to give the faculty of the institution every opportunity to say what they think about that school and its prospects for success.” The present Faculty Senate meeting, the Provost said, provides an opportunity for feedback, as the President promised in July.

The Provost, at this point, expressed his willingness to take questions on any or all of the items he and the President discussed in their reports, also adding that, if faculty or guests prefer, they can also address their questions and/or concerns directly to him via email.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

Bill Olejniczak, Senator - History, following up on a question he asked President Benson at the final meeting of the Faculty Senate for the 2013-14 academic year (see minutes, 3. B., “Questions/Comments”), asked where we stand in terms of the 100 new roster-line faculty that are called for in the strategic plan to be added by 2020, and if we can get from the Provost at the October Faculty Senate meeting an actual number for the hires we have made toward this goal.

The Provost said that at the upcoming October Faculty Senate meeting he will be happy to answer the question with as much precision as he can. However, to “be completely candid,” he added, “since 2009, when that plan was approved, the model that was supposed to fund those 100 faculty vanished in smoke. State appropriations have been flat, at best,” added to which there has been and will be no added growth in undergraduate enrollments. The funding options, thus, are slight: it would have to come from philanthropy, new state support, and/or on enrollment growth in areas where we can grow (graduate, evening or weekend enrollments here or at the North Campus). None of these seem promising. He will give a progress report, said the Provost, but he was not sanguine about the likelihood of our reaching the goal.

Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, said that as he...
understood the Provost’s report, the budget process will become public and transparent once budgets leave the schools. The Provost concurred.

Shaver then suggested that, since, as he put it, “department chairs are the people really in charge of where the rubber meets the road,” the process should be open and transparent first at the department chair level.

The Provost asked Shaver to clarify: “is the suggestion that we ought to have transparency between the chairs and the faculty within the schools so that everyone in the school can know what was submitted by every department?”

Shaver replied, yes, that would be one way. His concern, he said, “is that decisions can be made at the level of a school that will not be transparent if the department chairs in the school are not somehow represented in a prior aspect of the process.”

The Provost promised to have a conversation with the deans, but he noted that he thinks the idea sounds reasonable. The Provost sought the opinion of deans at the meeting, but too few were at that point in the room to get a good sample of opinion. He then asked if any department chairs in the audience had a “problem” with the idea.

Scott Peeples, Chair - Department of English, said that he is not sure how much he needs to know about other departments’ budgets but that he would like to know more about how decisions are made. Shaver’s idea seemed reasonable, he said.

Beth Goodier, Chair - Department of Communication, said she likes the idea of deans making clear how priorities are decided upon and sees no problem with more transparency at the departmental level.

The Provost reiterated that the idea seems reasonable to him, and he will take it into consideration.

Irina Gigova, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), thanked the Provost for the discussion of collaboration and faculty governance, and asked a question about the proposed SPS and the North Campus. What are the enrollments now on the North Campus and in the Bachelors in Professional Studies (BPS) program? Is the North Campus actually making money at present, and is it worth continuing our investment, given how short funds are throughout the College?

The Provost noted that the BPS was created relatively recently, and he feels it is his obligation in his role, as it is with all new programs, to give the program every opportunity to succeed. Regarding all the offerings at the North Campus, he said, calculating cost and return on investment to the downtown campus is important, but, he stressed, the same scrutiny should be applied to all our programs, not singling out only those at the North Campus.

Godfrey Gibbison, Dean - North Campus, replied that the North Campus meets the
needs of many types of students, among them BPS students. The BPS has recruited in the range of 50-55 students in its first year, which is a respectable number, given that the program first needed to be explained to the public and, indeed, to the faculty prior to that. Dean Gibbison said that the program has had good feedback and he expects it to grow, though he also expects that a couple adjustments may be needed along the way, with the input of faculty.

Beyond the BPS, a number of departments offer courses at the North Campus. Around 600 students each semester are enrolled to take courses and are supported at the campus. Several hundred students manage to get all their undergraduate credit hours at the North Campus every semester.

Also, despite the College having, as Dean Gibbison put it, “pulled a number of its old graduate programs from North Campus,” the graduate program is growing and doing quite well. “When we [CoC] had [those prior] graduate programs at the North Campus,” he noted, they were “at least generating on the order of several million dollars a year.” Dean Gibbison then asked Associate Provost Diamond to address budget concerns.

**Beverly Diamond, Associate Provost**, said that “it would be a little bit premature to be looking at the [BPS] to see if it’s generating a program that is, more or less, self-supporting,” but the College’s North Campus can and is being analyzed for costs right now.

To this end, she said, she has been looking at last year’s budgets and looking at the revenue that’s generated via student credit hours offered at the North Campus. Additionally, she reported having met with the Provost, with Associate Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning Jim Posey, and with Priscilla Burbage and Sam Jones in Business Affairs. These discussions are helping to establish the methodology for cost analysis and for developing an overhead figure. Overhead figures are used in analyzing programs on the main campus, like the Summer School, in order to capture facilities costs and the student support costs. The North Campus presents a different case, however, in part because there are a number of staff located there to provide ongoing student support in advising, financial aid, and admissions, for instance. Yet we still need to arrive at an overhead figure.

The Associate Provost reported that she is currently working on “tak[ing] the student credit hours that are associated with the education courses and a portion of the adjunct and permanent faculty costs and separat[ing] the costs associated with what they teach on this campus from what they teach on the North Campus.” This is, in effect, “combining the cost analysis approach we used a few years ago to determine a cost of the program, where we pull the cost of the student credit hours to the unit, but were also adding in all the facility costs, and then looking at all the tuition generated.” The Associate Provost said that the results of the analysis will be passed on to the Provost, the Chief Financial Officer, and the President, and to faculty.
The Provost added that he will try to provide a “yes, no, or maybe” response to Gigova’s question at the October meeting.

Gigova also asked if we can we continue discussion of the SPS in October, instead of ending discussion after this meeting.

The Provost replied that “ultimately, the President’s memo said end of September. I can’t extend that or change it; that’s his decision,” but the Provost said that the President would certainly take under advisement anything an individual wished to communicate to him, including suggesting that he give more time to the assessment of the SPS.

Beth Goodier, Chair - Department of Communication, commended Dean Gibbison on the BPS’s students and the work the program is doing in filling a vital need in the community. But she noted that with the creation of a new school, department chairs get understandably concerned about lines. With the creation of the BPS, she said, it was clear that department chairs would be hiring and credentialing faculty in the program. With the proposed SPS, though, she said, the line issue needs to be clarified.

The Provost replied that President Benson’s memo does not clarify the issue but, rather, “kicks it down the road.” On the one hand, the proposed SPS would be created “expressly” as a non-line school, which would, like other non-line schools (the Graduate School, the Honors College), “have to go out and get faculty elsewhere credentialed,” which is “consistent with the way this body created the [BPS] program, and the way, frankly, that the North Campus has been operating” for some time. On the other hand, the SPS as proposed also created “a way to move forward with hiring faculty, including roster faculty who might even be tenure stream with a notice provision.”

The Provost asserted that he is not sure if this was the right way to do it, but it does open the door for discussion about this issue. “It’s one thing to create a school. It’s another to say it can hire faculty.” While the school as created by President Benson would not, the Provost said, “change the game,” we do need to have answers addressing “what would change the game?,” and this is a question we might ask not only in regard to SPS, but also in regard to our existing non-line schools, the Graduate School and the Honors College.

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, also expressed concern about the notice provision, which struck him as “very weak.” It stipulates that “at any time the Provost may choose to initiate a transition for the School of Professional Studies to line-school status...,” which, Krasnoff observed, does not mean to “initiate the deliberations on”: instead, the transition can simply be put into motion by the Provost.

Also, the notice requirement sets notice at “six months to the date of the appointment of the first roster faculty member,” which could be August 15, but a search for this faculty member would very likely begin a lot earlier than six months. The Provost
could, then, give notice, Krasnoff pointed out, after the hiring process was already underway.

Thus, he suggested that there needs to be different language about the initiation of a change to line status and a longer period for notifying of the change. Very serious issues, Krasnoff argued, are opened with the shift to line status: will the standards of tenure and promotion be those in the FAM? If so, this could be a problem for the faculty hired for a school of this nature. If not, how would SPS faculty be evaluated? Until these issues are resolved, Krasnoff argued, the idea of switching to a line school is a “crazy” one.

The Provost summed up Krasnoff’s position and suggestion thusly: “if this goes forward, there ought to be a longer lead time and a separate trigger for a concrete faculty discussion in this body.” Krasnoff agreed.

There were no further questions.

C. The Speaker

The Speaker noted that the feasible, but perhaps too optimistic timeline for hiring a Faculty Secretariat to replace Heather Alexander would have a new secretariat in place at the October meeting.

The Speaker noted that he could use the assistance of the Senate in pointing out to him, the Faculty Secretary, and/or the Faculty Secretariat errors in and problems with the Senate webpages or pages that connect off of the Senate webpages.

The Speaker reported that our budget was set in June. The state legislature took a strong position on a tuition increase, capping it at 3.2%. This modest boost added approximately 4.5 million dollars to the budget, but accounting for the state-mandated 2% cost of living raises across the board, which took about 2 million dollars, and accounting for inflation, which took an additional 2 million dollars out, the remaining net gain from the increases is around .5 million to fund strategic initiatives and new programs.

In terms of faculty lines, the state approved for the College around 30 new lines but did not fund them. Two new faculty lines were approved through this year’s budget. One, in the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs, is a conversion from foundation funds to budget funds, and the other is to create the new Director of the Master’s in Child Life.

In his report, the President discussed a meeting between a group of faculty and the Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce. The Speaker noted, that because the order of reports were rearranged, some of the context for the President’s remarks was missing. The Speaker filled some of this in.

The President, he said, was surprised to learn that there had not been any meetings between the Chamber and faculty at the College, so he asked the Speaker to put
together a group of faculty to meet with the Chamber on August 19. The Speaker pulled together a group of 13 faculty members: one from each school, with more than one from schools which had been publically discussed as possible homes for future PhD programs. The Speaker found it an “enlightening experience” that was often affirming of what we do at the College. The President mentioned one employer’s comments: the speaker added that another IT entrepreneur at the meeting said that he hires lots of CofC students, particularly music majors, and if all they have is a minor in Computer Science, that is fine. The Speaker said that, as does the President, he hope this is the beginning of a continuing dialogue. The Speaker added that he will share with the faculty via email a list of those faculty who were in attendance at the meeting, in case anyone would like to contact them for more information about the meeting.

The Speaker concluded his report here.

D. The College’s Athletics Program: A Report to the Faculty Senate (Powerpoint)
Vincent Benigni, Faculty Athletics Representative

Benigni presented slides (linked to above) and discussed them: information below is in addition to that which is already provided in the slides or which represents significant elaboration on the content of the slides.

Athletic programs have done very well in the Colonial Athletic Association (CAA), but Benigni added, that the academic footprint of the conference was the most compelling reason to join the conference.

“Major clustering” on slide 3 refers to the tendency in some colleges and universities for athletes to cluster in a relatively small set of majors. That is not the case at the College: we have student athletes in all our majors.

While “academic progress rates” is a heading on the third slide, Benigni opted not to discuss it, for reasons of time.

The fifth slide lists schools in the CAA, and Benigni argued that these are schools the College might “benchmark with,” in a number of areas, including faculty salary.

Benigni thanked Trisha Fold-Bennett, Dean of the Honors College, and Andrea DeMaria, Health and Human Performance, for taking 10 of our students to the CAA research conference to present their research. Academic Affairs funded the presentations, and Benigni expressed hope that the funding will continue long term.

Cougar Trail events will be in Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, and New York to meet with alumni, prospective students, and donors. We will be trying to build our school brand across these major markets. The outreach should help us develop and keep the interest of prospective out-of-state students.
E. Faculty/Administration Manual Changes (PDF)
Rick Heldrich, Chair of the Committee on the By-Laws and the Faculty/Administration Manual

Heldrich noted that materials had been posted on the FAM changes and offered to answer questions.

There were none.

F. Progress Report: C of C’s Adjunct Faculty Policies & Practices (PDF | Word)
Presentation (PPT | PDF)
Julia Eichelberger, Faculty Administrative Fellow in the Office of Academic Affairs

Eichelberger presented slides (linked to above) and discussed them: information below is in addition to that which is already provided in the slides or which represents significant elaboration on the content of the slides. Her report (linked to above) is also posted on the Senate website.

Eichelberger explained that her report is based on work she has done in Academic Affairs as a Faculty Administrative Fellow.

By headcount (slide 4), the number of adjunct faculty may seem somewhat high, but that is due to the fact that we’re counting individuals who are adjunct faculty, versus roster faculty in full-time positions. Counting by percentage of undergraduate student credit hours (slide 5), we have a more meaningful number. When we compare the College’s adjunct use to national trends (slide 6), we have comparably favorable adjunct teaching data.

Regarding slide 7, if adjuncts teach a course that is more than three hours, their pay is prorated accordingly.

As the data in slides 7 and 8 demonstrate the College is paying an average adjunct wage, which is not to say, Eichelberger cautioned, that this is a good wage.

Affordable Care Act (ACA) coverage (Slide 12) is mandated for employees working 30 hours or more, and one has to qualify within a certain period, but many adjuncts will qualify for ACA coverage, which is a major improvement since 2013. The College has, Eichelberger noted, set aside funds to offer ACA coverage, and it will not cut hours of adjunct teachers in order to avoid mandated coverage. Eichelberger described ACA coverage access as a “game changer” for qualifying adjuncts.

Improved hiring procedures (Slide 13) move adjuncts into their jobs much more quickly, so that they can get paid as soon as possible. Nor do adjuncts get disconnected immediately from access to email when their terms end, a recognition that many adjuncts continue working for the College in successive semesters.
Professional development programs (Slide 14) “make individuals in departments better connected to their adjunct colleagues, they also support adjuncts in their teaching, strengthen their performance, and show respect for them.” These programs are a “big step forward.”

There is now a greater visibility for adjunct faculty (Slide 15) than there ever has been.

In slide 17, a “+” next to an item signifies progress in that area. “++” signifies significant progress. Those items without pluses are areas in which we have made no progress.

The recommendations specified in slides 19-25, Eichelberger stressed, are her own recommendations and not sponsored by or policy of Academic Affairs.

When departments request new lines, Eichelberger noted, it is to fulfill some instructional need and/or to acquire an expertise they do not already have. Departments, therefore, are not likely to ask for lines specifically to reduce adjunct dependency, but the Provost could (Slide 20).

Slide 22 represents the first page of an AAUP report supporting the inclusion of adjunct faculty in faculty governance.

Should adjunct faculty be represented in the Senate (Slide 23), Eichelberger said she thinks the President and the Provost would be receptive to creating stipends for those adjuncts who serve. She also offered, pursuant to the last item on the slide, to talk with any faculty or senate committee about adjunct issues and welfare.

Some departments, Eichelberger noted, already have hiring and evaluation processes comparable to those for roster faculty (Slide 24), such as hiring committees and consultation between the department chair and a hiring committee. Staffing plans in departments would account for how best to use adjuncts, how many adjuncts the department will think they need over time, and would help a department see how they are doing over time with adjunct staffing.

Questions / Discussion / Comments

Larry Krasnoff, Senator - Philosophy, asked if some departments had figured out how to pay adjuncts more or if that is not allowed.

Eichelberger noted that “there are a very small number of cases where individual adjuncts do get more.” Eichelberger said that she doesn’t think higher pay is disallowed, however. She deferred to Associate Provost Caveny-Noecker.

Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Associate Provost, noted that some departments with higher adjunct pay have made an argument about the market for the special expertise the adjunct has. There are two different situations, she said. In one, “a handful of
unique individuals make more because of the particular courses they can cover.” Then there are departments that have negotiated a slightly higher per-course rate, $2700, in at least one science department and in some departments in the School of Business.

**Krasnoff** also added that the kind of adjuncts we are talking about matters. We are not particularly concerned for the adjunct who works professionally but has also been teaching part-time for 10 or 15 years, whereas we should be deeply concerned for the cases in which an adjunct has been teaching full time for 10 or 15 years without any raises and so forth.

Eichelberger concurred, noting that the latter case is exploitative and has been featured in recent news stories in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and elsewhere. She would like, she said, to get a clearer picture of who our adjuncts are at the College.

**Krasnoff** also asked what the prospects might be for the expansion of instructor lines for those who have been serving in long-time, full time employment as adjuncts. Would departments balk at that, given that in most cases, when a department asks for an instructional line, it’s a tenure track line, typically?

Eichelberger agreed that departments tend to not ask for instructor lines. With our senior instructor lines and even visiting instructor lines, she replied, we come closer to best practices. An instructor, after all, is essentially an adjunct with a decent level of pay and an annual contract, things like that.

**Rick Heldrich**, Senator - School of Science and Math (SSM), noted that in the Chemistry department, instructors and adjuncts are defined quite differently. Instructors participate in curriculum development and are leaders of courses and labs, and adjuncts are temporary, part time, and, intentionally, are not invited to develop the curriculum, which they are not in the position to do. Nor are they qualified to do so.

**Phil Jos**, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS), commended Eichleberger for her work.

There were no further questions.

5. **Old Business**
   None

6. **New Business**
   A. **Election of Speaker Pro Tempore**

   The Speaker opened the floor for nominations.

   Kelly Shaver, Senator - Management and Entrepreneurship, nominated Irina Gigova, Senator - School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHHS).
As there were no other nominations, without objection and, thus, with unanimous consent, Gigova was elected Speaker Pro Tempore.

6. Constituents’ Concerns
   None.

7. Adjournment: 7:12 PM